

Palliate Destructive Attitude: Investigation on Pedagogical Strategies

Jane Irene PJ Antony*, Surindar Kaur Gurmukh Singh, A. Avene Atputharaj, Sonisha Johanthan

Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman,

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.102100149>

Received: 03 September 2026; Accepted: 08 September 2026; Published: 02 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Destructive attitudes have been a major concern that needs to be addressed by educators to ensure a smooth journey in a well-behaved classroom. A lesson will be less productive if the primary problem is unresolved. The focus of this study is to analyse students' perceptions of an unruly classroom, lesson productivity, strategies to subjugate destructive attitudes, and the key factors behind such actions. This was a qualitative study that employed semi-structured interviews. The participants were recruited based on non-probability sampling, where students had some extent of disruption in a classroom setting. Thirty students were recruited for this study within a classroom, in which fifteen students exhibited destructive attitudes, and fifteen students were affected by destructive attitudes. The results of this study showed that the destructive students were able to identify the types of misbehavior of themselves in class according to the actions that were taken against them. In contrast, the students who were involved were able to be watchful and focus on the everyday destruction that interrupted their learning process and abstain from doing their best for their education in the classroom. This study gives valuable insights into students' academic performance and a long-lasting journey for future opportunities. It highlights the challenges faced in the classroom due to their misbehavior and suggests ways to stay on track and progress academically.

Keywords: classroom, destructive attitude, observation, semi-structured interview, students' perceptions

INTRODUCTION

Destructive classroom attitudes contain a significant number of restrictions for pedagogues, as it hinders the delivery of guidelines, compromise students' acquisition, adding on students' overall academic ambiance. Students' attitude plays a prominent part in the education organisation as it determines whether students actually obtain the syllabus according to the terms of how it could be imparted by the educator and controls measures on how students change their attitudes to education. Thinley & Samten (2022) have stated that this problem reflects a continuous concern that pedagogues ought to address daily. Destructive classroom attitudes are important in the aspects of educational context, as it probably interferes with students and educators.

Destructive attitudes or students' misconduct are also perceived as disarraying students' attitudes that interfere with the learning process as the educator is teaching the class, as stated by Odegard and Sollberg (2024). Students' misbehavior greatly restricts both the teaching and learning ambience meanwhile stimulating students' social and academic advancement. It is vital to comprehend the effect of students' contextual features on the formation of teaching, related to abilities and norms, in order to sustain educators' confidence and professionalism. According to Granger et al., 2025, entailing an in depth understanding of the issue is able to furnish important insights towards enriching readiness and interventions directed at nurturing educators' relevant approaches in classroom management, particularly a powerful self-efficacy that is linked to decreasing educator-student disputes in provocative classroom contexts.

According to a recent study by Aslam and Farooq (2024), destructive attitudes by secondary school students are a main concern for educators; nonetheless, continuous effort on managing and minimise such misbehaviour. Following that, studies have shown that educators have applied varied approaches to classroom

management and attitude alteration strategies; nevertheless, the effectiveness may vary according to the reaction and the severity of students' attitudes. Ekundayo & Alade (2025) found that affirmative responses, guidance, and proactive classroom-management strategies have defined appropriate students' attitudes, whereas inadequate reactions to negative attitudes may reflect further destruction. Ergo, educators should be vigilant in assessing the severity and trends of students' misbehavior and propose suitable interventions at an early stage to hinder negative attitudes from spreading and propagating to other students. Hence, integrating students' opinions on assessments of students' misbehavior in the classroom may assist educators in comprehending the underlying circumstances and experiences connected to destructive attitudes.

Despite that, Chakkambath et al. (2024) conducted research on the perception of educators, which stated that destructions on classroom behaviour may exert a notable influence on students' academic achievement; nevertheless, inadequate investigation has been conducted into students' opinions. In order to carry out fruitful strategies to mitigate students' misconduct, a rigorous assessment of students' perceptions could be integrated; hence, educators are able to surface suitable approaches to oversee students' misbehaviour.

In the aspect of education, destructive attitudes in the classroom, contrary to students' academic experiences, probably influence their willingness and ability to further pursue their education. Additional time may be required for the educators to handle and oversee misbehavior, and this was supported by Franklin (2024), by stating that destructive attitudes from students will divert educators' attention and efforts from the elemental instructional responsibilities. Thus, the time needed for teaching and learning declines and could negatively impact those students who eagerly and desperately want to focus on the lessons.

Lacking pedagogical approaches to reducing the problems is essential to know the thoughts of students who are being influenced by their peers in order to ease and address actual scenarios in institutions that are dealing with education (Caldarella et al., 2020).

This study is initiated by three aims. Firstly, analysing students' opinions and experiences associated with destructive attitudes in the classroom and their effect on learning ambience. Secondly, the study attempts to investigate classroom management approaches that can be implemented to decrease and handle destructive classroom attitudes. Thirdly, it seeks to examine the causes of students' destructive behaviour in the classroom. In line with these, three research questions have been articulated in the guide for this study. The first research question examines students' opinions and experiences associated with destructive attitudes in the classroom and their effect on learning ambience. The second explores classroom management approaches that can be implemented to decrease and handle destructive classroom attitudes. Finally, the third investigates the causes of students' destructive behaviour in the classroom. These three research questions have been articulated as a guide for this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Factors Influencing Destructive Classroom Behaviour

Destructive classroom behaviour is not a simple issue of misbehaviour, but is caused by several inter-related factors. Children's destructive attitude can result from internal and external factors. Internal influences can be genetic and traumatic, while external influences can be influenced by home, society, and education. Both are important, according to Endang et al. (2023), as they affect and reflect students' behavioural patterns, which is pivotal in responding to students' destructive behaviours.

Student Boredom and Learning Disengagement

Boredom is one of the factors that lead to destructive classroom behaviour as identified by Endang et al. (2023). A destructive student might be less motivated or disengaged in a particular lesson or activity and feels that he might otherwise be better occupied with something else. This can result in missing classes, not participating in discussions, not cooperating with classmates, and failing to do assigned work. While boredom does not necessarily lead to destruction, the student's disengagement is still a concern as it can impact his

academic performance and educational development (Shi et al., 2026). Not being engaged in learning can lead to students' inability to identify their potential and competence, leading to increased risks of school absenteeism, a decline in academic performance, social issues, and eventually dropping out.

In Rahat and Reba (2023), a person-centred approach is introduced where the students are clients and responsible for their behaviour. This means that educators have to be understanding, empathetic, and sensitive towards the reasons behind students' misbehavior, so that they can assess suitable strategies to support and manage students' individual needs.

Positive Reinforcement and Behaviour Modification

Behaviour learning theory focusing on positive reinforcement was explored by Salcedo and Paglinawan (2025) as a strategy in addressing destructive classroom attitudes. Desired student behaviour was found to be encouraged by constructive feedback, praise, and effective classroom management. This feedback also fostered self-regulated learning and decreased student misconduct, a finding that suggests that Skinner-based interventions (Skinner, 1984) can be helpful in addressing problematic attitudes.

Classroom Management, Rules, and Behavioural Expectations

Finally, it is crucial to have a well-rounded system of classroom management set in place before students begin to learn. Setting clear behavioural expectations, procedures, and learning protocols supports students in understanding the boundaries of the classroom and educator expectations (Ijaz et al., 2024). Rules and boundaries are also related to moral aspects (Ødegård et al., 2025) and healthy educator-student relationships. These boundaries can foster respect by informing students of educator expectations and establishing a positive classroom. Overall, the literature highlights destructive attitude as multidimensional and addresses it in terms of understanding students' needs, minimising disengagement, positive reinforcement, and consistency of classroom management in various learning situations and relationships.

METHODOLOGY

This section describes the methodology adopted to investigate students' perspectives on the destructive classroom attitude and the pedagogical approaches associated with managing such behaviour. The methodology comprises the research design, participants, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design. This approach was considered appropriate because the purpose of the study was to obtain detailed accounts of students' experiences and interpretations rather than to measure attitude numerically. Qualitative research is particularly suitable when researchers seek to comprehend how participants interpret and describe experiences within their social and educational contexts. The primary data collection method was the utilisation of semi-structured interview questions, as this method provided a structured set of questions while allowing the researchers to ask follow-up questions and explore issues raised by the participants during the interviews. Recent methodological research in educational settings highlights the value of semi-structured interviews for obtaining detailed and contextually grounded information while maintaining sufficient consistency across participants (Ibarra-Sáiz et al., 2023). Similarly, semi-structured interviews can provide participants with the opportunity to elaborate on their experiences rather than restricting themselves to predetermined categories (Oliveira et al., 2023). Judgemental sampling was employed to choose the research participants. Judgemental sampling is appropriate in qualitative research when participants are intentionally selected based on the researcher's judgement and their relevant characteristics or experiences related to the phenomenon being investigated (Hazarika & Dagar, 2024). In the present study, participants were selected based on their observed involvement in destructive classroom attitudes or their experience of being affected by such an attitude. Prior classroom observation was conducted to assist in identifying students who exhibited destructive classroom attitudes and students who were affected

by the attitudes of their peers. The observations therefore served as the basis for participant selection. Following the identification process, semi-structured interviews were conducted using questions adapted from Debreli and Ishanova (2019).

Participants

The participants of this study were students from two classrooms from a secondary school in Malaysia, as the researcher was teaching these two classes. A total of 30 sixteen-year-old students were selected to participate with fifteen of them representing the male population and the other fifteen representing the female population. After conducting classroom observation, the selected participants were divided into two groups, whereby the first group represented fifteen students identified as those who displayed destructive attitude in the classroom while the second group was acknowledged as those who were affected by the destructive classroom attitude of the former. By using two different groups to investigate students' destructive classroom attitude, the study was able to shed light on this issue through different perspectives of the students.

Judgemental sampling was used to select the participants based on their relevance to the research objectives. The criteria for inclusion were that participants should be 16 years old, since they were from the selected classroom, and were directly involved or affected by the phenomena being investigated. The willingness of the participants to participate in this research was also recorded as consent from them, and the school were gathered before they take part in the study.

The sample size of 30 participants was considered appropriate for obtaining detailed perspectives from the two groups investigated in the study. The equal distribution of participants between the two groups allowed the researchers to examine destructive classroom attitudes from both the perspective of students who displayed such attitudes and students who were affected by them. The purpose was not to achieve statistical generalisation but to obtain rich and detailed accounts of students' experiences and perceptions.

Classroom Observation Procedures

Two classroom observation sessions were conducted before the interviews. The classroom observations were carried out for approximately one hour each during normal classroom activities in the selected Malaysian secondary school. The purpose of the observations was to develop an understanding of the classroom context and to assist in identifying students whose behaviour or experiences were relevant to the research objectives.

During the observations, attention was given to students' classroom behaviours, interactions with peers, participation in classroom activities, and responses to educators and classmates. Relevant observations were recorded to assist the researchers in identifying students who exhibited destructive classroom attitudes and students who were affected by such attitudes.

Permission to conduct the classroom observations was obtained from the school before the observation sessions commenced. The observations were conducted without intentionally disrupting the normal teaching and learning process. The observations were used as an initial basis for participant selection rather than a sole basis for determining students' attitudes. The subsequent interviews allowed the selected students to explain their own experiences and perspectives.

Data Collection Procedures

Semi-structured interview questions were used to gather individual data from the participants. Before collecting the data, the participants were notified of the purpose of the study, the nature of their voluntary involvement, and their identity and response discretion. The interview instrument was adapted from Debreli and Ishanova (2019), which had two sets of questions. The first set was intended to be answered by students who were affected by the destructive classroom attitude of their classmates (Appendix 1), whereas the second set was intended to be answered by those who exhibited destructive attitudes in the classroom (Appendix 2). Utilisation of two different sets of interview questions enabled the researchers to explore the diverse experiences and viewpoints of participants who were from two different groups.

Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with all 30 participants. The interviews were conducted in an English classroom in the selected Malaysian secondary school. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. The semi-structured format allowed the researchers to maintain consistency in the main areas explored while providing flexibility to ask follow-up and probing questions when participants provided responses that required further clarification or elaboration.

With appropriate consent, the interview sessions were audio recorded and later transcribed for analysis. The use of audio recording helped the researchers in accurately recording the participants' responses and minimised the possibility of omitting important information during the data collection process. Once this was completed, the transcribed content was eventually reviewed and prepared for thematic analysis.

Data Saturation and Sample Size

During the data collection process, data saturation was observed throughout. The answers acquired from the participants were examined by the researchers to identify whether any extra interviews continue to generate new information applicable to the interview questions. Repeating ideas, experiences and patterns began to develop across the participants' answers as the interviews progressed.

By approximately the 30th participant, the researchers observed substantial repetition in the information provided, with no substantially new issues emerging that were directly relevant to the central research questions. Therefore, data saturation was considered to have been reached at approximately 30 participants. The final sample of 30 participants was consequently considered sufficient to provide rich and varied perspectives from both participant groups.

Data Analysis Procedures

Thematic analysis was used to analyse the interview data collected. This is because this analysis helps in distinguishing and interpreting patterns within the qualitative datasets to bring meaning to the information collected. Braun and Clark (2023) and Byrne (2022) stated that the researchers should work towards establishing how the process of coding and theme development is interconnected with the research questions and the assumptions underlying the chosen analytical approach. The interview data were then methodically assessed to identify repeated ideas, patterns, and meanings related to destructive attitude in the classroom and students' perspectives on pedagogical approaches. Familiarisation with the interview data was the first step of the analysis, followed by identification and coding of relevant parts of students' responses.

The four researchers repeatedly read the interview transcripts to develop an overall understanding of the datasets and to identify significant responses relevant to the research questions. Initial codes were assigned to meaningful statements or sections of the transcripts. For example, a participant's description of being unable to concentrate because of the destructive attitude of their classmates was assigned the initial code "difficulty concentrating." Statements concerning interruptions during lessons were coded as "destructive attitude in the classroom," while descriptions of frustration or discomfort were coded as "emotional discomfort." Besides that, the answers about educators instituting clear rules and regulations in the classroom were coded as "clear classroom expectations," whereas the answers mentioning educators providing individual guidance were coded as "individual educator support."

As for the next step, the preliminary codes were linked and grouped based on the parallels in meaning. Codes that were related to one another were organised into extensive relevant categories. For example, the following codes "difficulty concentrating" and "destructive attitude in the classroom" were clustered together under the category "disruption to the learning environment". Similarly, the following codes "emotional discomfort", "frustration", and "feeling distracted" were clustered together under the category "emotional effects."

Next, the relationship between the categories were examined by the researchers and broader patterns within the datasets were detected. To develop potential themes, categories that displayed conceptual relationships were clustered together. For example, categories concerning disruption to the learning environment and

emotional effects could contribute to a broader theme concerning the impact of destructive classroom attitudes on students' learning experiences. Similarly, categories relating to clear classroom expectations and individual educator support could contribute to a theme concerning pedagogical approaches to managing destructive classroom attitudes.

The next step involves assessing related codes and grouping them together to identify extensive patterns within the datasets. Themes that surfaced from the interview data were then subsequently reviewed and refined to ensure that they represented meaningful patterns related to the research objectives and research questions.

The potential themes were subsequently reviewed and refined by the four researchers. The research team discussed the codes, categories, and emerging themes and compared their interpretations of the interview data. Where differences in interpretation occurred, the researchers discussed the relevant transcript sections until an agreed interpretation was reached. The themes were then reviewed against the interview transcripts to ensure that they represented meaningful and coherent patterns within the datasets and remained relevant to the research objectives and research questions.

The progression from the raw interview data to initial coding, categorising, and thematising was maintained throughout the analysis process. Significant quotations from the participants were also retained to provide empirical evidence for the analyses presented in the findings. Collaborative and systematic approaches that were implemented throughout the data collection and analysis have reinforced the reliability of the thematic analysis as this ensured that the findings were grounded in the participants' answers. Most importantly, to maintain the confidentiality of the participants, the participant codes, which were DS-1 to DS-15 and AS-1 to AS-15, were retained throughout the data analysis and reporting process.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical considerations were given utmost attention as the participants were sixteen-year-old school students. Before the observations were carried out, authorisation to conduct the classroom observations were obtained from the selected school's authorities. Once this was completed, participants were then notified about the objectives and the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and how their answers would be utilised for the research purposes. Following this, a consent form was signed by the participants prior to their participation, and they were then notified that their information and answers provided during the interview would be treated with utmost confidentiality.

To maintain the anonymity of their participation, their names were not utilised throughout the data collection, analysis and reporting process. Instead, they were all assigned a code whereby students who were identified as those who displayed destructive classroom attitudes were assigned DS-1 to DS-15 codes, while the students who were affected by the destructive attitudes of their peers were coded as AS-1 to AS-15.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are discussed from the perspective of the students who exhibited the destructive attitude (DS-1 to DS-15) and the students who were affected by it (AS-1 to AS-15), and their responses were categorised into common themes.

Students Who Exhibited Destructive Attitudes

Understanding of Destructive Attitude (via Educator's Authority)

Behavioral recognition for students rarely emerges from their internal self-reflection. Instead, external disciplinary measures drive student awareness regarding their own classroom misconduct. Educators dictate these boundaries. For instance, DS-1 shared, "Ya... educator always say I disturb friends in class." Student perspectives around misbehavior, hence, rely heavily upon outside reprimands rather than their internal

introspective realizations, providing direct empirical evidence addressing RQ1's focus on authority-mediated awareness.

Understanding of Destructive Attitude (Examples of Destructions)

Students hold concrete, pragmatic taxonomies of room disruption where they identify specific off-task actions such as continuous chatter, physical scuffles, sleeping, and unauthorized mobile phone use during instructional hours instantly. Straightforward accounts define their self-perceived conduct, where DS-4 admitted, "Playing handphone, sleeping in class, disturb educator lah." The students' observational clarity marks their responses. Everyday tangible acts indicate the primary lens through which students conceptualize classroom misconduct, aligning directly with RQ1.

Difficulty in Academics and Language Barrier

Academic struggles and language barriers form a major trigger in disruption. In Chinese-medium school environments, instruction delivered in English frequently overwhelms learners who are lacking baseline fluency, compelling reliance on Mandarin translations that ultimately fail during fast-paced lessons where frustration builds quickly, and disengagement follows. DS-6 stated, "My English no good, so I just talking to friend." Inability to follow instructional sequences routinely converts confusion into active peer distraction, an explicit answer to RQ3 regarding the operational root triggers of classroom disruption.

Negative Peer Influence

Classroom dynamics destabilize focus while peer behavior normalizes chaos. Personal restraint dissipates rapidly when students witness their peers acting out. RQ3 explicitly seeks these mechanics where misbehavior functions as reciprocal social exchange. DS-9 explained, "My friend disturb me, so I disturb them back lah..." The back-and-forth reaction within the classroom with mirroring peer habits creates a collective loop of instructional interference that educators struggle to interrupt.

Physical and Mental Well-being

Somatic fatigue drives behavioral deterioration. Depleted energy reserves destroy attentional capacity, forcing restless, erratic actions as students attempt to stay awake. Biological strain directly underpins RQ3's focus on disruption sources. Concentration lapses quickly under bodily strain. DS-5 shared, "Sometimes, I feel so sleepy, cannot focus, so I just play around..." Hence, it suggests that physical vitality must be maintained because without sufficient sleep, cognitive disengagement occurs, rendering subsequent behavioral breakdown that is completely inevitable.

Academic Impact

Destructive students understand that their own learning trajectories suffer directly from classroom misbehavior. The wasted instructional minutes, incomplete tasks, and eroded comprehension register clearly in their self-assessments, substantiating RQ1. The academic losses correlate with behavioral breaks. DS-8 observed, "I cannot focus in class, because I don't understand what happening in the class..." This reflection connects behavioral misconduct directly to poor academic performance, showing that unaddressed disturbances undermine long-term scholastic progress.

Emotional Response

Negative emotional states such as boredom, acute frustration, and total indifference spark persistent behavioral issues where the motivation evaporates. This dynamic connects directly to RQ1 regarding live student experience while signaling RQ2's demand for strategic management interventions. Indifference feeds the cycle's continuation, as DS-15 remarks: "The class so boring so I also don't care already." The emotional withdrawal fuels physical disruption, necessitating structured educator interventions to reignite baseline engagement.

Disciplinary Action

Disciplinary actions such as formal reprimands, loss of privileges, demerit tracking, and parental escalation represent standard institutional responses, connecting directly to RQ1 and RQ2. Standard discipline yields minimal lasting transformation. DS-10 noted, "Ya, educator got call my mother before, because I make noisy in class." These prove that institutional sanctions regularly fail to resolve foundational causes, providing empirical context for evaluating current behavioral intervention tactics.

Students Who Were Affected by Destructive Attitudes

Daily Destructive Attitudes

Attentive peers face constant operational hurdles. Continuous chatter, phone usage, roaming, and laughing create chronic friction while restricting academic progress. RQ1 addresses this lived friction. Students' focus suffers under ambient noise. AS-1 explained, "Like to disturb people, talking all the time, making noise in the class when educator teaching..." Similarly, AS-2 added, "I got see my friend always bring handphone and use in class, then they sometime talk and laughing very loud." These statements indicate how everyday distractions permeate the classroom setting.

Severe Destructive Attitudes

Extreme incidents such as broken desks, verbal assaults directed at educators, and physical fights breach physical safety and inflict lasting psychological stress upon innocent bystanders, addressing RQ1's focus on disruption intensity. Destructive and violent outbursts compromise the entire classroom. AS-5 recalled, "One time, I saw a boy throw a table... it hit someone." Meanwhile, AS-6 shared, "One time my friend fight inside the class with educator... He shout at the educator." Such violent or aggressive events cause chronic anxiety among attentive students.

Causes of Misbehavior

It is found that observant peers accurately diagnose the social dynamics driving their classmates' misbehavior. Attention-seeking, boredom, authority defiance, and personal distress emerge as prime drivers, providing explicit qualitative evidence for RQ3. Social motives then prompt deliberate disruptions. AS-8 noted, "They just want attention, you know, make friends laugh." AS-2 added, "Got the group of boys always shout bad words to the educator." Students recognize that disruptions stem from deliberate interpersonal calculations rather than random impulse.

Academic and Emotional Impact

Disrupted educator instruction forces attentive students to process material independently outside school hours, placing a heavy emotional tax on them. RQ1 and RQ2 intersect here. AS-9 noted, "I cannot hear educator talk what... later I also cannot do my homework." Expressing fear and anxiety, AS-12 shared, "I feel scared, and I cannot concentrate... educator stop teaching to stop them." AS-13 added, "It makes me lose focus... I get lost in the topic... I have to put in extra effort." The accounts detail the heavy emotional and academic burden placed on nondestructive students when listening becomes difficult.

Impact on Classroom Environment

Learning spaces collapse into noise. Collective instruction stalls while educators manage individual outbursts, encouraging academic dishonesty like homework copying to compensate for lost instructional time. RQ1 and RQ2 highlight this system-wide erosion as chaotic environments block memory formation. AS-5 observed, "Sometimes the whole class turns noisy... nothing can remember from what educator teaching." Highlighting widespread academic dishonesty, AS-15 remarked, "Many of them just copy my homework, no real effort." Collective punishments demotivate attentive students who feel that they have been unfairly penalized for their peers' destructive actions.

DISCUSSION

Franklin (2024) offered only a brief look into how destructive student behaviors impact academic performance. Root causes must be isolated to help educators grasp underlying mechanics. Destructive conduct does more than strain work-life balance for educators; it directly impairs the learning experience of non-disruptive peers, preventing them from focusing on schoolwork (Forsberg et al., 2021). Tense environments ruin concentration. Disengagement follows, wherein students actively withdraw from academic tasks and experience genuine emotional distress during class, rather than just showing passive disinterest (Steenberghs et al., 2021). Unaddressed disinterest erodes motivation across peer networks.

Educators must protect attentive learners. Evidence-based intervention strategies reduce negative classroom dynamics (Parveen & Yousaf, 2022). Proactive prevention outpaces heavy-handed punishment, which frequently damages student-educator relationships. Inclusive spaces require active cultivation (Paul, 2025). This fosters mutual respect between educators and learners, satisfying a key psychological need for students who require a supportive authority figure who guides and reassures them throughout their academic journey.

Triggers include boredom, attention-seeking, personal distress, language barriers, and peer pressure. Qualitative thematic analysis revealed that disruptive students unknowingly disclosed the underlying reasons behind their misconduct during interviews. Unconscious motives drove their actions. Boredom predominated. Struggling students dismiss lessons as useless, choosing instead to amuse themselves by distracting classmates (Bektiningsih et al., 2023). Attention-deprived individuals derail instruction intentionally, seizing the room's spotlight.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this research highlight that students exhibiting destructive behavior largely recognize their misconduct through disciplinary actions enforced by authority figures, whereas non-destructive peers closely observe these daily destructions, noting how continuous noise and off-task behavior consistently hinder their ability to concentrate and reach their full academic potential, thus affecting their learning.

Centering student voices enriches existing research. Dual perspectives on classroom disruption reveal severe environmental damages. Small sample sizes constrain broad generalisability, yet context regarding behavioral root triggers remains highly valuable.

Classroom misbehavior remains a persistent hurdle for both educators and students. However, by listening to student voices, making careful observational adjustments, and applying targeted, empathetic management strategies, educators can effectively reduce destruction and build a supportive, productive, and balanced learning environment for everyone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dasrena P. Shanmuganathan for helping out with the research, as well as the students who participated in this research.

Authors' Contribution

Jane P J Antony: Conceptualisation, methodology, writing, proofreading – original draft preparation

Surindar Kaur Gurmukh Singh: Data collection, data analysis, referencing – review and editing

A. Avene Atputharaj: Methodology writing and data procedures

Sonisha Johanthan: Literature review writing

REFERENCES

1. Aslam, S., & Farooq, P. M. S. (2024). Effect of behaviour modification strategies on secondary school students' classroom misbehaviour. *PJE*, 41(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.30971/pje.v41i1.2187>
2. Bektiningsih, F., Endang, P. Y., & Rahmawati, L. E. (2023). Factors causing disruptive behaviour of students in the classroom: A case study in elementary school. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning and Advanced Education (ICOLAE 2022)*, Indonesia, 369–377. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-086-2_31
3. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-086-2_31
4. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Is thematic analysis used well in health psychology? A critical review of published research, with recommendations for quality practice and reporting. *Health Psychology Review*, 17(4), 695–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2022.2161594>
5. Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56, 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
6. Caldarella, P., Larsen, R. A. A., Williams, L., Downs, K. R., Wills, H. P., & Wehby, J. H. (2020). Effects of teachers' praise-to-reprimand ratios on elementary students' on-task behaviour. *Educational Psychology*, 40(10), 1306–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1711872>
7. Chakkambath, R. S., Ananthu, K. S., & Maliakkal, E. T. (2024). Student incivility in classrooms: An insight from the student's point of view with focus on Kerala. *Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmacıları Dergisi*, 7(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.52134/ueader.1472101>
8. Debreli, E., & Ishanova, I. (2019). Foreign language classroom management: Types of student misbehaviour and strategies adapted by the teachers in handling disruptive behaviour. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), Article 1648629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1648629>
9. Ekundayo, D. A., & Alade, M. M. (2025). Predictive analysis of the influence of teachers' proactive classroom management strategies on students' disruptive behaviours. *Jurnal Bidang Pendidikan Dasar*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.21067/jbpd.v9i1.10491>
10. Endang, B., Prastiwi, Y., & Laili, R. (2023). Factors causing disruptive behaviour of students in the classroom: a case study in elementary school. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning and Advanced Education (ICOLAE 2022)*, Indonesia, 369–377. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-086-2_31
11. Forsberg, C., Chiriac, E. H., & Thornberg, R. (2021). Exploring pupils' perspectives on school climate. *Educational Research*, 63, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2021.1956988>
12. Franklin, A. R. (2024). Impact of disruptive behaviour on academic performance. [Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University].
13. Granger, K. L., Chow, J. C., Montesion, A., Stouffer, J. M., Sutherland, K. S., & Conroy, M. A. (2025). Teacher's classroom management self-efficacy and teacher–child conflict as a function of child ordinal behaviour ranking. *School Mental Health*, 17(1), 90–105. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-025-09741-6>
14. Hazarika, N., & Dagar, K. (2024). Educational technology to promote social entrepreneurship education in the COVID pandemic era. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 13(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23939575231210182>
15. Ibarra-Sáiz, M. S., González-Elorza, A., & Rodríguez-Gómez, G. (2023). Aportaciones metodológicas para el uso de la entrevista semiestructurada en la investigación educativa a partir de un estudio de caso múltiple. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 41(2), 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.6018/RIE.546401>
16. Ijaz, S., Nobles, J., Mamluk, L., Dawson, S., Curran, B., Pryor, R., Redwood, S., & Savović, J. (2024). Disciplinary behaviour management strategies in schools and their impact on student psychosocial outcomes: A systematic review. *NIHR Open Research*, 4, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.3310/nihropenres.13455.2>
17. <https://doi.org/10.3310/nihropenres.13455.2>
18. Ødegård, M., & Solberg, S. (2024). Identifying teachers' reactive strategies towards disruptive behaviour in classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 145, Article 104627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104627>
19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104627>
20. Ødegård, M., Valtteri Pesonen, H., & Solberg, S. (2025). Identifying strategies teachers apply to establish positive relationships with students. *Human Arenas*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-025-00514-w>
21. Oliveira, S. de, Guimarães, O. M., & Ferreira, J. de L. (2023). As entrevistas semiestruturadas na pesquisa qualitativa em educação. *Revista Linhas*, 24(55), 210–236.

22. <https://doi.org/10.5965/1984723824552023210>
23. Parveen, Q., & Yousaf, I. (2022). Strategies used by the teachers to reduce students' disruptive behavior in classroom. *Global Educational Studies Review*, 7(2), 555–562.
24. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022\(VII-II\).52](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022(VII-II).52)
25. Paul, R. B. (2025). *Classroom management: Creating a successful K-12 learning community* (8th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
26. Rahat, S., & Reba, A. (2023). Strategies of teachers for dealing with student misbehaviour in classroom, *SchoRes Journal of Education Research*, 1(1), 17–26.
27. Salcedo, J., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2025). The relationship of classroom environment and engagement of alternative learning system students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(5), 2880–2884. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000224>
28. Shi, Y., Hui, X., Li, G., Ouyang, M., & Yang, C. (2026). Boredom proneness and Chinese vocational college students academic disengagement: mediating role of academic self-efficacy and moderating role of self-control. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1687667.
29. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1687667>
30. Skinner, B. F. (1984). Methods and theories in the experimental analysis of behavior. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 7(4), 511–523. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00026996>
31. Steenberghs, N., Lavrijsen, J., Soenens, B., & Verschueren, K. (2021). Peer effects on engagement and disengagement: Differential contributions from friends, popular peers, and the entire class. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 726815. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.726815>
32. Thinley, W., & Samten, N. (2022). Classroom to reduce student disruptive behaviour: An action research. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 46(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v46n1-16>