Management of Disruptive Behaviors of Grade 1-Learners

Arcy S. Lazo

Associate Professor 1, College of Teacher Education, Benguet State University

Abstract

The study assessed the management of disruptive behaviors of grade 1 learners in La Trinidad, Benguet. Descriptive survey method was used, with a questionnaire as the main instrument for data collection. The findings reveal that the disruptive behaviors of grade 1 learners are moderately serious, the factors influencing disruptive behaviors have moderate influence, the academic performance is moderately affected, and lastly, the suggested measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors are very effective. In conclusion, disruptive learner behaviors causes problems for grade 1 teachers. The influencing factors are teacher-related and parent-related. Due to these problems, academic performance of learners is affected. Furthermore, the suggested measures to minimize the disruptive learner behaviors lie in the hands of teachers, who are the direct implementers.

Keywords: Desirable Behavior, Academic Difficulties, Positive Reinforcement

1. INTRODUCTION

Disruptive behaviors are undesirable behaviors of learners that distract the teaching and learning process of a class. Disruptive behaviors considered major and common problems in any school, remain and are continually experienced due to different children's experiences in their environment. Gines(2004) said, no matter how well organized and skillful a teacher is, some students will probably behave in ways that interfere with teaching and learning. Even in the best times, problem behaviors remain problems. For beginning teachers, the most difficult challenge they face is the difficulty in managing or controlling undesirable behaviors. Glasgow (2003) found out that stress arises when teachers are unable to discipline the students as they would usually prefer. Evertson and Emmer (2010), found out that pupils' misbehaviors impair their learning, achievement, and development. In the study of Woolfolk (2001) on 'Guidance Pupil Behavior', the greatest concern of the teachers is discipline. It is the key to success in every organization including the school endeavor. It is the preparation of pupils for life in a democratic society to help them acquire knowledge, power, habits, interests, determinations, and ideals designed for humane purposes. Discipline seeks the formation of a pupil's desirable behavior. B.F Skinner (1978), cited that reinforcement was proven to be powerful tool in shaping and controlling behavior both in and out of the classroom and emphasized that the environment had much greater influence on the learning and behavior. He further argued that the environment (parents, teachers, peers) reacts to our behavior and either reinforces or eliminates that behavior. Thus, behavior management is a skill for teachers to acquire.

Disruptive behaviors are great problems that affect the academic performance of the learners. Garcia, (2014), in a recent study of the National Center for Educational Statistics(NCES), 34% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the students' behavior problems interfered with their teaching. Administrators and

teachers perceived that behavioral problems had much effect on the academic performance of pupils, and activities were often undertaken. Furthermore, very serious misbehaviors of pupils emanate from home. Hence, family and home have an important role in building good behavior of the child (Cervantes, 2006). Banaag (2015), stressed that parents are the foremost persons to shape their children's lives. They play important roles in helping children self-regulate as well as the connections between thoughts, feelings and behavior. The school and the community have its contribution too to the behavioral problems of pupils.

These incivilities or behavioral problems are challenges for a classroom teacher especially the novice to find ways and use different strategies to overcome such disruptions. Management of these different disruptive behaviors is the most important thing to look into it and should be addressed by the administrators and teachers in school with the close cooperation of the parents. These problems should be controlled at an early age.

Management of disruptive behaviors is essential to solve such problems. Effective solutions are of prime importance in achieving the educational goal of quality education. Smooth flow, effective and efficient teaching and learning exist when undesirable behaviors are effectively controlled or minimized. The result of this study will contribute to the parents, classroom teachers, administrators, owners of schools, and the welfare of the learners.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Common Disruptive Behaviors

These problems arise in many schools and even in other countries. According to Kowalski(2003), reports of problematic behaviors are on the rise nationally, not only in the classroom but in society. Some of these immature, irritating, or thoughtless behaviors or "classroom incivilities" are: tardiness or leaving early, inappropriate cellphone and laptop usage in class, side conversations, disregard for deadlines, grade grubbing, sniping remarks, and cheating. Gines (2004), found out that students exhibited the following disruptive behaviors: humming, noises, restlessness, talkativeness, shouting one's answer, answering at the same time, moving around, standing, short attention span, fighting, hitting, temper tantrums, destructive, resistance, uncooperativeness, lack of perseverance, does not follow instruction, staring blankly, failing to finish activities, and eating inside the classroom. Ampe (2001), revealed that noisiness, easily disturbed, and whispering were various disciplinary problems often manifested by the pupils with insecurity. Disciplinary problems for aggressive behavior like troublesome, eating during class hours, and littering were the problems often manifested. Disciplinary problems on the withdrawal behaviors like writing on the board without permission. Littering, eating during class hours, and troublesome were the problems often manifested by pupils in the intermediate in Region I. Likewise, Baustista (2011), found out that passivity and physical aggression were both often encountered behavioral problems at the elementary level as perceived by the guidance counselors. Dio-al (2003) found out that some behavioral problems observed in the classroom are inattentiveness, talkativeness, truancy, laziness, standing and roaming around, cheating, and others. The study also highlighted laziness, absenteeism, and truancy as top behavioral problems perceived by elementary teachers, and administrators in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) . Another result of study by Pulquiso (2012) was the common problems in Bakun perceived by the school heads and teachers as very serious were: bullying and other unwanted behaviors of pupils.

2.2. Influencing Factors

There are some reasons or causes why pupils display undesirable behaviors. Pulquiso (2012) found the

following causes of classroom problems are inadequate skills, and training of teachers/parents on how to handle classroom and home discipline, the close-minded attitude of teachers to effect change in their teaching strategies, and less/no coordination/no rapport between parents and teachers. These are very serious problems as perceived by the teachers and school heads. Liberal(2007), found out that the most serious problem in performing the role to develop desirable behavior was the lukewarm attitude of the parents in following up the teachers' behavior modification strategies among their children.

Likewise, Viray (2006) discovered that the absence of acceptable study habits, numerous house chores, and a home that is not conducive to learning were the most influenced home-related factors to student disciplinary problems. The parents–related factors that highly influenced the occurrence and frequency of student disciplinary problems were poverty, insufficient cash allowance, and inadequate provisions because of unemployed parents. On this problem, Cervantes (2006) stressed that there are three indicators perceived by teachers as very serious causes of behavioral problems, such as: difficult and boring lessons, especially if it is difficult, indifference of parents, and poor health. Other problems include heavy home chores, poverty, and poor health. Kowalski (2003) also pointed out that students can engage in problematic behaviors because of health problems, personal or family problems, adjustment or development issues (Immaturity or self-esteem issues), or academic difficulties. Likewise, Beloken (2011) found out problems on parents such as having no one to take care of their children, parents having many children to attend to, parents having low educational level, and schools having no budget for their children to participate in funded school activities were also factors of behavioral problems of pupils. According to Banaag (2015) emotions serve as fundamental shapers/determinants of behavior in children. The research underscore that, denying children's emotions leads to a negative behavior. Furthermore, Banaag (2015) posited that parents' presence reduces the child's anxiety/fear in difficult situations, thereby enhancing their sense of competence and efficacy.

Other causes of behavioral problems that are always observed in a class were too protective parents that is why the child becomes dependent, pupils lack affection from parents due to work, lack of school supplies (poverty), the influence of peers, and others. In Cervantes (2010) study, found out that the very serious causes of behavioral problems were difficulty/ boring lessons, indifference of parents, and poor health. Likewise, Dio-al (2003) identified poor health, indifference of parents, and teacher factors as the three most significant causes of behavioral problems. Furthermore, Ampe (2010) revealed that the inability to cope with lessons, inadequate school facilities, poor recreational facilities, and boring and monotonous lessons were contributory to behavioral problems. Gines (2004) added that classroom physical conditions like poor ventilation, room temperature may cause disruption. In addition, Viray (2006), revealed dirty and dimly-lighted classrooms and favoritism highly influenced the occurrence of disciplinary problems.

The foregoing home and community factors discussed, which contributed to disciplinary problems, are summarized as follows: economic instability, unfavorable home environment, over-protection of parents, too many home chores, laxity or authoritarianism of parents and guardians, poor health, broken home, and indifference of parents.

2.3. Effect of Disruptive Behaviors

Disruptive behaviors affect the teaching and learning process leading to low academic performance. Cervantes (2006) found out that administrators and teachers perceived behavioral problems of pupils had much effect on learners' academic performance. Likewise, Pulquiso (2012) found out that the effect of common disruptive behavior problems encountered by school heads and teachers had very serious effects. These were the indifference of teachers to give remediation activities to slow-performing pupils,

withdrawal from the group/truancy/less socialization, low-performance rate, and unmotivated pupils to perform school activities. Viray (2006), cited also that teachers have a moderate capacity to handle and solve disciplinary problems, particularly the students who are quarrelsome, mischievous, tardy, and always absent. Kowalski (2003), pointed out that behavioral problems distract other students and instructors in class, reduce student participation, lower students' and instructors' motivation in and out of the class, and affect fairness in grading. He also discovered that instructors use time unproductively.

Kapalka (2009) revealed that impulsive individuals spend little time thinking through the consequences of their behaviors and act too quickly. Often those actions result in negative consequences, and reactions, including frustration and anger. Viray (2006) found out that for students who are either unruly or disrupted, the most significant effect on the teaching-learning process was lecture or discussion. The most manifested effects on academic performance were difficulty in establishing study habits and poor participation in classroom activities.

In addition, Kapalka (2009), revealed that impulsive individuals exhibit limited self-control. Their diminished ability to think through the consequences of their behaviors often results in their inability to adapt to situations that don't turn out as they would like. Impulsive, oppositional, and defiant students commonly develop a negative expectation of their academic abilities. Their poor tolerance of frustration and weak learning modality (e.g. problems with writing) affect their motivation because they recognize that they have to work hard to produce a product that is at least acceptable quality. In addition, because they frequently argue with their teachers, those students conclude that the teachers do not like them, and they do not want to work hard to satisfy the standards that those teachers impose on them.

2.4. Measures to Minimize Disruptive Behaviors

It is important to minimize disruptive behaviors in a classroom to achieve quality education for the learners. Their negative impact should be controlled. Liberal (2007) suggested that teachers being good role models could help minimize problems in developing desirable pupil behavior. Related to this Ampe (2001) proposed interpersonal relations with children and having a closed-door dialogueas measures to minimize disciplinary problems. Likewise, Pulquiso (2012) suggested the following measures: teaching with the love and logic principle, providing learning equipment and materials, openness of teachers, conducting teacher-parent conferences, and constantly improving the school head-teacher relationship. In addition, Timbreza (2014) suggested that teachers should practice and live the values they would like to instill into the children because what learners see, they imitate and imbibe. Furthermore, Bautista (2011) along with counseling, consultation and follow-up monitoring are more effective in handling of behavioral problems of physical aggression, defiance, and passivity. She recommended further emphasis on the need for collaborative effort between school and home in the intervention, prevention, remediation, and enrichment services by way of seminars, symposiums, and structured activities.

Evertson and Emmer, (2009) emphasized that inappropriate behavior must be handled promptly to prevent its continuation and spreading. Prolonged inattention makes it difficult for students to learn and to complete assignments. Furthermore, violations of rules and failure to follow procedures create many problems. Likewise, inappropriate behaviors should be dealt with directly but without overreaction. A calm and reasoned tone or approach is more productive and less likely to lead to confrontation. Make eye contact with the student or move closer to the student. Use a signal such as a finger to the lips or a headshake to prompt the appropriate behavior. Students not following the procedure correctly, remind the procedure. Students not working or off-task-redirect his/her attention to the task. Ask the students to stop the inappropriate behavior.

Furthermore, Sabornie (2010) suggested four principles to reduce behavioral problems. First, by defining school policies for the students to abide. Next, is knowing, and using students' names to avoid anonymity, and engage students in one-on-one interaction. Then, seeking feedback from students and lastly, engaging in active learning. Kapalka (2009) revealed that effective command to oppositional and defiant students leads to management success. The components of this effective command are attention cue, command, and follow-up look. According to Aquino and Miranda (2000), some ways of controlling behaviors are through intrinsic and external motivation. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to be effective and to perform a behavior for its own sake. External motivation, someone is motivated to do or work because of a reward or punishment. According to McComas (2015), there are three tips for parents and teachers to deal with problems. First, think about the pattern of problem. Where and when does the behavior typically happen, and what else is going on when the behavior begins? Second, keep children occupied and responsive. Third, set up practice sessions with the child for him or her to engage in appropriate behavior and reinforce with praise and positive rewards.

3. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of the Study

The study finds its anchor in the theory and concepts of behaviorism. Behaviorism is primarily concerned with observable aspects of human behavior. Behaviorist learning theories emphasize changes in behavior that result from stimulus-response associations made by the learner. Behavior is directed by stimuli. According to Parkay and Hass (2000), an individual selects one response instead of another because of prior conditioning and psychological drives existing at the moment of action.

Behaviorist asserts that the only behaviors worthy of study are those that can be directly observed; thus, it is actions rather than thoughts or emotions that are the legitimate object of the study. Behaviorist theory does not explain abnormal behavior in terms of the brain or its inner workings. Standridge (2002) posits that all behaviors are learned habits and attempts to account for how these habits are formed.

In assuming that human behavior is learned, behaviorists also hold that all behaviors can be unlearned and replaced by new behavior, that is, when a behavior becomes unacceptable. A key element of this theory of learning is the rewarded response. Parkay and Hass (2000) explained that the desired response must be rewarded for learning to take place.

Another theory on which this study was based is that of Pavlov's classical conditioning theory. This theory was based on the basic stimulus-response sequential relationships of behavior changes. It is based on the adhesive principle, which means that a response is attached to a stimulus occurring just before the response so that the recurrence of the stimulus will evoke or cause the response. On Pavlov's principle, Broniac (2009) believed that human behavior resulted from specific stimuli that elicited certain responses. His basic premise was that conclusions about human development should be based on observation of overt behavior rather than speculation about subconscious motives or patent cognitive processes.

Lastly, the study is also based on Bandura's social cognitive theory. This theory proposes that learners learn by modeling the behavior of others and noting the consequences of observed behavior. Bandura argues that reinforcement is not always a prerequisite to learning. Learning may also occur by watching someone else's actions and experiencing reinforcement or punishment. This kind of learning is called observational learning or modeling a wide range of behaviors. Children acquire many favorable and unfavorable responses by observing those around them.

Teachers sometimes systematically apply behaviorism, especially when addressing difficult and chronic behavioral problems. The two systematic approaches for modifying challenging behaviors are Applied

Behavior Analysis and Positive Behavior Support.

On Applied Analysis Behavior, Omrod (2000) calls this Behavior Modification, Behavior Therapy, or Contingency Management. This approach is based on the assumption that behavioral problems result from past and present environmental circumstances and that modifying the learner's present environment will promote more productive responses. Using Applied Behavioral Analysis, teachers use some strategies. One is to describe both present behavior and desired terminal behavior in observable, measurable terms. Identify one or more effective reinforcements, and develop a specific intervention or treatment plan. Measure the frequency of desired behavior, shaping, extinction, and reinforcing compatible behavior. Punishment or some combination of these, measure the frequency of desired and or undesirable behaviors both before treatment, and during treatment, monitor the treatment program for its effectiveness by observing how various behaviors change overtime; take steps to promote generalization of newly acquired behaviors; and gradually phase out the treatment after the desired behaviors are acquired.

Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) is an approach wherein teachers and therapists place particular emphasis on identifying one or more purposes that certain undesirable behaviors serve for the student. They also determine how the environment may inadvertently be encouraging those behaviors. They use several strategies to promote appropriate behaviors.

The foregoing discussed theories, concepts, and approaches, and the ideas abstracted from them were synthesized and conceptualized into this study focused on the management of disruptive behaviors of learners.

This study assessed the management of the disruptive behaviors of the grade I learners. It sought to determine the degree of seriousness of the common disruptive behaviors, degree of influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors, extent of effect of the disruptive behaviors on the academic performance of the learners, and degree of effectiveness of the measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

The descriptive survey method of research was used in this study, with the questionnaire as the main instrument in gathering the needed data. It is descriptive in the sense that it describes the prevailing conditions for analysis, description, and interpretation. It includes the identification of trends and relationships. According to Calmorin (2012), a descriptive survey design is a method that focuses on the present situation. The purpose is to find the truth. The truth may have different forms, such as an increased quantity of knowledge, a new generalization, and an increased insight into factors, which is operating the discovery of new causal relationships, a more accurate formulation of the problem to be solved, and many others. Zulueta and Costales (2004) further explained that descriptive research seeks information about one or more variables. It is used to answer the question "What exists?" This question can be answered in one or two ways: using a quantitative or qualitative method.

In this study it looked into and described the disruptive behaviors of grade I learners. The method was used to attain concrete vital facts as well as information relative to the descriptive behaviors of grade I learners.

4.2. Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study delved into the management of disruptive behaviors of learners in La Trinidad District, Benguet, Division, Philippines. It focused on the common disruptive behaviors of grade I learners, factors that

influence disruptive behaviors of learners, the effect of disruptive behaviors on the academic performance of learners, and measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners.

4.3. Local and Population of the Study

The study was conducted in the public elementary schools of La Trinidad District, Benguet Division, Philippines during the school year 2015 – 2016. The respondents consisted of 20 administrators and 48 Grade 1 teachers, totaling 68 respondents. Convenience sampling, a non-probability technique, was employed in this study.

4.4. Data Gathering Instrument

In gathering the data, the main tool used was the questionnaire. This was augmented by informal interviews, participation, observation, and library techniques. In constructing the questionnaire, the researcher studied carefully the specific problems to determine what each requires for its correct answer. Considering what the problems require for the answers, the questions were formulated ensuring that these questions were congruent to the problems.

4.5. Reliability and Validity of the Research Instrument

To determine the reliability of the instrument, it was tried out on 5 administrators and 5 teachers in the public elementary schools in Baguio City. The results were subjected to the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 (Rogathgi, 2003) to determine its reliability coefficient. The computations resulted in a computed reliability of 0.93, interpreted as very highly reliable.

To validate the questionnaire, the researcher used content validity. The specific problems were carefully analyzed to determine what data or information each problem needed to answer. The researcher constructed the questionnaire and submitted it to her adviser for critique. The needed corrections and enrichment of the questions were incorporated and finalized.

4.6. Data Gathering Procedure

Before floating the questionnaire, permission was obtained from the Dean of the Graduate School of Baguio Central University and the schools division superintendent of Benguet Division. During the distribution and retrieval of the questionnaires, some informal interviews were conducted to some teachers and administrators. Likewise, observations were done in the schools visited. The respondents were requested to accomplish the questionnaires honestly and were gathered at the earliest time. Upon collection of questionnaires the gathered data were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

4.7. Statistical Treatment of Data

The statistical treatments used were the weighted mean, ranking, and t-test equation for independent variables. The weighted mean was used to quantify the responses to the items in the tables, while the ranking was used to prioritize the items based on the weighted means. The t-test was used to determine the significance of difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers. Three-point Likert scale was used to determine the descriptive equivalent of responses.

Numerical values, statistical limits, descriptive equivalents, and symbols were used in the study with the three-point scale.

Problem Number	Numerical Value	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent	Symbol
1	3	2.34-3.00	Very Serious	VS
	2	1.67-2.33	Moderately Serious	MS
	1	1.00-1.66	Least Serious	LS

2	3	2.34-3.00	Great Influence	GI
	2	1.67-2.33	Moderate Influence	MI
	1	1.00-1.66	Least Influence	LI
3	3	2.34-3.00	Great Effect	GE
	2	1.67-2.33	Moderate Effect	ME
	1	1.00-1.66	Least Effect	LE
4	3	2.34-3.00	Very Effective	VE
	2	1.67-2.33	Moderately Effective	ME
	1	1.00-1.66	Least Effective	LE

5. Results and Discussions

5.1. Degree of Seriousness of the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Table 1 presents the degree of seriousness of the disruptive behaviors of learners. As shown in the table, generally the degree of seriousness of disruptive behaviors of learners is moderately serious, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 2.07, described as moderately serious. This means that teachers are somewhat managing their classes despite the diversity of learners. This further implies that while these behaviors are manageable by teachers in their own classrooms, they should not be neglected. Furthermore, this result may imply a stronger and positive behavior management. Looking at the mean of each group of respondents, it reveals that administrators and teachers perceive disruptive behaviors of learners as moderately serious, having means of 2.03 and 2.08, respectively. This result is may be related to the fact that any behavioral issues are reported or submitted to the administrators for possible guidance. This implies that both administrators and teachers have a positive collaboration in terms of learners' behavior. This further implies that schools have a unified policy that administrators, teachers and learners have to follow.

Digging in deeper, almost all identified disruptive behaviors were under moderately serious, however, noisy and talkative was shown to have the highest mean of 2.51, interpreted as very serious. This result may be associated with the fact that grade 1 learners are at their developmental stage where social interaction is a primary part of growth. They are generally expressive and eager to share their thoughts with peers. Uncontrolled talking overpowers the teacher's voice, which may cause interested learners to learn but not hear what the teacher says. Related to this, inattentive, bored and chatting with classmates while the teacher is discussing the lesson comes next with a mean of 2.21. This means that there is a limited involvement of learners in the learning activities done in the classroom. This behavior is commonly observed if the lesson is less interactive or not of interest to learners. Inattentiveness and boredom during the lesson discussion are the reasons why learners cannot understand the lesson being taught. Usually, inattentiveness is caused by a boring lesson aggravated by a boring teacher.

This is followed by playing and doing unnecessary things with a mean of 2.16, and shouting and interrupting even if not called to recite with a mean of 2.15. Playing is a natural activity of children and is part of their lives. Moreover, play and shouting are a natural outlet for children's energy. They display this disruptive behavior during recitation, shouting answers even someone is called to recite. They show aggressiveness, no respect to classmates, and to the teacher.

It is interesting to note that the least problematic was texting and playing games in the cellphone/tablet during class hours appeared to be less serious, with a mean of 1.56. This means that most of the learners abide by the class rules not to use cellphones/tablets during class time when these are not needed.

The above findings corroborate the studies of Kowalski (2003), Gines(2004), and Ampe(2001) that talkativeness, restlessness, shouting, chatting, cheating, aggressiveness, fighting, hurting, the use of laptops and cellphones were classroom problems encountered by teachers and administrators. They seriously disrupt the classes and impede learners' activities, thus academic performance is affected.

Table 1. Degree of Seriousness of the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Disruptive Behaviors of Learners	Administrators	Teachers	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Noisy and talkative	2.45	2.54	2.51	Very Serious
2. Inattentive, bored, and chatting with classmates while the teacher is teaching and discussing the lesson	2.10	2.25	2.21	Moderately Serious
3. Playing and doing unnecessary things (not related to the lesson)	1.95	2.25	2.16	Moderately Serious
4. Shouting and interrupting even if not called to recite	2.15	2.15	2.15	Moderately Serious
5. Whispering, giggling and tickling	2.10	1.98	2.02	Moderately Serious
6. Bullying and hurting others	2.15	2.13	2.14	Moderately Serious
7. Cheating or looking at one's answer during quizzes and examination	1.70	1.83	1.79	Moderately Serious
8. Restlessness (uneasy, constantly moving)	2.00	2.10	2.07	Moderately Serious
9. Laziness	2.15	2.04	2.07	Moderately Serious
10. Texting and playing games in the cellphone/tablet during class hours	1.55	1.56	1.56	Least Serious
Average Weighted Mean	**2.03**	**2.08**	**2.07**	Moderately Serious

Legend:

2.34 – 3.00	Very Serious (VS)
1.67 – 2.33	Moderately Serious (MS)
1.00 – 1.66	Least Serious (LS)

The foregoing findings revealed that there are common behavior problems exhibited by learners and that there are factors causing these common disruptive behaviors. These factors are the home, the school and the community or environment. The home is the first school of the children and their parents are their first teachers. It is where the children learn their first lessons. On the other hand, the school is the second home of the learners where the teachers reinforce and add to what learners learned at home as well as molding his character. The environment where the child lives has also a great influence on his kind of a person. A vice-ridden and unhealthy community has a great influence on the kind of person the child may become. The implication that can be drawn from the above findings cannot just be taken for granted by the teachers and parents. The molding of the character of the child is greatly affected by the process of character building which, when not given proper attention and control can adversely affect the instilling of moral, spiritual, and cultural values in the child. On managing and improving behavior, Sabornie (2009) pointed

out that pupil behavior in the classroom is at the forefront and concern of teachers across all instructional areas and grade levels. Schools in a grip of serious problems of learners' behavior when not control can wreak havoc on teaching and learning.

Further implied that these varied causes need different approaches and strategies to solve them. These classroom incivilities adversely affect the academic performance of learners. While these problems are moderately serious, they can become very serious and difficult to solve if they are not immediately addressed. This corroborates the study of Cervantes (2006) that he surfaced in his study that disruptive behaviors are a great problems that affect the performance of learners. He found out that these incivilities are behavioral challenges for classroom teachers to find ways and means to overcome such disruptions. These incivilities significantly hinder learner performance.

5.2. Comparison of perceptions of respondents on the Degree of Seriousness of the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Table 2 presents the comparison of perceptions of respondents on the Degree of Seriousness of the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners.

In the comparison of the perceptions, the computations yielded a computed t-value of 2.1589, which is higher than the critical value of 1.6694 at five percent level of significance with 66 degrees of freedom. Since the computed t-value is higher than the critical value, this means that there is significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers. As such, the null hypothesis is rejected. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the administrators and teachers on the degree of seriousness of the disruptive behavior or learners. The significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers is attributed to the point from where the respondents viewed the situations. The administrators observed the disruptive behaviors of learners only during their supervisory visits to the classroom to supervise their teachers in actual teaching. On the other hand, the teachers as the direct implementers of instruction, deal with their pupils every school day and who experienced the disruptive behaviors problems, hence knows every detail of the situations so they have a higher perception.

Table 2. Degree of Seriousness of the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

	Mean	t –value comp	t cv 0.05, 66df
Administrators	2.03	2.1589*	1.6697
Teachers	2.08		

Legend: *-significant

The findings implied that in the molding of the character of the learners, the disruptive behaviors impinge upon the process of character building which, when not controlled can adversely affect the process of instilling the moral, spiritual and cultural values of the learners. Learner behavior in the classroom is at the forefront and concern of teachers along all instructional areas. A school in a grip of school problems on learner behavior, when not controlled, can wreak havoc on the teaching and learning. From the findings, it can be implied that the disruptive behaviors problems are varied with varied causes, which demand varied approaches and strategies in solving them. This is meant by Bluestein (2010) when he emphasized, that behavior problems, whether quite in attentive or disorderly and disruptive, is the greatest challenge to teachers. Clearly some responses are more effective than others, not just in their effect on subsequent learner behavior but also on the climate of the class, their impact and their ability to support objectives.

Likewise emphasized, that uncooperative or disruptive behaviors of the students are reasons why teachers leave their professions and the top and most significant sources of frustration for many teachers and administrators. Further, findings corroborate the study of Harrison et. al.(2012) that classroom distraction problems were most commonly addressed by teachers, while aggression was most commonly addressed by administrators.

5.3. Degree of Influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners

As shown in the table 3, generally, the degree of influence of the factors influencing disruptive behaviors of learners exert a moderate influence, evidenced by the overall weighted mean of 2.27. Looking at the mean of each group of respondents, administrators and teachers viewed the influencing factors as moderate in influence, with means of 2.24 and 2.28, respectively. This means that while there are factors that can influence the disruptive behaviors of learners, the teachers' competence in teaching, and in handling disruptive behaviors, they were able to mitigate the gravity of the influencing factors to moderate influence.

Upon closer examination of the influencing factors, a majority (6 out of 10) were found to have a moderate influence, while the remaining 4 exhibited a great influence. The first influencing factor that had the highest mean was poor study habits, laziness, and lack of follow-up study at home, with a mean of 2.59, signifying a great influence. These can emanate from the home, the school, and the environment. It can also be the teacher or possibly the child himself. Study habit can be developed through the help of the teachers. Embedding this habit can lead to the good formation of study habit. Lack of follow up study at home is a complexity issue due to many reasons, and need to know first to find appropriate solution to help students develop follow up study at home. This can also be attained if parents follow up and monitor their children at home. On laziness, this can be traced to the kind of training provided by parents at home and reinforcement provided by the teacher in the school. It can also be the environment. If a child lives in a community where lazy people are, loitering around, doing nothing, or engaging in nonsense group conversations, he can be influenced by these bad habits. This finding corroborates the study of Viray (2006) that the absence of acceptable study habits was one of the most influential factors that cause disciplinary problems as perceived by the teachers and administrators. Furthermore, Beloken (2011) identified problems on parents why they lack time for their children such as having many children to attend to, busy working, and due to low educational level.

Table 3. Degree of Influence of the Factors Influencing the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Influencing Factors of Disruptive Behaviors	Administrators	Teachers	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Classroom rules are not strictly implemented by the teacher	2.30	2.13	2.22	Moderate Influence
2. The same strategy used by the teacher everyday	2.15	2.08	2.10	Moderate Influence
3. Lax teacher and does not think of students' welfare	2.15	2.04	2.07	Moderate Influence
4. Lack of home discipline and not properly guided by their parents	2.45	2.44	2.44	Great Influence

5. Not strict, ignoring and not correcting learners' undesirable behavior	2.15	2.19	2.18	Moderate Influence
6. Lack of attention and affection of parents	2.50	2.44	2.46	Great Influence
7. Poor study habits, laziness, and lack of follow-up study at home	2.55	2.60	2.59	Great Influence
8. Discontentment and dissatisfaction on the environment	1.90	2.00	1.97	Moderate Influence
9. Lack of home training and guidance of the child	2.30	2.54	2.47	Great Influence
10. Overuse of new technology (computer and other gadgets)	1.95	2.29	2.19	Moderate Influence
Average Weighted Mean	**2.24**	**2.28**	**2.27**	**Moderate Influence**

Legend:

2.34 – 3.00   Great Influence (GI)

1.67 – 2.33   Moderate Influence (MI)

1.00 – 1.66   Least Influence (LI)

The second influencing factor having a great influence was the Lack of home training and guidance of the child, with a mean of 2.47. According to Richardson (2002) stated that poor parenting and family breakdown are fueling a rise in disruptive misbehaviors among children. He blames a lack of positive role models at home. Training of children by their parents at home, stay with them as they grow, hence the kind of training a child is carried through as he grows up, and even if the teachers try to correct negative habits, they will find difficulty to erase entirely the negative side. So instead of reinforcing, teachers are devoting their time to straightening the crooked habits of learners.

The third influencing factor having a great influence was the Lack of attention and affection of parents, with a mean of 2.46. Due to the lack of attention from parents, children behave badly because they are seeking attention and affection from their parents. This is emphasized by Evertson and Emmer (2009), that children are the center of attention, which is the common desire of learners. Children seek their parents' affection, especially when both parents are working. This is true when parents are far from their children or too tired from their jobs; children crave their parents' affection. This affirms the study of Banaag (2015), which emphasized that feelings/emotions are very vital shapers/determinants of our perceptions and behavior. He stressed that denying children's emotions leads to a change in behavior.

The fourth influencing factor, having a great influence, was the Lack of home discipline and not being properly guided by their parents, with a mean of 2.44. The role of the parents is very crucial in developing and instilling proper discipline in their children at home, which is reinforced in school by their teachers. This corroborates the study of Pulquiso (2012) on classroom problems encountered by teachers, which found that among the causes emanating from the home is a lack of training in the discipline of children, and no coordination between parents and teachers.

Scrutinizing the identified influencing factor, discontentment and dissatisfaction with the classroom

environment had the lowest mean of 1.97, but was still interpreted as a moderate influence. This discontentment and dissatisfaction with the environment can be home environment, the classroom environment, and the community environment. In the home environment, broken homes, abandonment of children by parents, and cruelty of parents can be the reasons for a turbulent atmosphere in the home. As Muijs and Reynolds (2005) said, house circumstances can predispose pupils' misbehaviors. Likewise, psychological and emotional problems can play out in school.

In the classroom environment, a congested classroom, an unconducive classroom atmosphere, poor lighting and ventilation, a boring style of teaching, unfriendly and uncaring teacher cause dissatisfaction on the part of learners. This corroborates the study of Gines (2004) added that classroom physical conditions like poor ventilation, room temperature may cause disruption. Likewise Viray (2006) found that dirty and dimly-lighted classrooms highly influenced the occurrence of disciplinary problems. These may create discontentment and dissatisfaction. Along with boring teachers, Pulquiso (2012) found the following causes of classroom problems were a close-minded attitude of teachers to effect change in their teaching strategies, and less/no coordination/no rapport between parents and teachers. These problems were perceived by the teachers and school heads as very serious. These may cause discontentment. In the community environment, when the learners live in a community that is not child-friendly because of bad examples children see among the community people, such as drunkenness, gambling and quarreling, among others are bad examples to children.

The findings revealed that disruptive behavior problems can result from various causes, some of which are external in the classroom situation, and some of which may be caused or influenced by poor parenting and family breakdown. As Muijs and Reynolds (2005) said, house circumstances can predispose pupils' misbehaviors. Likewise, psychological and emotional problems can play out in school. Furthermore, the findings on the influence of factors on the disruptive behaviors of learners are a source of stress and burnout for old and inexperienced teachers. Teachers believe they spend a disproportionate amount of time dealing with behavior problems compared with the time spent on instruction and academic activities. Failure to address misbehavior comprises the environment whereby academic activities are interrupted, curriculum content is not covered, teacher authority is undermined, and most importantly, there are decreased opportunities to learn.

The above findings imply that behavior problems can create a chaotic environment, which is a serious impediment to learning for all learners. Learners who exhibit those challenging behaviors typically have higher rates of negative interactions with school personnel. Learners with this kind of problem spend less time academically engaged with their teachers. This lack of people of positive experience in the academic setting has been shown to be extremely detrimental to their academic development.

It corroborates mccomas (2015) study, which found out that disruptive behaviors affect the teaching and learning process. This problem affects most of the academic performance of learners and leads them to low performance. The disruptive and defiant behavior of students with emotional and behavioral disorders always leads to academic failure. Failure, in turn, predisposes them to further anti-social conduct.

5.4. Comparison of perceptions of respondents on the degree of influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners

Table 4 presents the comparison of perceptions of respondents on the degree of influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners.

In the comparison of the perceptions, the data were subjected to the t- test equation for independent variables to determine if there is a significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and

teachers on the degree of influence of the factors influencing disruptive behaviors of learners. The computations yielded a computed t-value of 0.1492, which is when compared with the critical value of 1.6697 is lower at five percent level of significance with 66 degrees of freedom. Since the t-computed value is lower than the critical value, this means that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the administrators and teachers on the degree of influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners. Since the result is not significant, the decision is to accept the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between the perception of the administrators and teachers on the degree of influence of the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners.

Table 4. Degree of Influence of the Factors Influencing the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

	Mean	t-value comp	t cv 0.05, 66df
Administrators	2.24	0.1492^{ns}	1.6697
Teachers	2.28		

Legend: ns-not significant

While there is a statistical difference between the perceptions of the administrators and teachers, the difference is too small to be considered significant. The similarity of the perceptions of administrators is attributed to their being in tandem in the education of children, the teacher as the direct implementer of instruction, while the administrator is the supervisor of instruction. As such, they similarly viewed the factors influencing the disruptive behaviors of learners, resulting in similar perceptions.

The findings imply that despite the teachers and administrators having distinct roles in the educational process, both have similar views on challenges. This shared understanding of classroom disruptions and their causes can lead to more effective and cohesive strategies for addressing disruptive behaviors. They can foster more effective and unified strategies to control disruptive behaviors.

5.5. Extent of the Effect of the Disruptive Behaviors on the academic performance of learners

Table 5 presents the extent of the effect of the disruptive behaviors on the academic performance of learners. As shown in the table, generally the extent of the effect of the disruptive behavior on the academic performance of learners is moderate, with its overall weighted mean of 2.20. This means that disruptive behaviors have a noticeable effect on the academic performance of learners. It may be that the teacher is capable of handling, managing, and controlling the behavioral problems in class. This implies that disruptive behaviors should not be ignored, but rather should be given more attention. In the study of Cervantes (2006) found out that administrators and teachers perceived that behavioral problems of pupils had much effect on the academic performance of learners. Likewise, Pulquiso (2012) found that the effect of common problems encountered by school heads and teachers had very serious effects, such as withdrawal from socialization of learners, low performance rate, and unmotivated pupils to perform school activities. Furthermore, Viray (2006) stated that teachers have a moderate capacity for handling and solving disciplinary problems, particularly with students who are quarrelsome and mischievous. Students who are always tardy and absent are also a problem. They create disturbance, especially when they lack knowledge from missed instruction, and activities as such make them unsure what to do.

Looking at the mean of each group of respondents, the administrators and teachers viewed the extent of the effect of the disruptive behaviors to academic performance as moderate, with means of 2.19 and 2.21, respectively. This means that there is a strong consensus or agreement between the administrators and teachers on the level of impact. May be due to the efforts and skills of the teachers in handling behavioral

problems, they were to minimize, and control such classroom problems. By giving intervention by the teachers, watered down great effect to moderate effect.

Scrutinizing the level of effects of the disruptive behaviors, it came out that almost all effects of disruptive behaviors were under moderate effect, however, inability of the learners to understand concepts and assimilate knowledge had the highest weighted mean of 2.46 interpreted as great effect. Indeed, the inability to understand concepts only and absorb learning has a great effect on the development of learner. A learner who cannot comprehend concepts cannot develop knowledge of what is taught in the lessons, especially when prerequisite knowledge and skills were not acquired due to lack of understanding the concepts. Both administrators and teachers were able to perceive these very similarly.

Next effect, cannot follow instruction/direction and unable to finish given task, with a mean of 2.32, described as great effect. It has truly a great effect because one cannot finish a task if he does not understand the instruction and cannot follow directions. The effects of poor performance of learners in answering questions, and refusal to participate in class recitation were under moderate effect, with a mean of 2.28, described as a moderate effect.

Table 5. Extent of Effect of the Disruptive Behaviors on the Academic Performance of Learners

Effect of Disruptive Behaviors	Administrators	Teacher	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Inability of the learners to understand concepts and assimilate knowledge	2.45	2.46	2.46	Great Effect
2. Poor performance of learners in answering questions	2.25	2.31	2.28	Moderate Effect
3. Refusal to participate in class recitation	2.30	2.25	2.28	Moderate Effect
4. Disruption of class discussion and inability of the teacher to deliver the lesson	2.30	2.19	2.25	Moderate Effect
5. Cannot follow instruction/direction and unable to finish given task	2.25	2.38	2.32	Great Effect
6. High rate of drop-outs and absenteeism of students due to fear	1.75	1.77	1.76	Moderate Effect
7. Become dependent and lazy to accomplish their homework and projects	2.15	2.17	2.16	Moderate Effect
8. Become unruly and hard to finish a task	2.20	2.21	2.21	Moderate Effect
9. No participation in class or lesson activities	2.21	2.21	2.21	Moderate Effect
10. Addiction to new educational technology which leads to inattentiveness	2.00	2.19	2.10	Moderate Effect
Weighted Mean	**2.19**	**2.21**	**2.20**	**Moderate**

				Effect

Legend:

2.34 – 3.00 Great Effect (GE)

1.67 – 2.33 Moderate Effect (ME)

1.00 – 1.66 Least Effect (LE)

On the poor performance of learners in answering questions, there may be two reasons why they could not answer the questions correctly. The question may not have been clearly stated, and may not have been within their grade level. They cannot answer the questions because they cannot understand them, or they did not understand the lesson during the lesson development. If learners do not understand the lesson activity, naturally they refuse to participate. One reason why there are learners who refuse to recite id due to shyness, lack of self-confidence, cannot express themselves in medium of instruction used such as in English, in the mother tongue, and in Filipino. This should be a food for thought for teachers

The extent of effect which had the lowest mean was high rate of drop-outs and absenteeism of students due to fear with a mean of 1.76, but still interpreted as a moderate effect. Absenteeism and drop-outs have many causes, and one of these is the teacher herself. A boring teacher, a cranky teacher, an incompetent teacher, a cruel teacher, a lax teacher, or an uncaring teacher can be a reason for learners to be always absent.

The different findings on the effects of disruptive behavior problems are truly a source of stress and burnout for teachers. Disruptive behaviors create chaotic environment which is a serious impediment to learning for all the learners. . Disruptive behavior problems usually cause low academic performance of learners due to their inability to sustain on task behavior. Engaging independent work to learners with behavior problems is difficult. The learners showed off task and non-compliant behaviors during individual activities. They cannot manage themselves to work on assigned tasks. Disruptive behavior problems have real costs, including distracting other learners and the teacher in class. This reduce learner participation and lowering others learners' and teachers' motivation in and out of class. This may also affect fairness in grading and using teacher time unproductively. These effects corroborate the study of Cervantes (2006), and Pulquiso (2012) that behavioral problems of pupils had much effect on the academic performance of learners as perceived by administrators or heads, and teachers.

The findings imply that failure to address misbehaviors compromises the environment, whereby academic activities are interrupted, curriculum content is not covered, teacher authority is undermined, and most importantly, there are decreased opportunities to learn. As found out by Kapalka (2009), impulsive individuals exhibit limited self-control. Their diminished ability to think through the consequences of their behaviors often results in their inability to adapt to situations that don't turn out as they like. The impulsive students are known to have difficulties with thinking through their actions and often exhibit behaviors characterized by limited self-control.

Findings also imply that managing behavior problems is a major component of effective teaching. Teachers need strategies to be sure that the learners have a learning environment infused with positive discipline and effective classroom procedures. This aspect of behavior management is very important when teachers use positive and negative reinforcements. In the study of Tamayo (2013) suggests some strategies in dealing with problem learners, such as accepting them as they are but building on and accentuating their positive qualities; being confident, taking charge of the situation, and not giving up in front of the students. Be a firm friend but maintain psychological and physical distance so pupils know

you are still the teacher; explain rules and routines; rely on motivation and not on your prowess to maintain order; an interesting lesson keeps the students on task.

5.6. Comparison of perceptions of respondents on the extent of effect of disruptive behaviors of learners on the academic performance of learners

Table 6 presents the comparison of respondents on the extent of effect of disruptive behaviors of learners on the academic performance of learners.

In the comparison of perceptions, the data were treated with t-test equation for independent variables. This was done to determine if there was a significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers as regards the effect of disruptive behavior problems on the academic performance of learners. The result of the computations revealed a computed t value of 0.1074. This is lesser than the critical value of 1.6697 at five percent level of significance with 66 degrees of freedom. This means that since the computed t- value is lesser than the critical value, there is no significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers on the extent of effect of the disruptive behaviors of learners on their academic performance. While there is a difference in the weighted means of the administrators' and the teachers', the difference is short of the level of significance; in other words, insignificant. The result is not significant, therefore, the decision is to accept the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers on the extent of effect of the disruptive behavior problems on the academic performance of learners.

Table 6. Extent of effect of disruptive behaviors of learners on the academic performance of learners.

	Mean	t –value comp	t cv 0.05, 66df
Administrators	2.19	0.1074^{ns}	1.6697
Teachers	2.21		

Legend: ns- not significant

The above findings on the comparison of perceptions imply that the administrators and teachers have some kind of collaboration in solving the disruptive behaviors problems of learners, the reason why the problems were controlled to a moderate level considering the nature of the problems encountered. As Cruickshank (2009) stressed, teachers immediately deal with misbehaviors to stop them from escalating and causing increasing problems. Teachers need appropriate strategies to make sure that learners have a learning environment infused with positive and effective classroom procedures.

5.7. Degree of Effectiveness of the Measures to Minimize the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Table 7 presents the degree of effectiveness of the suggested measure to minimize disruptive behaviors. Generally, the suggested measures to minimize disruptive behaviors were viewed by administrators and teachers as very effective, with an overall weighted mean of 2.71. This means that in their assessment, all the suggested measures are very effective, but this will depend on how effectively teachers implement.

Analyzing the degree of effectiveness of the suggested measure for minimizing disruptive behaviors, it was determined to be very effective among administrators, evidenced by its weighted mean of 2.68. Likewise, the teachers viewed the degree of effectiveness of the suggested measure to minimize disruptive behaviors as very effective, as revealed by its weighted mean of 2.74. This means that in their assessment, all the suggested measures were very effective but this will depend on how effectively teachers will implement.

On the analysis of the specific measures, it came out that all suggested measures for minimizing disruptive behaviors were very effective, as determined by their mean scores. The measure with the highest mean was different strategies should be used in teaching by teachers, with a mean of 2.87, interpreted as very effective. This mean that this specific strategy was considered very effective by the respondents." With their experience in teaching, teachers should know and master a variety of strategies. To be more effective in teaching, they should know how to tailor their lessons with appropriate strategies. This is supported by Braniac (2009), stated that it is of prime importance to teachers to choose the right strategy to solve problems of misbehaviors in the classroom. Choosing strategies in solving behavior problems is very critical because an inappropriate strategy may worsen the behavior being modified or reinforced. As a general guide, however, positive reinforcement and modeling techniques are more effective. Teachers should recognize the importance of preventing significant behavior problems and effectively using fundamental prevention tools.

Table 7. Degree of Effectiveness of the Measures to Minimize the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Suggested Measures to Minimize the Disruptive Behaviors	Administrators	Teachers	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Introduce the strict implementation of school policies	2.85	2.81	2.82	Very Effective
2. Different strategies should be used by the teacher in teaching	2.85	2.88	2.87	Very Effective
3. Teacher-Parent conference on classroom issues and concerns to build rapport and resolve problems	2.75	2.81	2.79	Very Effective
4. Positive approach or positive encouragement to let the learner behave	2.75	2.75	2.75	Very Effective
5. Intervention to low performing students by the teacher (one-on- one)	2.75	2.73	2.74	Very Effective
6. Lecture on bullying to discuss its consequences to their education and personality	2.50	2.56	2.54	Very Effective
7. Teacher should socialize and bond with the learners	2.40	2.52	2.48	Very Effective
8. Give appropriate and interesting activity for the learners to join	2.70	2.81	2.78	Very Effective
9. Positive motivation to learners to perform or study well	2.70	2.77	2.75	Very Effective
10. Prohibition of going to computer shops during class hours	2.55	2.79	2.67	Very Effective
Weighted Mean	**2.68**	**2.74**	**2.71**	**Very Effective**

Legend:

2.34 – 3.00	Very Effective (VE)
1.67 – 2.33	Moderately Effective (ME)

1.00 – 1.66	Least Effective (LE)

Second measure was the introduction of the strict implementation of school policies with a mean of 2.82, described as very effective. In the implementation of school policies and school rules, teachers should be firm regardless of who violates the policy or rules. This is a sign that the teacher main business and that he or she is fair. The third measure, the teacher-parent conference on classroom issues and concerns to build rapport and resolve problems, was very effective as determined by its mean of 2.79. On the teacher-parent conference, teachers should immediately confer with parents regarding the misbehaviors of their children and discuss solutions they would jointly implement. Dialogue with parents and conducting home visitations, can help established rapport.

The suggested measure that had the lowest mean was teachers should socialize and bond with the learners. Despite being the lowest strategy, respondents still considered as very effective, evidenced by a weighted mean of 2.48. An effective and well-loved teacher is a child friendly teacher. This is a very important asset of a teacher. Be a firm friend but maintain psychological and physical distance so that your learners will know you are still their teacher. Aloofness of teachers puts a big distance between teachers and learners in terms of the teacher-learner human relationship. To get the confidence, obedience, and respect of learners, teachers should develop and establish good human and social relationships with learners as well as their parents. Proper bonding with learners and their parents makes it easier for teachers to solve disruptive behaviors.

It surfaced in the findings that all the suggested measures to minimize disruptive behaviors of learners were very effective as perceived by administrators and teachers. This is understandable because teachers and administrators are working closely with each other. Furthermore, teachers consult their administrators' assistance when the behavior problems are very serious, such as bullying. With their day-to-day encounter with their learners experiencing all kinds of misbehaviors and solutions for each misbehavior, they can feel that all the suggested measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners can be very effective. They are aware however, that it would depend on the ability and skill of teachers is in applying the measures. According to Evertson and Emmer (2009), while teachers have similar experiences in the classroom, an individual's teaching behavior is a distinctive as any other aspect of his personality. These are teachers' factors in a teacher's background that influence the kind of behavior that will be adopted as a vehicle for the teachers' classroom intervention with learners.

The findings imply that the effectiveness of any solutions and interventions to measure to solve behavior problems lies in the hands of the teachers who are the direct implementers of the measures and interventions devised to solve the behavior problems. This places a great responsibility of teachers because maintaining appropriate behavior in the classroom significantly to effective teaching, and learning, which in turn, raises academic performance of learners. Decreasing disruptive behaviors of learners is essential in creating a safe and positive classroom climate in fostering learning. This includes the administrators because they are the supervisors of teachers whose function is not only to administer but more importantly to supervise and assist teachers in instruction and instructional problems. They work with teachers in tandem for the improvement of the quality of learning. This is supported by the study of Van Lier et al. (2004) which found that teachers' interventions had a positive impact on the development of all disruptive behavior problems in children with intermediate levels on attention-deficit/hyperactivity problems, oppositional defiant problems, and conduct problems. Interventions targeting conduct problems showed the highest level of positive impact in children's behavior and leading to improve academic performance.

5.8. Comparison of respondents on the degree of Effectiveness of the Measures to Minimize the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

Table 8 presents the comparison of respondents on the degree of effectiveness of the measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners.

In the comparison of the respondents' perceptions to determine the significance of difference between the two perceptions, the computations using the t-test equation for independent variables resulted to a t-value of 0.1964. Comparing it to the critical value of 1.6697 that t-value is lesser than that of the critical value, hence it is not significant at five percent level of significance with 66 degrees of freedom. This means that while the administrators and teachers differ in their average weighted mean, the difference is too small to be considered significant. The two perceptions insignificantly different statistically but are descriptively the same assessment of the effectiveness of the suggested measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners.

Table 8. Degree of Effectiveness of the Measures to Minimize the Disruptive Behaviors of Learners

	Mean	t-value comp	t cv 0.05, 66df
Administrators	2.68	0.1964^{ns}	1.6697
Teachers	2.74		

ns- not significant

It implies that no matter how serious disruptive behavior problems are, there are measures that can be implemented to minimize or solve. However, their disruptive behavior issues negatively impact teachers' effectiveness in instruction and hinder the achievement of quality learning that enhances students' academic performance. This is supported by Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Reschly, D. J.(2010), which found that teachers' classroom management practices have a significant, positive effect on reducing problem behavior in the classroom.

6. Conclusions

There are disruptive behaviors of learners that cause problems to grade I teachers in La Trinidad District. The teacher-related and parent-related factors influence the disruptive behavior of learners. The academic performance of learners are affected by disruptive behaviors of learners. The effectiveness of the measures to minimize the disruptive behaviors of learners lies in the hands of the teachers who are the direct implementers of the measures.

7. Recommendations

The causes of the disruptive behaviors of learners should be identified and carefully analyzed so that appropriate solutions can be implemented. The teacher-related and parent-related factors should be seriously 93 given concern by teachers, parents, and administrators to eliminate the factors. Teachers should strive for maximum competence in teaching to make the teaching-learning process meaningful, interesting, motivational, exciting and delivered masterfully. Teachers, with the assistance of administrators, should carefully study the suggested measures to determine the most appropriate and effective strategies in implementing the suggested measures to minimize disruptive misbehaviors.

References

1. Ampe, E. A. (2001). Disciplinary problems of elementary pupils in Region I, Baguio Central University, Baguio City (Unpublished dissertation)
2. Aquino, G., & Miranda N. (2003). Introduction to psychology. Mandaluyong City: National Book Store, Inc.
3. Asaag, A. S. (2008). Statistics made simple for researchers. Manila: Rex Book Store
4. Banaag, C. (2015). Symposium: Sad, mad or glad: How children's feelings affect their behavior. Baguio City: Philippine Mental Health Association
5. Bautista, M. (2011). Behavioral problems and the remedial – preventive role of guidance in the elementary and high school levels. Unpublished master's thesis, Saint Louis University, Baguio City.
6. Beloken, C. (2011). Parental involvement in school activities in Quezon elementary school, Baguio City. Unpublished master's thesis, Benguet State University
7. Bermudez, A. (2005). Disciplinary measures used in the public elementary schools in region I. Unpublished dissertation, Baguio Central University, Baguio City.
8. Bilbao, P., et.al. (2012). The teaching profession. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
9. Broniac, C. (2009). How to manage classroom behavior.
10. Bruestein, J. (2015). Managing 21st century classroom: How do I avoid ineffective classroom practices? ASCD publication,
11. Bughong, R. A. (2012). Managing behavior problems of pupils in public elementary schools of Atok and Tublay districts, Benguet division. Unpublished master's thesis, Baguio Central University, Baguio City
12. Calmorin, L.P. and Calmorin, M. A. (2007). Research and methods in thesis writing. Manila: Rex Book Store
13. Carreon, M., Prieto, N., & Vega, V. (2006). Social dimensions of education.
8. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.
14. Cervantes, R. M. (2006). Management of behavioral problems of public elementary school pupils. Unpublished dissertation, Baguio Central University, Baguio City.
15. Cruickshank, D. et.al (2009). The act of teaching 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
16. DepEd Order No. 8 s. 2015. Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for K to12 basic education.
17. DepEd Order No. 31 s. 2012. Policy guidelines on the implementation of Grades 1-10 of the K to 12 basic education curriculum (BEC) effective School year 2012 – 2013.
18. Dinampilis, A. (2006). Managing children with special needs (learning Disability, ADHD, Autism). Manila: Rex Book Store
19. Dio-al, B. M. (2005). Behavioral problems of public secondary students that affect their learning activities. Unpublished dissertation, Baguio Central University, Baguio City.
20. Downie, N.M. (1984). Basic statistical methods. New York: Harper and Row Publishing
21. Esteban, E. J. (1990). Education in values. Manila: Sinag – Tala Publishers, Inc.
22. Evertson, C. and Emmer, E. (2009). Classroom management for elementary teachers. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
23. Garcia, M.C. (2014). Behavioral management in pre-school education. Benguet State University. (Unpublished thesis)
24. Gines, A. (2004). Educational psychology. Manila: Rex Book Store Glasgow, N. & Hicks, C. (2003). What successful teacher do. California: Corwin Press, Inc.

25. Glasgow, N. & Hicks, C. (2003). What successful teacher do. California: Corwin Press, Inc.

26. Harrison, J. R., Vannest, K., Davis, J., & Reynolds, C. (2012). Common Problem Behaviors of Children and Adolescents in General Education Classrooms in the United States. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426611421157

27. Heward, W. (2000). Exceptional children: An introduction to special Education. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.

28. Kapalka, G. (2009). 8 steps to classroom management success. California: Corwin A SAGE Company

29. Kowalski, R. M. (2003). Complaining, teasing, and other annoying behaviors. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

30. Liberal, B. (2007). Developing desirable pupil behavior in the public elementary schools in the 2nd district of Ilocos Sur. Unpublished thesis, Baguio Central University, Baguio City

31. McComas, J. (2015). How to deal with childhood problem behavior.
Retrieved from: http//:cehdivision2020.umn.edu/cehblog/children-problem

32. Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Teacher classroom management practices: Effects on disruptive or aggressive student behavior. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 7(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2011.4

33. Omrod, D.E. (2004). Educational psychology developing learners. New Jersey: R.R. Donnelly and Sons Company

34. Parkay, F., & Hass, G. (2002). Curriculum planning (7th ed). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon

35. Pulquiso, M. D. (2012). The classroom problems encountered by the elementary teachers in Bakun District, Division on Benguet. Unpublished thesis, Baguio Central University, Baguio City.

36. Richardson, H. (2007). Pupils' behavior worsened. Retrieved from:
http://dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1167922/html

37. San Mateo, R. & Tangco, M. (1997). Foundations of education II. Quezon City: Katha Publishing Company, Inc.

38. Skinner, B. F. (1978). Reflections on behaviorism and society. Englewood Cliffs, N.N.: Prentice Hall

39. Sorigian, A. C., et.al (2012). The relationship between learning problems and behavior problems

40. Standridge, M. (2002). Behaviorism – emergency perspectives on learning, teaching and technology.
Retrieved from: http://projects.coe.uga.edu/ opett/index.php?title

41. Tamayo, A. (2013). Social dimension of education. Manila: Rex Bookstore The Education Act of the Philippines (2004)

42. Timbreza, F. (2010). Filipino values today

43. Van Lier, P. A. C., Muthén, B. O., van der Sar, R. M., & Crijnen, A. A. M. (2004). Preventing Disruptive Behavior in Elementary Schoolchildren: Impact of a Universal Classroom-Based Intervention. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72(3), 467–478. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.72.3.467

44. Viray, E.C. (2006). Handling of disciplinary problems by teachers in the public secondary schools in region I. Unpublished dissertation, Baguio Central University, Baguio City

45. Woolfolk, A. (2001). Educational psychology. USA: Allyn and Bacon Company