

Misbehaviour in Jordanian Secondary Schools

Ameen Mohammed Mousa Mahasneh¹, Sharifah Md. Nor², Abdul Rahman bin Md. Aroff³, Nur Surayyah M. Abdullah³, Bahaman Abu Samah⁴, Ahmad Mohammed Mousa Mahasneh⁵ & Mohammed Jaber Sherbib Asiri⁶

¹ Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

² Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

³ Department of Language and Humanities Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

⁴ Department of Professional Development and Continuing Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

⁵ The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

⁶ Educational Technology, Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Correspondence: Ameen Mohammed Mousa Mahasneh, Registration and Admission Office, The Hashemite University, Zarqa 13115, The Kingdom of Jordan. Tel: 962-77-593-4994. E-mail: ameen1977@live.com

Received: December 24, 2011

Accepted: February 13, 2012

Published: May 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ass.v8n6p121

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n6p121>

Abstract

The main goal of the current study is to explore the demographic variables that are related to student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools in the Governorate of Jarash using a survey research design. The level of student misbehaviour is measured by a questionnaire consisting of 30 items distributed over the three categories disobedience, classroom disruption and vandalising school property. The results of the present study show that student misbehaviour differs significantly in respect to the students' academic achievement and the parents' level of education. However, student misbehaviour does not differ significantly according to the students' monthly family income. The findings of the study has viable implications for future school reforms and includes recommendations to improve the role of the family and the school in modern secondary education.

Keywords: misbehaviour, academic achievement, parents level of education, family income

1. Introduction

Student misbehaviour is not an isolated problem only school administrators, teachers and parents have to deal with. Adolescents who have acquired the habit of ignoring rules, challenging authority and giving in to physical aggression are likely to carry these traits into adulthood. Student misbehaviour starts in school but its effects extend into the community at large. As more and more student exhibit disruptive behaviour, so do the rest of their peers feel that it hinders their ability to focus on their studies. In the same manner, teachers feel that student misbehaviour interferes with their ability to teach and contributes to their heightened stress levels (Beaman, Wheldall, & Kemp, 2007) and prompts many of them to quit their teaching profession (Gonzalez, Brown, & Slate, 2008). Educators look at the problem of student misbehaviour focusing on its connection with school dropout rates on the rise. The lack of student discipline has come to be regarded an important predictor of dropping out of school (Gutierrez & Shoemaker, 2008).

Toby (1998) found that U.S. students who commit acts of misbehaviour commit them on a daily basis. Finn, Fish, & Scott (2008) have proven that student misbehaviour is related to low academic achievement and dropping out of school. Student misbehaviour does not only hinder the perpetrators from learning but prevents their classmates and peers from learning as well. They divert the students' attention, interrupt lessons, waste their teachers' and their own limited time in class, and, most alarmingly, reduces the probability of completing their formal education. Student misbehaviour increases the teachers' stress levels, diverts their attention away from the lesson and thus adversely affects the quality of teaching and learning. Ultimately, it interferes with academic achievement and success. Misbehaviour also creates an atmosphere of discomfort, insecurity and fear at school which is

experienced by the students and teachers alike, and school administrators are forced to spend a high amount of time dealing with discipline problems (Gaustad, 1992 ; Owaidat & Hamdi, 1997) instead of appraisal and motivation (Todras, 2007). Not surprisingly, sorting out discipline problems seems to be the greatest challenge teachers and school administrators have to face on a frequent basis (Alia, 2001).

Finn et al. (2008) asserted that during adolescence most of the negative behavioural traits related to inappropriate behaviour are acquired. Jenkins(1997) observed that such disruptive behaviour translated into students hitting other students, damaging school property, disrupting class, not doing homework and not paying attention, the most frequent and common forms of school misconduct.

The body of existing research suggests that the increase in disruptive classroom behaviour is associated with higher dropout rates (Goyette, Dore, & Dion, 2000), academic failure, substance abuse as well as poverty and unemployment in adulthood. Several studies have subsequently confirmed this general prediction (Mahadi, 2000). In this respect, Loeber and Dishion (1998) asserted that misbehaviour becomes a gateway to other negative forms of adolescent behaviour, such as vandalism, drug abuse, and more serious criminal offenses in adulthood. Research has indicated that students who drop out of school are more likely to commit serious legal offenses which result in conviction and incarceration (Loeber, 1990; Loeber & Dishion, 1998; Loeber & Dishion, 1983; Owaidat & Hamdi, 1997).

Hirschi (1978) stated that “perhaps the best predictor of delinquency in American society is difficulty in school” (p. 334). He argued that school achievement was affected by an individual’s academic performance and ability which were negatively related to misbehaviour. Thus, the students’ academic performance and ability affected their attitudes toward school and teachers. Students who performed poorly at school were considerably more likely to collide with the law compared to those who did well. Hirschi conceded that students with lower academic achievement simply learned to dislike school and defy the school’s authority.

The present study seeks to bridge the gap between existing research on student misbehaviour in general and specialized studies focusing on the Jordanian educational system in particular. Firstly, no conclusive empirical evidence has been established to fully explain the relation between school achievement and student misbehaviour. Secondly, the parental level of education contributes to the students’ level of academic achievement whereby more educated parents are more likely to engage in their children’s activities at school and enforce more discipline. Thirdly, previous studies examining the relation of family income and student misbehaviour have failed to produce consistent results and additional research is needed to assess this relationship. The researcher postulates that students with poor academic achievement are more likely to commit acts of misbehaviour, students of higher educated parents are more likely to behave in a more adjusted manner than their peers whose parents are less educated, and students from lower family income groups are expected to exhibit higher levels of misbehaviour than those with a higher socio-economic background.

The purpose of this study is to identify the variables that are related to student misbehaviour, such as academic achievement, the paternal level of education, the maternal level of education, and family income. It is hoped that this study will provide more insight and a deeper understanding of what causes student misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools which ultimately contributes to the quality -- or more specifically the lack of quality -- of Jordanian high school graduates.

2. Research Questions

This study seeks to find answers to the following questions:

- 1) Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for differing academic achievement levels?
- 2) Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for differing educational levels of the students’ fathers?
- 3) Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for differing educational levels of the students’ mothers?
- 4) Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for differing family income?

3. Material and Method

3.1 Research Design

This study is quantitative in nature and employs a descriptive research design. The questionnaire is utilized to meet the objective of the study.

3.2 Participation

The population of this study consists of all public high schools students in the Jordanian Governorate of Jarash in the academic year 2010/2011 summing up to a total of approximately 6700 students. A stratified random sampling is employed.

In this study, the Cohen Table is used to determine the sample size needed to conduct the analysis of the current study. The significance criterion alpha level (α) was 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). In order to determine the sample size for one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) when the effect size is medium ($d=.25$), the alpha level is $=.05$, the statistical power is .80, and the necessary sample size for per group is 39 cases. Therefore, in the particular study the sample size required for five student academic achievement groups are 195 cases. Due the number of non-responsive students who did not complete their questionnaire, the researcher used oversampling of 443 respondents to account for lost or uncooperative respondents and to ensure that at least 168 students responded to the questionnaire. Therefore, the total sample selected for this study consists of 443 male and female high school students.

3.3 Research Instruments

After reviewing the existing literature on the subject, the researcher created a modified self-report questionnaire building on the findings and implications of related research pertaining to the phenomenon of student misbehaviour.

In order to ensure the validity of this research, the process of validating the research instrument has been completed in consecutive stages. Firstly, the researcher has consulted a panel of judges to comment upon every part of the instrument and suggest any changes in terms of the clarity of the instrument, language accuracy, the degree of conformity in every question with the field under which it was going to be classified, and modifying or commenting upon whatever the referees deemed appropriate to validate the research instrument specifically for its Jordanian context. Secondly, after a series of discussion sessions with the panel judges, the face validity of the questionnaire has been revised accordingly. The research instrument validated by the panel of judges has been sent to a group of qualified translators. The questionnaire contains an English version and an Arabic version. It is imperative that the translations are accurate and convey the same meaning as the original instruments. The questionnaires have been verified again by the supervisor committee at University Putra Malaysia and the panel judges of the Hashemite University and the University of Jordan to check the format, arrangement, appropriateness of the content and language used in the instrument.

The survey consists of two sections. Set (A) focuses on the demographic data of the respondents to collect general background information regarding the participants' academic achievement (GPA), their fathers' level of education, their mothers' level of education, and monthly family income. Set (B) contains statements related to the students' perception towards misbehaviour.

Student misbehaviour is reflected in 30 items such as cheating during exams, wearing improper clothing in school, annoying the teacher during class, disturbing other students just for the sake of fun, calling other students with undesired names or adjectives, smoking cigarettes, carrying weapons to school, behaving insolently toward other students, teachers and school staff, getting into physical fights with fellow students, etc. The statements are designed to measure the students' perceptions toward school rules, classroom disruption and vandalising school property on 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 are asked to indicate how often they have behaved in a specific manner during the current school year. The reliability of the items was (.80)

3.4 Statistical Procedures

A total of 443 students completed the survey and returned their questionnaire 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.

The independent variables in this study, academic achievement GPA, the father's level of education, the mother's level of education, and monthly family income are categorical, while the dependent variable (student misbehaviour) is continuous scale. In addition, inferential statistics, namely one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), was used to answer the research objective of the study.

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to compare the means of student misbehaviour across different academic achievement (GPA) groups, the fathers' levels of education groups, the mothers' levels of education

groups, and family income groups. Pallant (2007) states that before performing an ANOVA test there are a number of common issues that need to be considered. First, one way analysis of variance requires the dependent variable to be measured on an interval or ratio, while the independent variables to be measured on a nominal or ordinal scale. Hence, in the present study the dependent variable (student misbehaviour) is measured on an interval, while the independent variables (academic achievement, fathers' levels of education, mothers' levels of education and family monthly income) were measured on an ordinal scale. Therefore, the assumption of level of measurement for ANOVA was met.

Secondly, the assumption of ANOVA test for random sampling must be obtained randomly from the population. Therefore, in the current study the sample was randomly selected from the population (high school students from the Governorate of Jarash) through a stratified random sampling. Thus, the value of Skewness and Kurtosis for the five academic achievement (GPA) groups, three fathers' levels of education groups, three mothers' levels of education groups and four family monthly income groups has been determined at being below (1), which means that the shapes of distributions for these variables on student misbehaviour are considered to be normal. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality has been met.

Thirdly, the assumption of homogeneity of variance for the ANOVA test is that samples must be obtained from a population of equal variance. In the present study, the Levene's test of equality of variance has been conducted for the ANOVA test. The non-significant value (>0.05) suggests that the assumption of homogeneity of variance does not violate the assumption. It is observable from Levene's test that the significance level for Levene's test of academic achievement is (.123), the fathers' levels of education (.134), the mothers' levels of education (.098) and family income (.232). This is larger than the cut-off value of (.05). This means that the variances for the five academic achievement groups, the six levels of education groups, and the four family income groups are the same. Therefore, the homogeneity of variance has met the assumption.

4. Results

4.1 Student Misbehaviour Based on Academic Achievement (GPA)

To answer the first research question (Is there a significant difference in the mean student misbehaviour scores for differing academic achievement?), one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is conducted to examine whether there are significant differences between the five student GPA groups and student misbehaviour.

Table 1 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicate a statistically significant difference among the five student GPA groups and student misbehaviour [$F(4,438) = 3.32, p = .011$].

Table 1. ANOVA Summary Table Comparing Academic Achievement

Variables	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Academic Achievement				3.328	.011
50 – 59	8	2.34	.41		
60 – 69	31	1.80	.28		
70 – 79	93	1.94	.43		
80 – 89	150	1.90	.36		
90 – 100	161	1.90	.40		

Table 1 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among the five students' GPA groups on student misbehaviour [$F(4,438) = 3.32, p = .011$].

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicated that students with mean GPA scores which ranged from 50 to 59 ($M = 1.80, S.D = .28$) and 70 to 79 ($M = 1.94, S.D = .43$) were significantly different in terms of misbehaviour compared to all the other groups of students with GPA scores ranging from 60 to 69, 80 to 89 and 90 to 100. The findings suggest that students in the 50 to 59 and 70 to 79 GPA groups scored significantly higher in misbehaviour compared to other all groups of students. Therefore, it can be concluded that in Jordanian high school students with lower academic achievement (GPA) generally were more likely to misbehave than those who have higher academic achievement (GPA).

Thus, the resulting eta-square value is .029, this means that only 2.9 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by academic achievement (GPA), which in Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a small effect size. Cohen criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicated that students with mean GPA scores ranging from 50 to 59 ($M= 1.80$, $S.D= .28$) and 70 to 79 ($M= 1.94$, $S.D= .43$) are significantly different in terms of misbehaviour compared to all the other groups of students with GPA scores ranging from 60 to 69, 80 to 89 and 90 to 100. The findings suggest that students in the 50 to 59 and 70 to 79 GPA groups have scored significantly higher in misbehaviour compared to other groups. Therefore, it can be concluded that Jordanian high school students with lower academic achievement (GPA) are more likely to misbehave than those with a higher academic achievement (GPA).

The resulting eta-square value is .029 which means that only 2.9 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by academic achievement (GPA). In Cohen's (1988) terms, this would be considered a small effect size. Cohen criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

4.2 Student Misbehaviour Based on the Educational Level of the Father

To answer the second research question (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing father's levels of education?), on way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is employed to ascertain whether there are differences for the three groups of the father's level of education and student misbehaviour. Their mean scores are compared for each group (never attended school, attended secondary school and below, completed college and above).

Table 2 indicates a statistically significant difference in the three father's level of education groups and student misbehaviour [$F(2,440) = 8.752$, $p= .001$].

Table 2. ANOVA Summary Table Comparing Father's Level of Education

Variables	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Father's Education				8.752	.001
Never Attended School	46	2.11	.40		
Secondary School and Less	220	1.92	.41		
College and above	177	1.85	.34		

To answer research question two (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing father's levels of education?), on way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to ascertain whether there are differences for the three groups of father's level of education on students' misbehaviour, their mean scores were compared for each group (never attended school, attended secondary school and below, and completed college and above).

Table 2 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among the three father's level of education groups on student's misbehaviour [$F(2,440) = 8.752$, $p= .001$].

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicated that the mean score for students whose father's never attended school ($M= 2.11$, $SD= .40$) was significantly different from students who had fathers who attended secondary school or below ($M= 1.92$, $SD= .41$), and also was significantly different from students whose father's completed college and other types of higher education ($M= 1.85$, $SD=.34$). Therefore, it can be concluded that in Jordanian high schools students with more educated fathers are less involved in misbehaviour.

Thus, the resulting eta-square value is .038, this means that only 3.8 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by father's level of education, 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).

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicates that the mean score for students whose fathers never attended school ($M= 2.11$, $SD= .40$) is significantly different from students whose fathers have attended secondary school or below ($M= 1.92$, $SD= .41$), and is also significantly different from students whose fathers completed college and other types of higher education ($M= 1.85$, $SD=.34$). Therefore, it can be concluded that Jordanian high school students with more educated fathers are less likely to be involved in misbehaviour.

The resulting eta-square value is .038 which means that only 3.8 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by the father's level of education. In Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a small effect size.

4.3 Student Misbehaviour Based on Mother's Education

To answer the third research question (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing mother's levels of education?), on way analysis of variance is conducted to ascertain whether there are differences for the three groups of mother's level of education and student misbehaviour. Their mean scores are compared for each group (never attended school, attended secondary school and below, completed college and above).

Table 3 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicate a statistically significant difference among the three mother's level of education groups and student misbehaviour [$F(2,440) = 9.565, p = .001$].

Table 3. ANOVA Summary Table Comparing Mother's Level of Education

Variables	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Mother's Education				9.565	.001
Never Attended School	61	2.05	.43		
Secondary School and Less	196	1.95	.38		
College and above	186	1.82	.36		

To answer research question three (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing mother's levels of education?), on way analysis of variance was conducted to ascertain whether there are differences for the three groups of mother's level of education on students' misbehaviour, their mean scores were compared for each group (never attended school, attended secondary school and below, and completed college and above).

Table 3 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among the three mother's level of education students' misbehaviour [$F(2,440) = 9.565, p = .001$].

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for students whose mother's never attended school ($M = 2.05, SD = .43$) was significantly different from students whose mother's completed college and other types of higher education ($M = 1.82, SD = .36$). Further analysis revealed that students who had mothers who attended secondary school and below ($M = 1.93, SD = .36$), was significantly different from students whose mother's completed college and above ($M = 1.82, SD = .36$). Thus, it can be concluded that in Jordanian high schools students with more educated mothers are less involved in misbehaviour at Jordanian high school. However, students whose mother's never attended school did not differ significantly in term of their misbehaviour scores compared to students whose mothers obtained secondary school education and below.

Thus, the resulting eta-square value is .042, this means that only 4.2 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by mother's level of education, which in Cohen's (1988) terms, would be considered a small effect size. Cohen criteria is (0.01 = small effect, 0.06 = moderate effect, and 0.14 = large effect).

The result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD test indicates that the mean score for students whose mothers never attended school ($M = 2.05, SD = .43$) is significantly different from students whose mothers have completed college and other types of higher education ($M = 1.82, SD = .36$). Further analysis reveals that students whose mothers have attended secondary school and below ($M = 1.93, SD = .36$), is significantly different from students whose mothers have completed college and above ($M = 1.82, SD = .36$). Thus, it can be concluded that in Jordanian high schools, students with more educated mothers are less likely to be involved in misbehaviour than others. However, students whose mothers have never attended school do not differ significantly in term of their misbehaviour scores compared to students whose mothers have obtained secondary school education and below.

The resulting eta-square value is .042 which means that only 4.2 percent of the variance in misbehaviour is explained by the mother's level of education which is considered a small effect size.

4.4 Students' Misbehaviour Based on Family Income

To answer the fourth research question (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing family monthly income?), on way analysis of variance is conducted to ascertain whether there are differences for the four groups of monthly family income and student misbehaviour. Their mean scores are compared for each group (below 300JD, between 301 to 499 JD, between 500 to 699JD, and above 700JD).

Table 4 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between students based on family income's groups and their level of misbehaviour in Jordanian high schools [$F(3,439) = 1.954, p = .120$]. It was thus not necessary to conduct Post hoc Tukey HSD Test.

Table 4. ANOVA Summary Table Comparing Family Income

Variables	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Family Income				1.95	.120
<300 JD	149	1.88	.39		
301 to 499 JD	134	1.93	.42		
500 to 699	93	1.85	.35		
>700 JD	83	1.98	.39		

To answer research question four (Is there a significant difference in the mean students' misbehaviour scores for differing family monthly income?), on way analysis of variance was conducted to ascertain whether there are differences for the four groups of family monthly income on students' misbehaviour, their mean scores were compared for each group (below 300JD, between 301 to 499 JD, between 500 to 699JD, and above 700JD).

Table 4 shows that the results of ANOVA test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between students based on family income's groups in terms of misbehaviour at Jordanian high schools [F (3,439)= 1.954, p= .120]. Therefore, it was not necessary to conduct Post hoc Tukey HSD Test.

5. Discussion

5.1 Student Misbehaviour and Academic Achievement (GPA)

This section addresses the first research question of the study which examines the relation of student misbehaviour and academic achievement (GPA) based on the data gathered from the selected Jordanian high schools. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) reveals striking disparities in the levels of misbehaviour displayed by students with different academic achievement. In addition, the result of the Post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicates that students with GPA scores ranging from 50 to 59 and 70 to 79 behave differently from the rest of the students with GPA scores ranging from 60 to 69, 80 to 89 and 90 to 100. The findings suggest that students in the 50 to 59 and 70 to 79 GPA groups misbehave more frequently than other groups. Therefore, it can be concluded that high school students with lower academic achievement (GPA) are more likely to misbehave than those with higher academic achievement (GPA).

The findings above accord with previous results reported by Hirschi (1978) who stated that "perhaps the best predictor of delinquency in American society is difficulty in school" (p.334). According to his observations, academic achievement and ability were negatively related to misbehaviour. He further added that individuals who had done poorly in school were considerably more likely to get into conflict with the law than those who had done well.

The findings of this study support those of Al-Fokah (2001) who posited that student academic achievement had a significant influence on how students perceived violence and aggressive behaviour. Similar conclusions were reached by Al-Zoubi (2004) who found that undergraduate students of the Hashemite University earning a lower SGPA displayed a higher tendency towards aggressive behaviour

Finn et al. (2008), Gottfredson & Hirschi (1990), Bryant et al (2003) and Stewart (2003) agreed that students with high academic achievement were generally found to engage less in delinquent behaviour. Contrary to these findings, Owaidat & Hamdi (1997) alleged that there existed no significant relationship between student misbehaviour and academic achievement. Their different results might be attributed to the application of different methods measuring student academic achievement (GPA) and student misbehaviour. There is no doubt that student misbehaviour and low academic performance are correlated. Low academic achievement can act as a factor contributing to student misbehaviour. Students who have difficulty coping with the learning process and earn discouraging results are likely to divert their attention to other not subject related activities. On the other hand, students who – for reasons unrelated to their academic abilities – misbehave and for example pay no attention in class and not complete their coursework, will produce poor academic results. As such, the relation between misbehaviour and low academic achievement is twofold. It can be either the low academic performance which prompts students to misbehave in order to express their dissatisfaction and frustration in the classroom or it can be prior misbehaviour and frequent distraction from class which results in poor grades.

5.2 Student Misbehaviour and the Academic Background of Parents

This section discusses the second and third research question of the present study which examines the correlation of student misbehaviour and the educational level of parents. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) shows that the rate of student misbehaviour differs for each of the three groups of fathers with a different educational

background. The result of the post hoc Tukey HSD Test indicates that the average score earned by students whose fathers have never attended school differed significantly from students whose fathers have attended secondary school, completed college or have attended other institutions of higher education. It seems justified to conclude that Jordanian high schools students with more educated fathers are less likely to be involved in misbehaviour.

In regard to the level of education of students' mothers, the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) also reveal that the rate of student misbehaviour differs for each of the three groups of mothers with a different educational background. The results of the post hoc Tukey HSD test indicate that the average score for students whose mothers have never attended school differs significantly from students whose mothers have completed college or attended other institutions of higher education. Further analysis reveals that students with mothers who have attended secondary school have earned scores which vary from those of students whose mothers have furthered their education. Thus, it can be concluded that Jordanian high schools students with educated mothers are less likely to be involved in misbehaviour than others.

The above findings agree with the results procured by Sharaz (2006) and Jenkins (1995) who found that educated parents were likely to stress the importance of higher education in front of their children and encourage them to be more productive at school. This is supported by Al-Zoubi (2004) who observed that Jordanian undergraduate students of the Hashemite University with less educated parents displayed a significantly higher tendency towards aggressive behaviour. Mahasneh (2006) added that students with more educated mothers were generally more committed to school and more readily submitted to school rules and regulations.

Similar conclusions were drawn by Xu (2002) whose study asserted that the parental level of education influenced the level of parental involvement in their children's schooling. More specifically, higher educated parents monitored their children's progress at school more frequently and provided them with a positive example of how to successfully interact with teachers and peers. Another line of evidence supporting this point was produced by White (1989) and Stevenson & Baker (1987) who observed that the parental level of education was positively associated with their involvement at school.

Similarly, Eckert (1988) found that the behaviour and performance of children at school reflected their parents' social status. Alter (1987) had suggested earlier that the parents' level of education constituted one of the most decisive family background variables in the prediction of student behaviour. Finn et al. (2008) later shared the same conclusion when asserting that inappropriate behaviour was exhibited more frequently by students whose parents had only enjoyed a very basic level of education.

In this respect, Saleh (1997) and Mendler & Curwin (1983) highlighted another aspect relevant to the above mentioned findings in line with the present study. Both concluded that a student's home environment strongly influenced his or her behaviour at school, and that students of uneducated and unsupportive parents were more likely to misbehave.

The consistent nature of the collective body of evidence therefore affirms that the quality of home life ought to be considered the single most significant factor affecting student behaviour. Parents act as role models and children have the natural tendency to emulate their parents. Students with educated parents learn early in their lives that education is important and that their well adapted behaviour at school earns them their parents' approval and appreciation of their efforts. Students with less educated parents, however, do not receive the same sort of encouragement and cannot follow a path already trodden by their parents. They do not experience the same motivation students of educated parents' experience who are guided by parental expectations.

5.3 Student Misbehaviour and Family Income

When looking at the relation between student misbehaviour and family income, the results of the ANOVA test reveal no significant difference between the scores accumulated by Jordanian high school students from families of different income levels. Students hailing from families belonging to lower income groups do not exhibit a higher rate of misbehaviour than those being raised in higher income groups.

The above findings confirm those of Mahasneh (2006) and Morgan (1990) stating that the level of family income was not related to aggressive behaviour among students. The results of the present study also agree with the findings of Al-Fuqaha (2001) who observed that family income had no significant effect on the aggressive behaviour reported of students at the Philadelphia University in Jordan.

However, there are a considerable number of studies which yielded different results inconsistent with these findings (Alter, 1987; Brantlinger, 1991; Diprete, 1981; Finn, et al., 2008; Kerr, 2004; Malikia, 2009; Peter, 1988; Sampson & Laub, 1994; Sharaz, 2006; Stewart, 2003; Suhaimi, 1998; Xu, 2002). Their research suggested that student misbehaviour was associated with lower family income. Hirschi (1978) for instance noted that lower

income families were less able to guide and control their children effectively. In affirmation of the latter, Al-Zoubi (2004) concluded that Jordanian undergraduate students at the Hashemite University who came from lower income families showed a higher tendency towards aggressive behaviour than those of higher income families.

The apparent inconsistencies in the findings of previous studies and the present study could be attributed to the differences in the applied methods of measuring family income and rates of misbehaviour. A number of the above cited researches were done focusing on the relation of adolescent delinquency and family income, rather than family income and student misbehaviour. This may have resulted in different findings. Another reason may be that in the socioeconomic context of Jordan, low income does not equal a low level of parental education. Also, the monthly income earned by families in which only one parent, usually the husband, is working generally tends to be lower than that of families where both parents are earning a living. Although those students fall to a lower income group, they enjoy more parental supervision than those whose parents are both working fulltime.

6. Limitation of the Study

The sample has been limited to public high schools in the Jordanian Governorate of Jarash to the exclusion of other parts of Jordan. Extending the scope of this study to all Jordanian high schools would have exceeded the amount of time and financial resources available to the researcher. Furthermore, the study did not differentiate between students living in the cities or the countryside. It is suggested, however, that participants living in the cities have more educated parents than those living in the countryside and also belong to higher income groups.

7. Conclusions of the Study

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions can be made:

- Jordanian high school students with lower academic achievement (GPA) are generally more likely to misbehave than those with a higher academic achievement (GPA).
- Jordanian high school students with more educated parents are less likely to be involved in misbehaviour.
- In terms of misbehaviour, there is no significant statistical difference between students with varying family income.

In the light of these findings, alternative and improved teaching and learning approaches need to be devised to reduce the existing rate of student misbehaviour. The schools should initiate more programs involving parents, students and other relevant parties to increase communication and address respective needs and expectations. Thus, it is recommended that – in order to improve the learning experience for Jordanian high school students – the following steps should be undertaken:

- The Ministry of Education of Jordan should instigate the creation of regular workshops involving students, teachers, administrators, school staff, and parents to highlight the importance of discipline in school, provide programs to enhance parent-student relationships, set up committees to develop strategies and design programs to reduce disciplinary problems among students. A consistent policy for the successful operation of such programmes could gradually reduce or eliminate student misconduct.
- Mutual cooperation and a closer relationship between parents and teachers should be established and fostered through media such as newsletters, report cards, telephone calls, parents-teacher conferences, home visits, and open day programs.
- Student misbehaviour programs focusing on improving the students' relationship with their parents, peers and teachers and strengthening moral reasoning are likely to prevent Jordanian high school students from getting involved in disruptive activities in school.
- Further studies including respondents of a wider age range could provide future researchers with a set of complementary data to include rates of misbehaviour from primary and elementary schools, colleges and universities.

References

- 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 the relational variables. *Drasat Al-Ahlem Altrbwai University of Jordan*, 28(2), 480-501.
- 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.
- Alter, O. M. (1987). Youth and City and aggressive behavior. *Dar Alfker Al-Araby Beirut*, 47, 134-166.
- 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>
- Brantlinger, E. (1991). Social class distinction in adolescents' reports of problems and punishment in school. *Behavioral Disorders*, 17(1), 36-46.
- Bryant, A. L., Schulenberg, J. E., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Johnston, L. D. (2003). How academic achievement, attitudes, and behaviors relate to the course of substance use during adolescence: A 6-Year, Multiwave National Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(3), 361-397. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1303005>
- Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Diprete, T. (1981). *Discipline and order in American high schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Center for Educational Statistics Chicago Chicago.
- 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>
- Gaustad, J. (1992). School discipline, college of education: University of Oregon. Retrieved May 20, 2010, from <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest078.html>
- 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, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford 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>
- Hirschi, T. (1978). Causes and prevention of juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry*, 47(1), 322-341.
- 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>
- Kerr, D. (2004). Family transformations and the well-being of children: Recent evidence from Canadian longitudinal data. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 35(1), 73-91.
- Loeber, R. (1990). Development and risk factors of juvenile anti-social behavior and delinquency. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 10 (1), 1-41. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358\(90\)90105-J](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(90)90105-J)
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, M. (1998). Development of juvenile aggression and violence: some common misconceptions and controversies. *American Psychologist*, 53(2), 242-259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.2.242>
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency. *A Review Psychological Bulletin*, 93(1), 68-99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/00332909.94.1.68>
- Mahadi, S. A. (2000). *Students' perceptions of school safety: A study of two high risk schools in the Sentul Zone*. Unpublished master's thesis, International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Mahasneh, A. M. (2006). *The effect of some chosen variables on social control of secondary school students*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Jordan, Amman.
- Malikia, A. (2009). Parental socioeconomic status and attitude of towards cultism in Niger Delta University. *J Hum Ecol*, 26(1), 65-69.
- Mendler, A., N., & Curwin, R., L. (1983). *Taking charge in the classroom: A practical guide to effective discipline*. Reston, VA: Reston Publisher.

- Morgan, A. R. (1990). *Orders of aggression and motives: The segments of the Egyptian youth*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Ain Shams University, Cairo.
- Owaitat, 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.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Peter, A. R. (1988). *Adolescent aggression from a medical point*. Unpublished master's thesis, Graduate Institute of Childhood Ain Shams University, Cairo.
- Saleh, H. J. (1997). *Institutions of socialization, the problem of aggressive behavior among young people*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ain Shams, Cairo
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1994). Urban poverty and the family context of delinquency: A new look at structure and process in a classic study. *Child Development*, 65, 523-540. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1131400>
- Sharaz, M. (2006). Major family factors affecting the level of school achievement. *Journal Human and Social Science of the University Am-Algra*, 18(2), 85-144.
- Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. (1987). The family-school relation and the child's school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1348-1357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130626>
- 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>
- Suhaimi, A. (1998). *The study of aggressive behavior among students and secondary school students in the light of some psychological and social variables within the family*. Unpublished master thesis, Graduate Institute of Childhood Ain Shams University, Cairo.
- Toby, J. (1998). Getting serious about school discipline school report. Retrieved July 22, 2010, from http://mss3.libraries.rutgers.edu/dlr/TMP/rutgers-lib_21288-PDF-1.pdf
- Todras, P. (2007). *Teachers' perspectives of disruptive behaviors in the classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- White, J. L. (1989). *The troubled adolescence*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Xu, J. (2002). *A longitudinal study of the effects of the parental involvement on adolescent deviant behaviour*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Brigham: USA.