

Characterizing Misbehaviour among Jordanian High School Students

Ameen Mohammed Mousa Mahasneh

PhD student, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: ameen1977@live.com

Prof. Sharifah Md. Nor

Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Educational Studies

University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: Sharifah@edu.upm.my

Prof. Abdul Rahman bin Md. Aroff

Department of Language and Humanities Education, Faculty of Educational Studies

University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: abma@educ.upm.edu.my

Dr. Nur Surayyah M. Abdullah

Department of Department of Language Studies and Humanities Faculty of Educational Studies

University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: Surayyah@edu.upm.my

Associate. Prof. Bahaman Abu Samah

Department of Professional Development and Continuing Education, Faculty of Educational Studies

University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

E-mail: Drbas@ace.upm.edu.my

Dr. Ahmad Mohammed Mousa Mahasneh

The Hashemite University, Zerqa, Jordan

E-mail: ahmadMosa2003@yahoo.com

Received: June 22, 2011

Accepted: July 12, 2011

Published: December 1, 2011

doi:10.5539/ass.v7n12p3

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n12p3>

Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the level of student misbehaviour and to explore the types of student misbehaviour among Jordanian high school students in the Governorate of Jarash. This paper presents the findings of a survey conducted to identify the level and type of misbehaviour. It emphasizes the important role school plays in reinforcing positive societal norms and values in teenagers with the ultimate aim to produce well-adjusted young adults. The findings support the idea that factors such as gender and grade level affect the type and level of misbehaviour exhibited by Jordanian high school students. The results of this study also revealed that the majority of the respondents showed a low level of misbehaviour. The most frequent types of misbehaviour found among Jordanian high schools students were disobedience, classroom disruption and vandalizing school

property. Student misbehaviour differs significantly according to the students' gender, grade level and the type of school they attend

Keywords: Student misbehaviour, Gender, Grade level, Type of school

1. Introduction

The system of education in Jordan has been guided by the country's national aspirations and its determination to achieve a sizable increase in national productivity and modernization, as well as the development of the social, moral, and spiritual values of the people (Ministry of Education, 2000).

Education in Jordan emphasizes the moral implications of student development as part of educating students in human rights and democracy. The acquisition of appropriate social and moral behaviour is understood as an integral part of moulding Jordan's young generation- a process which starts with schooling.

Since moral education does not exist as a formal school subject, moral education of students is emphasized through the idea of the person that is to be developed through schooling. As Jordan is a predominantly Muslim society, moral education is understood as a purposeful process of translating Islamic principles into a social, ethical, emotional and physical reality. A morally educated individual is thus a person who reflects morality in his or her thinking, feeling and action (Rashdan & Hamshari, 2002).

The tell-tale sign of a successful education system is a low level of student misbehaviour. Students who are well-integrated into school and experience schooling as a rewarding and beneficial part of their socialization process do not generate high levels of misbehaviour, except in cases where emotional or psychological factors prevent normal integration. However, research into education in Jordan has shown that this has not been achieved (Al-Fokah, 2001; AL-Zoubi, 2004; Alia, 2001; Bader, 1985; Dogan & Atoum, 2004; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010). Although educational system, society, and family generally encourage students to behave well, yet the problem of student misbehaviour has not been resolved and is actually on the rise. Since student misbehaviour is related to the students' background, school system and societal demands, more research needs to be done in order to properly identify the factors responsible for this development.

Student misbehaviour has the most problematic and negative effect on society, as researchers agree (Charles, 2008; Kaplan, Gheen, & Midgley, 2002; Kulinna, Krech, & Cothran, 2010; Luiselli, Putnam, & Sunderland, 2002; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010). It is a phenomenon not exclusive to the USA – although most widely studied -- but a problem of most school systems in the world, Jordan being by no means an exemption (Mnazal, 1993; Owaidat & Hamdi, 1997; Rawaqa, Ta'ani, & Kawasmeh, 1998; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010). The level of student misbehaviour observed and reported in all parts of the world has increased dramatically over the past few years (Charles, 2008; Jenkins, 1995, 1997; Leung & Ho, 2001; Mnazal, 1993). As for the Jordanian education system, the scarcity of positive data in regard to student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools is one of the main reasons why no effective measures have been undertaken by the Ministry of Education to resolve this problem. Student misbehaviour is not only a serious problem for the schools but it permeates into the rest of society at large and has adversely affected the level of productivity of developing nations (Gonzalez, Brown, & Slate, 2008; Gottfredson, 2001; Kann & Hanna, 2000; Leung & Ho, 2001; Li, 2006; Makhilavi, 1995). Student misbehaviour cannot be resolved by the call for harsher disciplinary methods. Laying the blame for student misbehaviour on the students themselves may constitute a counterproductive approach as it does not seek to explain past misbehaviour nor does it prevent similarly disruptive behaviour from occurring in the future. Persistently high levels of student misbehaviour do seriously call into question the overall quality and employability of graduates produced by public high schools nationwide and thus directly affect a country's economic foundations (Infantino & Little, 2005 ; Janini, 1999; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002; Supaporn, 2000; Tawfiq, 2003; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010). Be that as it may, without a more definite and comprehensive understanding of student misbehaviour in all its existent forms, any measures to eradicate such misbehaviour cannot be effectively implemented and appropriate recommendations cannot be formulated.

School teachers confirm that student misconduct constitutes the most difficult part of their teaching experience (Al-bakor, 1985; Al-Fokah, 2001; Al-Khulaifi, 1994; AL-Zoubi, 2004; Mahasneh, 2006). Owaidat and Hamdi (1997) examined the cases of disciplinary problems reported by Jordanian teachers, and Thawabieh and Al-Rofo (2010) listed the amount of damage done by Jordanian students to their school facilities.

According to Owaidat and Hamdi (1997), Jordanian schools are presently facing greater challenges and higher expectations than ever before. Jordanian administrators, teachers, parents, and educators have realized that managing student misbehaviour has become a major concern for public schools. Administrators and teachers are confronted with disciplinary cases ranging from rising rates of truancy to physical assaults on teachers. The

students themselves experience an atmosphere of fear and insecurity in school. Parents are growing more and more concerned about the frequent lack of respect for authority and the apparent lack of discipline at schools, and school misbehaviour has caught the media's attention (Huwaidi & Al-Yammam, 2007; Mnazal, 1993; Owaidat & Hamdi, 1997; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010). For instance, the *Al-Quds Al-Arabi* newspaper (2011) recently reported a case in which a group of Jordanian high school students set fire to their school, destroyed school property, and prevented teachers from entering it. The *Al-Ra'i* newspaper (2006) cited by Thawabieh and Al-Rofo (2010) estimated the rate of vandalism at 70 % for male students and 30 % for female students in Jordanian schools. The maintenance costs for these schools have risen to a staggering US \$ 10 million annually. Educators and the community at large are confronted with the fact that this form of violent student misbehaviour in high schools is steadily corroding the learning environment.

2. The aim of the Study

The main purpose of the study presented in this paper is to investigate the level and the types of students' misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools. This study also investigates whether there any differences between student misbehaviour based on gender, grade level and types of school. Questions addressed are as follows:

1. What is the level of students' misbehaviour?
2. What types of misbehaviour exist among students in Jordanian high schools?
3. Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for male and female students?
4. Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for grade 11 and 12 students?
5. Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for academic and vocational school students?

In this study, the term student misbehaviour is defined by the researcher as any inappropriate behaviour occurring in the school caused by students, such as student disobedient towards school authority, classroom disruption and vandalising school property. It is measured by the frequency of misbehaviour.

3. Material and Method

3.1 Research design

This study is quantitative in nature and employs the descriptive research design. A set of questionnaire is utilized to meet the objectives of the study.

3.2 Participation

The population of this study consisted of all 6,700 public high schools students in the Governorate of Jarash in the academic year 2010/2011. Schools selected in this study are government schools and thus have similar characteristics. These schools offered academic oriented classes, provide similar education facilities, and are comparable in educational program. In this study, the Cohen Table was used to determine the sample size needed to conduct the analysis of the current study. It is important to emphasize that the significance criterion alpha level (α) has been determined at .05. In general, this value of alpha is considered common in most of educational researches. The statistical power is .80, and the effect size is medium to determine the sample size according to Cohen Table (Cohen, 1992). Thus, In order to determine the sample size for independent sample t-test when the effect size is medium ($d=.50$), alpha level is $=.05$, statistical power is .80, the sample size requires 64 for each group. Therefore, in the particular study the sample size requires is 168. It is important to point out that due to non responsive students to the questionnaires the researcher used oversampling of 600 responded to account for lost or uncooperative students to the questionnaire and to ensure that at least 168 responded to the questionnaire. Therefore, the total sample selected for this study consists of 600 male and female high school students.

3.3 Research instruments

After the researcher has reviewed the literature of student misbehaviour a self-report questionnaire was developed by the researcher.

In order to ensure the validity of this research, the process of validating for research instrument involved a few stages. Firstly, the researcher consulted a panel of judges to comment upon every part of the instrument and to suggest any changes, in terms of the clarity of the instrument, language accuracy, the degree of conformity in every question with the area under which it shall be classified, and then adding, deleting, changing or commenting upon whatever the referees deemed appropriate to help the research instrument to be used in the Jordan context. Secondly, after a series of discussion with the panel judges' the face validity of the questionnaire was revised accordingly. The research instrument that was validated by the panel of judges was then sent to a group of qualified

translators to be translated. In addition, the questionnaire contained two versions of language, the English version and Arabic version. Since the instruments in the questionnaires were translated into Arabic language and then translated back to English language, it is imperative that the translation be accurate and conveyed the same meaning as the original instrument. After the translation process, the questionnaires were verified again by the supervisor committee at University Putra Malaysia and the panel judges of Hashemite University and University of Jordan to check the format, arrangement, appropriateness of the content and language used in the instrument.

The survey has two sections: set (A) deals with the demographic data of the respondents, it was developed to collect general background information about the participants regarding their gender, grade level and types of schools. The set (B) includes students' perception towards misbehaviour. Each section in that set presents questions or statements that students are asked to respond as honestly as possible. The responses are based on a 4-point Likert scale (never, rarely, sometime, and always).

Students' misbehaviour consists of three categories disobedience, classroom disruption, and vandalism towards school property. First, the subscale of student's disobedience consists of nine items (cheating on exams; wearing improper clothing during school day; refusing to do class work; not bringing to school books and related materials that are necessary for learning; leaving school without permission; smoking cigarettes in school; carrying weapons to school; behaving insolently toward other students, teachers and school staff; and getting into physical fights with students in school) designed to measure students' perceptions toward school rules, which uses a 4-point Likert-type scale. Each question provides responses on a Likert scale with a range of frequencies of behaviour from 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometime, 4= Always. Hence, a response of "Always" received a score 4. The respondents were asked to indicate how often she/he misbehaves in the current school year. The reliability of the items was (.78)

Second, the subscale of student's classrooms disruption consists of 11 items (moving around to disrupt other students; not following teacher's instructions during the class; making a lot of noise in corridors between classes; "doodling" or passing notes to other students; throwing stones, books, or other objects inside the classroom; annoying the teacher during class; disturbing other students just for the sake of fun; calling other students with undesired names or adjectives; leaving classrooms without permission; and talking during class unnecessary) designed to measure students' perceptions toward classroom disruption, which uses a 4-point Likert-type scale. Each question provides responses on a Likert scale with a range of frequencies of behaviour from 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometime, 4= Always. Hence, a response of "Always" received a score 4. The respondents were asked to indicate how often she/he misbehaves in the current school year. The reliability of the questionnaire was (.80)

Third, the subscale of student's vandalism towards school property consists of 11 items (breaking desks or chairs; breaking keyboard or mouse in the computer laboratory; breaking lamps in school; destroying trees in the school garden; breaking taps in school; breaking windows in the school; writing on the classroom wall; writing on the school wall; writing on the school toilet wall; throwing litter on school playground; and puncturing or slashing the tyres of teacher's car) designed to measure students' perceptions toward vandalising school property, which uses a 4-point Likert-type scale. Each question provides responses on a Likert scale with a range of frequencies of behavior from 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometime, 4= Always. Hence, a response of "Always" received a score 4. The respondents will be asked to indicate how often she/he misbehaves in the current school year. The reliability of the items was (.87).

3.4 Statistical procedures

A total of 443 students completed the survey and returned them during class time. It took an average of 50 to 60 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Approximately 443 responses were entered into a SPSS version 19 for the analysis.

To answer research questions one and two in this study the mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage of students' misbehaviour were calculated. Thus, to determine the levels of student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools it seems reasonable to set a specific cut point to measure these levels. Thus, the Likert-type scale from 1 to 2 is low, from 2.01 to 3 is moderate and from 3.01 to 4 is high.

Data were analyzed descriptively using percentage, frequencies, means, and standard deviation to describe socio-demographic variables. In addition, inferential statistics namely an independent sample T-test were also used to answer the research objectives of the study.

4. Findings of the Study

4.1 Level of students' misbehaviour

The results of the analysis indicate that the majority of the students (62.5%) had low level of misbehaviour. The remaining namely 37.2 percent and 0.2 percent had moderate and high levels of misbehaviour respectively. The mean score of students' level of misbehaviour was 1.91 with a standard deviation of .39, suggesting that their level of misbehaviour in school is generally low.

4.2 Type of misbehaviour

The findings regarding the type of misbehaviour in Jordanian high school show that the mean of disobedient behaviour was higher than the other means (2.02) and standard deviation of (.53), followed by students' involvement in classroom disruption with mean score of (1.91) and standard deviation of (.57), while vandalizing school property with mean score of (1.82) and standard deviation of (.36). Therefore, it can conclude that the type of misbehaviour most common was disobedient behaviour followed by classroom disruption. Vandalism was the least common type of misbehaviour found amongst these students.

4.3 Student misbehaviour based on gender

The results of the analysis reveal that there was a significant difference in scores for males ($M=2.05$, $SD=.39$), and females [$M=1.78$, $SD=.34$; $t(441)=7.68$, $p=.001$] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Therefore, it can be concluded that male students were more likely to misbehave compared to female students in Jordanian high schools. The resulting eta-square value is .11, this means that only 11 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by gender, which in Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a moderate effect size. Cohen's criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

4.4 Student misbehaviour based on grade level

The results of the analysis show that there was a significant difference in scores for grade eleven ($M=1.95$, $SD=.35$), and grade twelve [$M=1.87$, $SD=.43$, $t(390.19)=2.09$, $p=.037$] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Therefore, it can be concluded that grade 11 students were more likely to misbehave compared to grade 12 students in Jordanian high schools. The resulting eta-square value is .01, this means that only 1 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by grade level which in Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a small effect size. Cohen's criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

4.5 Student misbehaviour based on types of school

The results of the analysis indicate that there was a significant difference in scores for vocational schools ($M=1.79$, $SD=.35$), and academic schools [$M=1.93$, $SD=.39$, $t(441)=-2.71$, $p=.007$] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Thus, it can be concluded that academic students were more likely to misbehave compared to vocational students in Jordanian high schools. The resulting eta-square value is .016, this means that only 1.6 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by types of school, which in Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a small effect size. Cohen's criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

5. Conclusions and Discussion

5.1 Conclusions

In conclusion, it can be inferred that the majority of the respondents (62.5%) showed low level of misbehaviour and 37.2 percent of the respondents had moderate level of misbehaviour, while only 0.2 percent showed high level of misbehaviour in Jordanian high school studied. The most frequent types of misbehaviour found among Jordanian high schools students were disobedience, followed by classroom disruption and vandalism of school property. The results of the independent sample t-test demonstrated that male students were significantly more likely to misbehave than female students, students from grade 11 were more likely to commit misbehaviour than grade 12 students, students from academic schools obtained significantly higher scores in misbehaviour compared to students from vocational schools.

One of the major objectives of the Jordanian educational system is to guide Jordanian children in becoming well-adjusted and morally upright members of society. In the eyes of many parents, even a low level of misbehaviour is unacceptable and calls for immediate attention and concern. Minor discipline problems, however, are a normal phenomenon among young people, especially adolescents. On the other hand, continued disobedience to school rules and class disruption may imply that students are not sufficiently engaged in the learning process and that the lesson content is not conveyed in a manner interesting enough to capture the students' attention. The strictly academic nature of the curriculum and the teaching techniques used or practised may not be comprehensive

enough to keep the students engaged. Efforts to make the curriculum content more relevant and the teaching more interesting should be further enhanced by the schools and the relevant authorities. The teaching and learning approaches need to be considered. Thus, it is recommended that the Jordanian high school should initiate more programmes involving parents, students and other relevant practice to meet special needs.

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Level of student misbehaviour

The first research question in this study is to determine the level of student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools. The results of the data analysis reveal that the majority of the respondents (62.5%) exhibited a low level of misbehaviour, 37.2 percent displayed a moderate level of misbehaviour, while only 0.2 percent of the respondents contributed to a high level of misbehaviour.

The above findings are similar to the results reported by Jenkins (1997) on U.S. schools. He observed that minor deviant behaviour occurred more frequently than serious deviant behaviour. Additionally, the findings also agree with Beaman et al. (2007) who reported that there were low level of misbehaviour in Australian schools.

The fact that the level of student misbehaviour found in Jordanian high schools is generally low, however, does not mean that these results meet the expectations of Jordanian educators. Even a low level of misbehaviour is considered a serious problem because it reflects on Jordanian society at large. Being a cohesive Muslim society, Islamic norms and values rank high, and the socially acceptable form of behaviour expected to be imparted at the school level is behaviour consistent with these specific norms and values. Essential to Islamic morality and culture is a strong emphasis on family, a close relationship between parents and their children, and the children's obedience to school authority. Jordanian high school students who are in the process of becoming adult members of society are thus expected to behave according to these norms.

5.2.2 Type of student misbehaviour

The second research objective is to determine the type of student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools. The results of the analysis reveal that the most frequent types of misbehaviour found among the Jordanian high school students are disobedience, classroom disruption and vandalising school property.

The above findings are in accordance with the results produced by Western researchers such as Yoncalik (2010); Finn, Fish, & Scott (2008); Beaman, et al. (2007); Weerman, Harland, & Van Der Laan. (2007); (Lee, Chen, Lee, & Kaur (2007); Infantino & Little (2005); Johnson (2003); Bryant, Schulenberg, Bachman, O'Malley, & Johnston (2000); Goyette, Dore, & Dion (2000); Kann & Hanna (2000); Supaporn (2000); Jenkins (1995) and Menacker, Ewldon, & Hurwitz (1989) who generally observed that the most frequent type of misbehaviour was disruption in the classroom, disobedience and vandalising school property.

The results of this research also agree with the findings of Jordanian researchers as early as Bader (1985); Mnazal (1993), Al-Khulaifi (1994); Al-Issawi (1997); Owaidat & Hamdi (1997); Rawaqa, et al. (1998) and Alia (2001). Recent findings of Jordanian researchers also show that the most prevalent form of inappropriate behaviour exhibited by students in Jordanian schools are the various forms of disobedience, classroom disruption and vandalising school property (AL-Zoubi, 2004; Dogan & Atoum, 2004; Mahasneh, 2006; Thawabieh & Al-Rofo, 2010).

5.2.3 Student misbehaviour based on gender

The third research question in the study focuses on the relation between gender and misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools. An independent sample t-test was conducted. The results of the analysis reveal that there is a significant difference in misbehaviour scores for males and females. The results of the analysis suggest that male students are significantly more likely to misbehave than female students.

This finding is supported by those of Booth, Farrell, & Varano (2008); Finn, et al., (2008); Gutierrez & Shoemaker (2008); Beaman, et al. (2007); Viljoen, O'Neill, & Sidhu (2005); Stewart (2003); Johnson(2003); Skiba, et al. (2002); Leung & Ho (2001); Kann & Hanna(2000); Jenkins (1997); Farrington, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber, Van-Kammen, & Schmidt (1996) and Elliott, Huizinga, & Ageton (1985). Although the present study is based on data collected in Jordan, it has yielded similar results to the above cited studies which were mostly done in the U.S. This suggests that girls are generally more likely to be less involved in misbehaviour and behave better in school than boys, irrespective of their geographical location or cultural membership.

Other researchers who conducted studies in the Middle East and produced similar evidence are Thawabieh & Al-Rofo (2010); Huwaidi & Al-Yammam (2007); Mahasneh (2006); Al-Zoubi (2004); Dogan & Atoum (2004); Tawfiq (2003); Alia (2001); Al-Fokah (2001); Owaidat & Hamdi (1997); Al-Khulaifi (1994) and Mnazal (1993).

Their results also confirm that male students in general behave more aggressively and inappropriately compared to their female peers.

Female Jordanian high school students are more likely to behave and identify more readily with school rules, norms, and regulations. One probable reason may be their different psychological makeup which favours inclusion as member of a group or institution and establishing unity rather than standing out. Boys on the other hand tend to behaviour which singles them out and enables them to position themselves independently.

5.2.4 Student misbehaviour based on grade level

The fourth objective of this research is to determine the significant differences in misbehaviour recorded by Jordanian high school students at different grades. An independent sample t-test was conducted. The obtained statistical data shows that Grade 11 and 12 students accumulated different scores, and that Grade 11 students are more likely to be involved in acts of misbehaviour than Grade 12 students.

A similar observation was made by Mnazal (1993) who found that students aged 15 to 17 years displayed more behavioural problems than students aged 18 to 22. It is therefore concluded that adolescence-related problems declined with increasing age. The findings of this study are also supported by those made by Thawabieh & Al-Rofo (2010) who noted different statistical results in the count of acts of vandalism committed by Grade 11 students.

However, the present findings related to the misbehaviour of students of different grade levels are not conclusive with those made by Al-Khulaifi (1994) in Qatar and Beaman et al. (2007) in Australia. They observed that behavioural problems became more severe with students moving up to higher grades. Older students attending the upper grades committed more recorded acts of misbehaviour than students in lower grades. The findings of this study are also inconsistent with Huwaidi & Al-Yammai (2007) who could not confirm any significant difference in misbehaviour displayed by students of different grade levels.

One possible explanation for the differences observed is that Jordanian high school students have to sit for the national exam at the end of Grade 12. Focusing on their exam preparation may divert students' attention away from distractions and leave them no time for their usual acts of misconduct. Another factor contributing to this change of behaviour could be that students become more matured in their thinking and acting and have come to realize that their school life is about to end and that a higher degree of conformity at this point will create new opportunities for them later outside school.

5.2.5 Student misbehaviour based on type of school

This section addresses the fifth research question of this study which aims at determining the relationship between student misbehaviour and the type of school students attend. An independent sample t-test was conducted and the results reveal that students of vocational schools scored differently from students of academic schools. Academic school students obtained significantly higher scores in misbehaviour than students who attended vocational schools.

The findings of this study coincide with an earlier study conducted by Rawaqa et al. (1998) which suggested that students who attended prevocational workshops demonstrated a lower degree of behavioural problems. Vocational students had a higher attendance record and spent a lot of time in their workshop or in the school garden compared to students attending regular schools. However, the findings of this research contradicts with the findings of Mahasneh (2006) who found that students from academic schools displayed more respectful manners and were more obedient to the school rules than those from vocational schools.

One possible reason for these different observations might be the more practice-oriented curriculum of the vocational schools. Vocational students are more involved with their school work which yields immediate observable results, satisfaction and sense of achievement and thus are less easily distracted or motivated to misbehave. Obviously, it is important to point out that currently there is a dearth of research which focuses on the relationship between misbehaviour and different school types. More studies need to be undertaken to produce a wider and more reliable pool of data on which to base a more conclusive analysis.

6. Limitation and Recommendation

This study was limited to public high school students' governorate of Jarash and was applied only to grade 11/ 12 in governorate of Jerash. The findings of this study revealed that male students are more likely to misbehave compared to female students. Similarly, grade 11 students are more likely to misbehave compared to grade 12 students, and students in academic schools have high level of misbehaviour compared to vocational school students. Therefore, experimental research could be carried out to study and develop teaching methods that are

able to encourage appropriate behaviour for students in academic schools. The finding could help teachers, headmasters and educational policymakers to develop more programmes to eradicate student misbehaviour.

References

- Al-bakor, N. (1985). *Definition of classroom aggression behavioral patterns in Jordanian primary schools*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Jordan, Amman.
- Al-Fokah, E. (2001). Levels of the tendency to violence and aggressive behaviour among the students of Philadelphia University and its relationship with some of therelational variables. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai University of Jordan*, 28(2), 480-501.
- Al-Issawi, A.-R. (1997). *Psychology of the offender*. Alexandria: DarAl-Ratab Aljamheh LI-Nasher waltzweh.
- Al-Khulaifi, S. Y. (1994). Behavior problem of the primary school children in Qatar. *Journal of Education in Qatar*, 6(1), 11-55.
- AL-Zoubi, Z. (2004). *The effect of some socio-economic and academic variables on the tendency towards aggressive behavior of the undergraduate students of the Hashemite University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Jordan, Amman.
- Alia, M. M. A. (2001). The effect of exposure to school violence on children's anxiety and school adjustment. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai Hashemite University*, 28(1), 102-116.
- Bader, J. S. S. (1985). *Class aggression forms in the elementary stage and their relationship with class size, pupil's and gender*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yarmoke University, Irbid.
- Beaman, R., Wheldall, K., & Kemp, C. (2007). Recent research on troublesome classroom behavior: A review. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 45-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10300110701189014>
- Booth, J. A., Farrell, A., & Varano, S. P. (2008). Social control, serious delinquency, and risky behavior: A gender analysis. *Crime and Delinquency*, 54(3), 423-456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011128707306121>
- Bryant, A., Schulenberg, J., Bachman, J., O'Malley, P., & Johnston, L. (2000). Understanding the links among school misbehavior, academic achievement, and cigarette use: a national panel study of adolescents. *Prevention Science*, 1(2), 71-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1010038130788>
- Charles, C. M. (2008). *Building classroom discipline* (9 ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Dogan, K. I., & Atoum, A. S. Y. (2004). The emotional and social problem that face children in the first basic grade due to the perception of their teachers. *Al-Manara*, 10(4), 83-102.
- Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. S. (1985). Explaining delinquency and drug use. *Educational & School Psychology*, 27(1), 176-190.
- Farrington, D., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Van-Kammen, W., & Schmidt, L. (1996). Self-reported delinquency and a combined delinquency seriousness scale based on boys, mothers, and teachers: Concurrent and predictive validity for African Americans and Caucasians. *Criminology*, 34(3), 493-517, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1996.tb01217.x>
- Finn, J. D., Fish, R. M., & Scott, L. A. (2008). Educational sequelae of high school misbehavior. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 101(5), 259-274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.101.5.259-274>
- Gonzalez, L., Brown, M. S., & Slate, J. R. (2008). Teachers who left the teaching profession: A qualitative understanding. *The qualitative report*, 13(1), 1-11.
- Gottfredson, G. D. (2001). *Schools and delinquency*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goyette, R., Dore, R., & Dion, E. (2000). Pupils' misbehavior and reactions and causal attributions of physical education student teachers: a sequential analysis. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20(1), 3-14.
- Gutierrez, F. C., & Shoemaker, D. J. (2008). Self-Reported delinquency of high school students in Metro Manila: Gender and social class. *Youth & Society*, 40(1), 55-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0044118X07309986>
- Huwaidi, M., & Al-Yammai, S. (2007). Unacceptable behavior from teachers point of view amongst students at the primary stage in the Kingdom of Bahrain. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 8(1), 13-45.
- Infantinao, J., & Little, E. (2005). Students' perceptions of classroom behaviour problems and the effectiveness of different disciplinary methods. *Educational Psychology*, 25(5), 491-508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410500046549>

- Janini, N. (1999). Patterns of socialization in school as perceived by teachers of official basic schools in Madaba district. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai University of Jordan*, 26(1), 109-127.
- Jenkins, P. H. (1995). School delinquency and school commitment. *Sociology of Education*, 68(3), 221-242, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2112686>
- Jenkins, P. H. (1997). School delinquency and the school social bond. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(3), 337-367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022427897034003003>
- Johnson, S. (2003). *Teacher variables affecting the intervention strategies selected to manage the disruptive behavior of elementary students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, United States of America.
- Kann, T., & Hanna, F. J. (2000). Disruptive behavior disorders in children and adolescents: How do girls differ from boys? *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(3), 267-274.
- Kaplan, A., Gheen, M., & Midgley, C. (2002). Classroom goal structure and student disruptive behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 191-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709902158847>
- Kulinna, P. H., Krech, P., & Cothran, D. J. (2010). Development of a short-form version of the physical education classroom instrument: Measuring secondary pupils' disruptive behaviors. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15(1), 209-225.
- Lee, L.-K., Chen, P. C., Lee, K.-K., & Kaur, J. (2007). Violence related behaviours among Malaysian adolescents: A cross sectional survey among secondary school students in Negeri Sembilan. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*, 36(3), 169-174.
- Leung, J., & Ho, C. (2001). Disruptive behaviour perceived by Hong Kong primary school teachers. *Educational Research Journal*, 16, 223-237.
- Li, G. (2006). What do parents think? Middle class Chinese immigrant parents' perspectives on literacy learning, homework, and school home communication. *School Community Journal*, 16(2), 27-46.
- Luiselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., & Sunderland, M. (2002). Longitudinal evaluation of behavior support intervention in a public middle school. *Journal of Positive Behaviour Interventions*, 4(3), 182-188, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10983007020040030701>
- Mahasneh, A. M. (2006). *The effect of some chosen variables on social control of secondary school students*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Jordan, Amman.
- Makhilavi, N. A. (1995). *The relationship between aggressive behavior and values and how affected by a number of demographic variables*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid.
- Menacker, J., Ewldon, W., & Hurwitz, E. (1989). School order and safety as community issue. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(1), 39-55.
- Ministry of Education. (2000). The update national population strategy: Concepts, foundation, and goals. [Online] Available: http://www.policyproject.com/pubs/countryreports/Jordan_NPS.pdf (January 22, 2010)
- Mnazal, A. F. (1993). The Problems of adolescents in Jordan due to gender and age. *Drasat Al-Mojaled*, 20(1), 264-300.
- Owaidat, A., & Hamdi, N. (1997). Behavioral problems of male students in 8th, 9th and 10th classes in Jordan and variables related to those problems. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai University of Jordan*, 24(2), 298-315.
- Rashdan, A., & Hamshari, O. A. (2002). *System of education in Jordan*. Amman: Dar al-Safa Ll-Nasher waltwzeh.
- Rawaqa, G., Ta'ani, H., & Kawasmeh, H. (1998). The role of the prevocational activities on the restriction of the compulsory students' behaviour problems. *Abhat AL-Yarmouk "Salsalh Al-hlwm Al-Nsaneh Al-Jtmaheh*, 14(1), 63-78.
- Skiba, R., Michael, R., Nardo, A., & Peterson, R. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review*, 34(4), 317-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320817372>
- Stewart, E. (2003). School social bonds, school climate, and school misbehavior: A multilevel analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 575-604. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418820300095621>

- Supaporn, S. (2000). High school students' perspectives about misbehavior. *Physical Educator*, 57(3), 124-153.
- Tawfiq, T. A.-M. (2003). Global components of aggressive behavior in samples of students at both undergraduate and secondary schools in Bahrain. *Journal of Social Science*, 31(2), 112-144.
- Thawabieh, A. M., & Al-Rofo, M. A. (2010). Vandalism at boys schools in Jordan. *Introduction Journal Education Science*, 2(1), 41-46.
- Viljoen, J., O'Neill, M., & Sidhu, A. (2005). Bullying behavior in female and male adolescent offenders: Prevalence, types, and association with psychology adjustment. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31(6), 521-536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20036>
- Weerman, F. M., Harland, P., & Van Der Laan, P. H. (2007). Misbehavior at school and delinquency elsewhere: A complex relationship. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(4), 358-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0734016807311905>
- Yoncalik, O. (2010). Students' misbehaviors in physical education lessons: A sample from Turkey. *Education & Psychology*, 8(1), 59-86.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents Based on Gender, Grade level and Types of School (n=443)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	216	48.8
Female	227	51.2
Grade levels		
Grade Eleven	239	54.0
Grade Twelve	204	46.0
Type of Schools		
Vocational	71	16.0
Academic	372	84.0
Total Respondent	443	100.0

Table 1 presents the distribution of the students based on gender, grade level, and type of schools. The data in table 1 indicates that participants in this study consisted primarily of 443 students, which in 48.8 percent were males while 51.2 percent were females. Among the respondents, 54.0 percent were in grade eleven while 46.0 percent were in grade twelve. The analysis by the type of schools shows that, 16.0 percent were from vocational schools while 84.0 percent were from academic schools.

Table 2. Students Level of Misbehaviour (n=443)

Levels	Mean	Frequency	Percentage
Low	1-2	227	62.5
Moderate	2.01-3	165	37.2
High	3.01-4	1	.2
Mean= 1.91	Std. deviation= .39	Minimum= 1	Maximum= 4

Table 2 presents the distribution of the students by level of students' misbehaviour. The data indicates that the majority of the students (62.5%) had low level of misbehaviour. The remaining namely 37.2 percent and .2 percent had moderate and high levels of misbehaviour respectively. The mean score of students' level of misbehaviour was 1.91 with a standard deviation of .39, suggesting that their level of misbehaviour behaviour in school is generally low.

Table 3. Mean, Standard Deviation and Rankings of Type of Misbehaviour (N=443)

Type of Misbehaviour	Mean	SD	Rank
Disobedience	2.02	.53	1
Classroom disruption	1.91	.57	2
Vandalism school property	1.82	.36	3

It is observable from the table 3 that with regard to the means and standard deviations of the three types of misbehaviour, the mean of disobedient behaviour was higher than the other means (2.02) and standard deviation of (.53), followed by students' involvement in classroom disruption with mean score of (1.91) and standard deviation of (.57), while vandalizing school property with mean score of (1.82) and standard deviation of (.36).

Table 4. Independent Sample T-test Analysis Comparing Scores of Student Misbehaviour Based on Gender, Grade Level, and Types of School (n=443)

Variables	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Gender				7.68	.001
Male	216	2.05	.39		
Female	227	1.78	.34		
Grade Level				2.09	.037
Grade 11	239	1.95	.35		
Grade 12	204	1.78	.43		
Type of School				-2.71	.007
Vocational	71	1.79	.35		
Academic	372	1.93	.39		

P>.05

To answer research questions 3, 4 and 5 in the current study (Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for gender, grade level and type of school?), an independent samples t-test was conducted.

Table 4 indicates that there was a significant difference in scores for males (M= 2.05, SD= .39), and females [(M= 1.78, SD= .34; t(441)= 7.68, p= .001] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Therefore, it can be concluded that male students were more likely to misbehave compared to female students in Jordanian high schools.

Table 4 reveals that there was a significant difference in scores for grade eleven (M= 1.95, SD= .35), and grade twelve [(M= 1.87, SD= .43, t(390.19)= 2.09, p= .037] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Therefore, it can be concluded that grade 11 students were more likely to misbehave compared to grade 12 students in Jordanian high schools.

Table 4 shows that there was a significant difference in scores for vocational schools (M= 1.79, SD= .35), and academic schools [M= 1.93, SD= .39, t(441)= -2.71, p= .007] in terms of the frequency of misbehaviour. Thus, it can be concluded that academic students were more likely to misbehave compared to vocational students in Jordanian high schools.