

Classroom Teacher Strategies for Addressing Disruptive Behavior in an Islamic Elementary School

Thomas Wira Jaya*

Universitas Islam Negeri Jurai Siwo Lampung
Jalan Ki Hajar Dewantara No.15A, Iringmulyo, Lampung
thomaswirajaya1@gmail.com

Firma Andrian

Universitas Islam Negeri Jurai Siwo Lampung
Jalan Ki Hajar Dewantara No.15A, Iringmulyo, Lampung
firmaandrian@metrouniv.ac.id

Received: 06/02/2026

Accepted : 28/06/2026

Revised : 28/06/2026

Publication : 29/06/2026

**Corresponding Author*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32332/elementary/v.12.i1.13023>

Abstract

Disruptive behavior during lessons not only disrupts the learning atmosphere but also hinders student development. This study aims to examine the strategies employed by the class teacher to address student disruptive behavior and to identify the underlying factors—considering gender differences—among third-grade students (Class III D) at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Negeri (MIN) 2 Metro. A descriptive qualitative approach was used, involving ten informants. Data were collected through interviews, observation, and documentation, while data validity was verified via triangulation of techniques, sources, and time. All data were analyzed through the stages of reduction, presentation, and conclusion drawing. The results indicate that the teacher employs preventive strategies—such as establishing classroom rules—to preemptively curb disruptive behavior, as well as reactive strategies—including reprimands, seat reassignments, physical and verbal punishments, and adjustments to teaching methods—when such behavior occurs.

Student disruptive behavior is influenced by internal factors (e.g., hyperactivity, susceptibility to being easily bored, a need for attention, curiosity, and academic difficulties) and external factors (e.g., classroom dynamics and peer influence). Furthermore, male students exhibit higher levels of disruptive behavior across all categories compared to female students. The study concludes that the management of disruptive behavior among Class III D students at MIN 2 Metro remains reactive and focused on situational control.

Keywords: Teacher Strategy; Disruptive Behavior; Madrasah Students.

A. Introduction

Primary education is a fundamental component of the educational system, playing a crucial role in shaping children's futures, morals, and character (Lessy et al., 2024). In the diverse context of Indonesia, the presence of basic education institutions such as Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Negeri (MIN) provides its own position in basic education. MIN not only focuses on mastering materials, but is also responsible for instilling reformative and transformative new knowledge to build an advanced and quality nation. The atmosphere of the madrasah filled with discipline, honesty, and compassion is expected to produce good character so that it can encourage the improvement of the quality of learning (Sari & Putro, 2021).

Learning activities in elementary schools, especially in madrasah ibtidaiyah, should take place holistically by prioritizing a child-friendly, fun, and communicative approach (Pane & Dasopang, 2017). Learning activities are basically a process. The process of organizing and organizing the environment around students so that it can grow and encourage students to learn actively (Pane & Dasopang, 2017). This is where the role of teachers as facilitators, facilitators, and managers of classroom dynamics is needed, because in practice, the success of learning is greatly influenced by how teachers create and maintain a positive classroom climate and support the teaching and learning process.

A conducive classroom atmosphere is the main requirement for learning to take place effectively. An orderly, calm and attentive learning environment allows students to absorb the material better and the teacher can deliver lessons optimally. On the other hand, a rowdy, uncontrollable, or distracted atmosphere will hinder students' concentration and make it difficult for teachers to manage the classroom. This means that the learning process will take place efficiently and effectively if a student learns cooperatively with teachers and other students in a supportive atmosphere and environment

(Degeng et al., 2016). However, in daily reality, building a conducive learning atmosphere is not an easy matter, especially for low-grade teachers such as grade III, in which there are students with different characters and needs. There are still many obstacles that arise in the classroom itself, one of which is student behavior that does not support learning, or what is known as disruptive behavior.

In the context of learning, disruptive behavior is defined as student conduct within the classroom that does not support the learning process (Khotimah, 2024). Such behavior generally hinders teaching and learning. According to Morin & Battalio in Maddeh (2015) explained that disruptive behavior is a difficulty that distracts students from what they are supposed to learn in class, this behavior damages the relationship between teacher and student and has a bad impact on the learning process in school. Disruptive behavior can also lead to decline, which in some cases can have a significant impact on students' opportunities to learn, and can even create other directions or focuses that are contrary to learning goals (Maddeh et al., 2015).

Forms of disruptive behavior during learning can vary, as revealed by Hakim & Mustafa (2023) ranging from hyperactive disorders such as talking to other students when the teacher is explaining, making noises, and walking around without permission from the teacher, to committing aggressive actions in the form of threats or abusive behavior. These forms of behavior seem real and can be observed directly in students in grade III D MIN 2 Metro who are on average eight to nine years old. At this age, the child is in an important stage of social and emotional development. They enjoy being around their friends and begin to understand social rules, but still have a tendency to explore and express themselves freely. Children of this age also tend to have short *attention spans*, are easily bored with monotonous activities, and like to move, play, and climb (Wulandari et al., 2023). Social interaction is very interesting for them, so they prefer to talk or play with friends instead of focusing on listening to the teacher.

Based on the results of initial observations in MIN 2 Metro, especially in class III D, it was found that there were a number of disruptive behaviors that interfered with the course of learning. Students look unfocused when the teacher explains, often students talk to their classmates, and some other students seem to leave the bench and walk around without permission from the teacher. Handling actions have been taken by the teacher, such as reprimanding students who speak when the teacher explains, moving seats, and patting students on the shoulders as a warning to refocus on the learning

process. However, these actions are only able to make students focus for a few minutes, because after that disruptive behavior reappears.

When interviews were conducted with class teachers, information was obtained that all of these behaviors occur almost every day with a fairly high frequency. The teacher also stated that male students tend to be very physically active, verbally, and difficult to be quiet, and some other students have a tendency to seek the attention of friends or teachers, while female students show more passive verbal disruptive behaviors such as chatting with their classmates at a low volume, and daydreaming.

Disruptive behavior that continues to occur in class III D certainly has a negative impact on the quality of learning. The process of delivering material is not optimal because the teacher always reprimands and intervenes with students who are disruptive. The learning time is reduced so that the teacher's teaching burden increases and it is not uncommon for teachers to have to deliver material in a hurry. In addition, other students were also affected by this disruptive behavior. Those who should be able to study calmly and be able to digest and understand the material presented, actually lose focus and concentration due to students behaving disruptively. In the long run, this condition can reduce students' motivation to learn, create stress for teachers, and create an imbalance in classroom management. If left unchecked, disruptive behavior can develop into more serious negative behaviors.

A number of previous studies have provided a point of view as well as a starting foothold for researchers, including, Niwaz (2021) explained that disruptive behavior will cause many problems in schools, so teachers need to learn the reasons behind their disruptive behavior because it will help understand the causes and design the right strategy. Ødegård & Solberg (2024) say that different types of disruptive behavior will certainly require different strategies. So teachers need a high level of reasoning and flexibility to utilize various techniques and strategies in overcoming these behaviors. Nazla & Hasibuan (2023) also reinforce this phenomenon by explaining that disruptive behavior cannot be underestimated. In addition, increasing teachers' understanding is needed to be more careful in identifying the symptoms of disruptive behavior and be able to apply various strategies before disruptive perpetrators affect classmates.

In dealing with disruptive behavior, teachers are required to overcome it with various strategies. Previous research has highlighted teacher strategies for managing disruptive behavior among upper-level and junior high school students; a study by Sari and Charlina (2024) explains that teachers require

parental involvement and community cooperation to effectively address delinquency and disruptive behavior during the learning process, given that junior high students are entering early adolescence. Similar issues arise in Vocational High Schools (SMK) where the student body is predominantly male. This is evident from research by Khasinah and Elviana (2022), which indicates that in schools dominated by male students in late adolescence, teachers need to implement rules at the start of the semester – while also offering guidance, instilling a sense of responsibility, and building trust – to mitigate disruptive behavior. Clearly, this underscores the need for a deeper understanding of strategies tailored to specific classroom conditions, student characteristics, and gender; such understanding enables teachers to select appropriate approaches for managing disruptive behavior – particularly among elementary school students – thereby allowing for early prevention.

In light of this phenomenon, the study aims to address a research gap by focusing on strategies for managing disruptive behavior among elementary school students at State Islamic Elementary Schools (MIN). The research seeks to describe the strategies employed by classroom teachers and to identify the underlying causes and gender-based differences, thereby providing a basis for implementing more appropriate and proportionate management strategies.

B. Research Methods

This research is qualitative with a descriptive nature. This is chosen and done so that the researcher can describe the phenomenon naturally and as it is, so that the results obtained have depth of meaning and describe the phenomenon comprehensively. This research was carried out at MIN 2 Metro which is located in Central Metro District, Metro City, Lampung Province, Indonesia. The selection of the research location is based on the existence of disruptive behavioral phenomena that appear in students during the learning process, so it is considered relevant to the focus of the study being studied. The sampling technique used is in the form of *purposive sampling*, which is a technique for determining informants based on certain considerations that are in accordance with research needs. Informants were chosen because they were considered to be able to provide in-depth information about students' disruptive behavior and the strategies used by teachers in handling it. The subjects in this study consisted of the main informant, namely a teacher of class III D who was directly responsible and recognized the characteristics of his students, while the supporting informant consisted of seven students of class III D who showed disruptive behavior based on the results of initial observation and the recommendations of the class teacher. The characteristics of students who are

selected as informants are students who carry out disruptive actions repeatedly. In addition, the researcher also involved additional informants, such as two outstanding students in grade III D who were used to coordinating and understanding classroom conditions to strengthen the research data.

The focus of this research is directed at classroom teachers' strategies in overcoming students' disruptive behavior during the learning process. Indicators of teacher strategy include preventive, repressive, and curative strategies, where these indicators refer to the theory described by JA Pearce cited by Fachriiswantoro & Lismawati (2023) in their research. Meanwhile, the indicator of disruptive behavior refers to the book Charles (2014), the author who first used and discussed the term disruptive behavior in scientific papers. Indicators of disruptive behavior include aggression, breaking rules, confrontation, and disinterest.

This research will be carried out in November 2025 with data collection techniques in the form of interviews, observations, and documentation. Interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner to all informants, both teachers and students to obtain information about the forms of disruptive behavior that emerged and the handling strategies given. Observation was carried out directly in the classroom with the non-participant technique as many as nine meetings with a duration of one hour to one and a half hours in one meeting. In the implementation of observation, the researcher uses an observation sheet that contains indicators of disruptive behavior of students and the form of handling carried out by teachers. The researcher recorded the frequency of disruptive behavior, the situation behind the behavior, the teacher's response to student behavior, and changes in student behavior after being handled by the teacher. Meanwhile, documentation is used to obtain supporting data in the form of student behavior reports, class attendance, class teachers' daily journals, classroom teacher teaching tools, as well as classroom rules as well as madrasah rules. Furthermore, the data validity technique in this study includes triangulation of techniques implemented through observation, interview, and documentation data that will later be compared. Time triangulation applied through the implementation of research for two weeks to obtain consistent data at different times and conditions, as well as source triangulation that is realized through data extraction from various sources, such as classroom teachers, students who carry out disruptive actions, and outstanding students, so that the data obtained has a stronger level of credibility. The data analysis technique in this study uses a conventional technique initiated by Miles and Huberman, namely an interactive data analysis technique that includes reduction, display,

and conclusion drawn.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Classroom teachers' strategies in overcoming disruptive behavior of grade III D MIN 2 Metro students

Understanding the teacher's strategy is necessary to ensure that learning takes place effectively. Therefore, strategy is a very important tool for teachers. Choosing the right strategy allows teachers to suppress disruptive behaviors and turn them into positive behaviors and prevent similar actions from happening in the future. In addition, the right strategy also creates an environment that supports the growth of students' cognitive and psychomotor aspects. After the researcher conducted interviews, observations, analyzed available documents, and related them to relevant theories and research, several types of teacher strategies were found, which include:

a. Preventive Strategies

1) Class Rules

Class rules are given to students through direct warnings, such as a ban on chatting, a ban on playing around, and a strict ban on students leaving the class if they are not ready to learn. These findings show that teachers understand the importance of establishing a set of disciplinary behaviors at the beginning of learning so that students have guidelines and behavioral boundaries as learning progresses. However, the observational findings show that teachers are not consistent in applying these preventive strategies at every meeting. It can be seen through the results of student interviews, which explain that students still violate the rules even though they have been set at the beginning of learning. This shows that the classroom rules are actually understood by the students, but their effectiveness decreases because they are not enforced consistently or continuously at the beginning of each learning. The teacher's inconsistency led to a lack of order; students perceived the situation as unfair because identical behaviors sometimes resulted in punishment and other times did not, causing them to become reluctant to comply with the rules.

These findings are in line with Nurdian's (2025) research which concluded that consistent enforcement of classroom rules by teachers can create a sense of justice, classroom order, strengthen

positive behavior, and encourage students to obey the rules. Furthermore, Nurdian said that this not only creates orderly classroom conditions but also increases student involvement during learning.

b. Repressive Strategies

1) Reprimanding Students

Giving reprimands to students shows that teachers are trying to enforce class order through verbal actions when disruptive behavior arises during the learning process. Based on findings in the field, teachers gave verbal reprimands combined with non-verbal reprimands when students engaged in behaviors such as talking to friends, leaving the bench without permission, seeking answers from other friends, and paying less attention to the teacher's explanations. The reprimand given ranged from the call of name, to the instruction to refocus accompanied by intense eye gazes. This practice shows that teachers not only play the role of delivering material, but also as classroom managers who actively maintain the stability of the learning process.

The application of repressive strategies in the form of reprimanding students is relevant to the concept of *teacher reprimands* as explained in the results of Caldarella's (2021) research which emphasizes that reprimands are carried out to stop inappropriate student behavior. But Caldarella also explained that reprimands can only change behavior temporarily and do not result in long-term behavioral changes. This is especially relevant to the condition of class III D, where students revert their behavior after a while before receiving a reprimand by the class teacher. According to Caldarella, teachers who focus on reprimanding students who behave disruptively will actually harass other students who are not involved. Thus, Caldarella suggests replacing reprimands with classroom management strategies such as setting *classroom expectations*, reinforcing students' positive behaviors, and using praise as a strategy against bad behavior and student apathy. This recommendation is based on the finding that teacher reprimands do not reduce disruptive behavior in the future nor do they increase student engagement in learning.

2) Moving Students' Sitting Positions

The strategy of moving the sitting position of students who behave disruptively can be understood as a form of control of the classroom environment carried out by teachers. This is done to regulate external stimuli so that the classroom atmosphere becomes more conducive. When teachers separate students from their peers who engage in disruptive behavior, this directly reduces the opportunity for students to interact intensely with their peers, thus inhibiting the potential for disruptive behavior. The findings are in line with Bicard (2012) who explains that arranging student seating is one of the easiest classroom management techniques available to teachers. Additionally, it can help minimize or even eliminate problematic behaviors without having to over-intervene such as punishing students.

3) Corporal punishment

Findings regarding the use of physical punishment by grade III D teachers showed that there was a pattern of repressive intervention when verbal strategies and seating arrangements were considered not effective enough to control disruptive behavior. Practices such as hitting gently with wood or rattan, pinching, knocking on the table loudly, and threats to expel students from the classroom show that teachers interpret classroom order as a condition that requires an immediate response, even with minor physical consequences. Although some students interpret this action as painless or just a form of joke, it does not take away from the fact that corporal punishment remains the strategy chosen by teachers because it is effective in addressing students' disruptive behavior.

This is in line with Wong's opinion in Sun (2015), explaining that punishment can indeed have a direct effect and inhibit disruptive behavior. However, punishment cannot reduce disruptive behavior in the long run. Punishment only briefly suppresses disruptive behavior but cannot eliminate it. On the other hand, Widyaningrum & Fauziah (2025) stated that punitive actions must be accompanied by *reinforcement* such as giving praise and rewards in order to strengthen positive behavior. Widyaningrum & Fauziah also proved that these two things have proven to be effective in shaping student disciplined behavior and can create an orderly and conducive learning atmosphere. It does not stop there, the

recommendations given by Widyaningrum & Fauziah are in line with Skinner's theory, namely *Operant Conditioning* which is the Grand theory in this study. In his theory, Skinner explains that punishment can weaken bad behavior, but *reinforcement* is also needed to encourage positive behavior (Peras et al., 2023).

4) Scolding Students

The results of the study showed that teachers used repressive strategies in the form of scolding students or raising their high pitch as a form of handling. This strategy is in line with Khairunnisa's (2025) research which explains that scolding students is a form of verbal punishment to students. The use of verbal punishment or scolding students serves to provide consequences for negative behavior and encourage students not to repeat it. However, Khairunnisa also explained that the use of verbal punishment must be with educational principles and not excessive. By providing appropriate punishment, students improve discipline and improve their behavior. However, inappropriate or excessive punishment can risk damaging the relationship between teacher and student and negatively impact the student's emotional development. Again, Khairunnisa also emphasized the balance between *reward and punishment*. Balanced, wise, and consistent use can help students increase their motivation to learn, discipline, and students' character will be better formed. Thus, disruptive behavior can be minimized and eliminated. This is consistent with Skinner's *operant conditioning* theory which explains that human behavior can be learned, changed, and survived because it is amplified. Bad behavior can be changed by giving punishment, while positive behavior can be strengthened by giving reinforcement such as praise, gifts, or awards (Peras et al., 2023).

5) Changing Teaching Methods

The main findings in the context of class III D show that the change in teaching methods from lectures to dictates is a form of situational repressive strategies used by teachers to reduce disruptive behaviors that increase during learning. This change in method was not carried out as a pedagogical variation, but rather as a direct response to the need to restore classroom order. Interviews with students such as SNA, ALS, and SBA show that the dictating method keeps all students focused on writing activities so

that excessive movements, conversations between students, and other disruptive activities are significantly reduced. The fact that teachers only apply this method when the class starts to be uncondusive shows that teachers are positioning it as a behavior control strategy, not as a learning method that is used regularly.

This is in line with Sun (2015's) research which explains that adapting teaching methods can reduce bad behavior in the classroom. Therefore, the change in teaching methods carried out by grade III D teachers can be understood as a form of repressive handling oriented towards class stability. When teachers move from the lecture method to the dictating method, the learning conditions become more structured and demand subtle motor involvement through writing activities. These activities naturally limit students' space to engage in impulsive behavior or social interactions that are not relevant to learning.

c. Curative Strategy

The main findings of the study showed that teachers of grade III D did not apply curative strategies as a follow-up in dealing with disruptive behavior in the classroom, even though teachers actually had experience in conducting coaching in the context of violations outside of learning. The absence of curative strategies in the classroom can be seen from the absence of individual coaching, counseling sessions, behavioral reflection, and follow-up efforts after students repeatedly commit violations during the learning process. The teacher acknowledged that face-to-face coaching had never been done, but he recognized the importance of such strategies to be implemented in the future. Meanwhile, interviews with students reinforced the finding that no follow-up action was given to students who repeat disruptive behavior in class. This condition gives an idea that the handling of student behavior takes place reactively and is limited in the classroom only in the form of reprimands or other repressive actions.

When compared to the results of previous research, the findings above show significant differences, such as in the study of Abidin (2023) which said that curative strategies are important steps taken as a form of improving the quality of education and achieving learning goals. Furthermore, research conducted by Amani (2025) also says the same thing. Curative strategies are carried out to foster perpetrators so

that they do not repeat their actions, and can form a positive mindset for perpetrators through character development that is carried out in a humanist manner.

2. Factors that cause students to engage in disruptive behavior

a. Internal factors

1) Hyperactive

The findings in grade III D MIN 2 Metro students show that hyperactive activity is an internal factor that triggers disruptive behavior. Hyperactive students, such as ZYN, AZK, and SBA, show difficulty in self-control, a strong urge to keep moving, and an inability to maintain focus while learning. This behavior is not only seen through excessive physical movements, but also through disruptive interactions, such as talking, playing, laughing, and ruining friends' notes when the teacher explains the material. The results of interviews with students and teachers reinforced these findings, where classroom teachers confirmed that such hyperactive behaviors demanded more attention, while students themselves were aware of their inability to sit still or focus on learning.

These findings are consistent with the research of Zentall (1983) who said that hyperactivity is a syndrome of excessive behavior such as impulsiveness, overexertion, difficulty focusing, tendency to be aggressive, and behaving unstable or changeable. According to Zentall's *optimal stimulation theory*, hyperactive children suffer from a lack of arousal caused by a lack of stimulation. They behave as if their environmental stimulation levels are insufficient. When the child is in a low stimulation environment, the child will seek stimulus (Zentall & Thomas R. Zentall, 1983). Based on the findings, grade III D students engaged in disruptive behavior when the teacher was explaining with the lecture method, this is what made them feel that they did not get enough stimulation, so they engaged in disruptive behavior to meet their stimulation needs.

2) Easily bored

Being easily bored emerges as an internal factor that is very easy to observe and very easily encourages students to engage in disruptive behavior. When learning takes place in a monotonous lecture method, where students simply listen to the teacher without

much interaction, variety, or activity that actively engages them, many students feel disinterested and disengaged. This condition gives rise to two forms of response. Female students become bored passively such as daydreaming, sleeping on a bench, drawing in a book, or distracting with small movements. Meanwhile, male students respond by being bored actively, namely standing, talking, walking, or doing other activities that are clearly not in accordance with the learning context.

This finding is in line with the findings of Trisnawati (2024), who explains that being easily bored can trigger disruptive behaviors such as chatting, sleeping in class, permission to go to the bathroom, and doodling on books. In addition, Trisnawati also explained that the teacher's monotonous teaching style such as using the lecture method is a factor that causes student being easily bored. Thus, students' disruptive behavior can be understood as a chain effect that starts from a monotonous teacher's teaching style that causes being easily bored in students.

3) Attention needs

The findings of the study in class III D MIN 2 Metro show that the need to be noticed arises as a clear internal drive for some students, such as ZYN students who consistently exhibit attention-grabbing behavior by repeatedly raising their hands, speaking loudly, even making comments even though they know that the comments made are wrong. This is done not just to contribute to the lesson, but to ensure that teachers and friends pay attention to it. The statement also emphasized that the main motivation is to get recognition, not just academic participation. So does the teacher's acknowledgment that students like ZYN need attention, reinforcing that this need really exists and is visible in everyday interactions in the classroom.

These findings do not stand alone, the results of Hasanov's (2025) research also explain that the common reason students behave badly in elementary school is to seek attention. This shows that the student's motive is not just unawareness or disobedience, but rather a human need to feel valued and recognized in the social environment, which in this case is friends and teachers.

4) Curiosity

Field findings in grade III D MIN 2 Metro students show that curiosity is one of the main drivers of the emergence of disruptive behavior. Students such as KZO, AZK, and ERR exhibit behavioral patterns that lead to repeated exploration of the stimuli around them in the form of turning their heads when friends move, checking lockers, looking at objects that friends have removed, and turning away from the whiteboard to observe other activities. At the heart of this behavior is the internal drive to know what's going on, not to follow an ongoing learning flow.

This finding is in line with Cunff's (2024) research which states that curiosity is a momentary impulse that can cause distractions because it can make a person constantly shift focus from one thing to another. Furthermore, Cunff also explained that curiosity causes distractions because individuals are impulsively interested in knowing something. Cunff's findings are particularly relevant to the behavior evoked by grade III D students in which the desire to know the activities of friends is stronger than the urge to understand the subject matter.

5) Academic difficulties

Field findings in grade III D MIN 2 Metro students show that academic difficulties play an important role in encouraging the emergence of disruptive behaviors. Students such as SNA and AZK are unable to follow the flow of the material, do not understand the teacher's instructions, and cannot complete assignments independently. This condition of disability encourages them to look for alternative activities as a form of escape from tasks that they cannot complete, such as playing alone, turning their heads in different directions, walking around in class, or waiting for a friend to finish doing an assignment and then cheat the answer. These behaviors indicate academic frustration as well as an inability to maintain focus, which is directly related to difficulties in understanding learning.

These field findings are in line with Kessels' (2020) research which says that academic difficulties can lead to later problematic behaviors. In addition, academic difficulties can also increase the likelihood of students engaging in inappropriate behavior in the classroom. Kessels also added that students who have academic

difficulties are more likely to exhibit disruptive behavior in class. In fact, such disruptive behavior worsens their future achievements.

b. External factors

1) Class factor

In addition to internal factors, field findings in grade III D MIN 2 students Metro shows that the classroom environment plays an important role as an external factor that influences the emergence of disruptive behaviors. Disorderly classroom situations, unstable learning atmospheres, and the existence of imitating behavior among students create conditions that trigger the emergence of inappropriate behavior. The class teacher was also seen confirming that many students behaved imitatively when they saw the majority of students in the class doing something. This can be seen from the habits of students who are reluctant to enter class just because they follow friends who have not entered, to the behavior of students who immediately imitate the activities of friends when the classroom atmosphere begins to be uncondusive. The results of the observations also showed that when some students played with scouting attributes, talked, or moved actively, other students immediately adjusted by exhibiting similar behaviors.

This finding is certainly supported by Munir's (2025) research which says that the learning environment in the classroom has an important and significant role in students' affective, behavioral, and cognitive involvement. If the classroom environment is unstable, students will be more easily encouraged to exhibit negative behaviors, including disruptive behavior. On the other hand, a well-organized environment will strengthen students' learning, behavior, and cognitive engagement. Thus, field findings and empirical studies both confirm that class is an external factor that has a direct impact on students' tendency to exhibit disruptive behavior. When the classroom is not conducive, negative behavior does not only appear individually, but spreads through mechanisms of imitation and social interaction among students. This is also reinforced by the ecological systems theory created by Urie Bronfenbrenner in Rus (2020), which states that the classroom is one part of a microsystem, and it is this environment that is very strong for the development of children because it is this

environment where they develop together. Furthermore, Bronfenbrenner also explained that the relationship of individuals to these microsystems is dynamic and interdependent.

2) Peer factor

The field results seen in grade III D MIN 2 Metro students showed that peers had a strong influence on the emergence of disruptive behavior. Students tend to imitate the behavior of friends around them, both in the form of active behavior such as joking, talking, and walking around in class, or passive behavior such as being silent or not paying attention to the teacher. Interviews with classroom teachers reveal that students who are initially calm can turn into rowdy when sitting with students who are often disruptive. This is in line with the admission of ZYN and ARK students who stated that their behavior was greatly influenced by friends who were nearby. The observations made by the researchers also confirmed that spontaneous interactions between students, such as joking or getting close to each other, quickly divert their focus from learning activities and trigger the classroom atmosphere to become less conducive.

The above findings are in line with the results of Adnani's (2025) research, which explains that a student often imitates the behavior of other students if one student commits a disruptive act, other students tend to follow as a form of solidarity or want to be considered "brave". The same thing was also found in the results of Ulum's research (2024) which defined that peers have a very strong influence, especially for friends who have negative behaviors. This can be very easy to imitate and follow. In addition, the results of Muhliawati's (2023) research also revealed the same thing, explaining that peers have a significant influence on students' disruptive behavior.

In addition, this finding is also reinforced by Urie Bronfenbrenner's ecological system theory in Rus (2020), which explains that human development is influenced by various environments around it. Furthermore, the environment in question is divided into four types, namely microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems, and macrosystems. Peers fall into the category of microsystems and fall into the most influential, most intense,

intimate, most enduring, and deepest levels because most individual behaviors are studied in these microsystem environments (Rus et al., 2020). This shows that peers are one of the microsystem environments that are very influential for children.

3. Differences in the factors that cause disruptive behavior of male and female students

a. Hyperactive

The hyperactive behavior that appears in grade III D students shows a very clear pattern that the expression of hyperactivity differs between male students and female students. In male students, hyperactivity appears as a strong urge to keep moving, difficulty maintaining a sitting position, being easily distracted by small stimuli, as well as impulsivity to interact with friends outside of learning needs. This phenomenon can be seen from interviews and observations that show how male students often stand, walk, change seats, disturb friends, and continue to make social contact even though learning is ongoing. In contrast, female students showed a form of hyperactivity that was not seen in the form of large physical activity, but in the form of subtle and repetitive movements such as playing stationery, correcting sitting positions, moving hands, and losing focus without leaving a seat. This pattern confirms that although both genders show hyperactivity, they are qualitatively different.

Referring to previous research, there is the same thing in Slobodin's (2019) study which shows that girls show fewer symptoms of hyperactivity and impulsivity compared to boys. However, Slobodin also added that girls experience more symptoms of inattention compared to boys. Willcutt's (2012) research also reinforces this by saying that the percentage of hyperactivity and impulsivity is higher in boys compared to girls. In fact, Barkley (2006) also explained the same thing in his book, writing that boys are three times more likely to have ADHD or difficulty concentrating, impulsive behavior and hyperactivity than girls.

b. Easily bored

Feelings of being easily bored in the classroom can be an important trigger for the emergence of disruptive behavior, especially when monotonous teaching methods such as long lectures without variety or interaction. This makes students lose interest and involvement. In the

context of class III D MIN 2 Metro, the findings show that being easily bored elicits two different responses. Female students tend to react with passive being easily bored such as daydreaming, drawing, sleeping on a bench, or distracting through small movements. While male students show active being easily bored such as standing, walking, talking, or doing physical activities that are clearly not in accordance with the learning context. These different forms of response suggest that gender influences how students respond to being easily bored, not simply the being easily bored itself.

This is consistent and in line with the results of Wang's (2022) research which explains that boys have a higher level of being easily bored than girls. Wang also emphasized that this is in line with many previous studies. Furthermore, Wang explained that boys tend to have a greater need for various stimuli. They are more active, more risk-taking, and have greater motivation to seek new sensations and experiences compared to women. In contrast, women tend to be more trained to stay calm, keep their emotions in check, and look for simple ways to cope with being easily bored than men (Wang et al., 2022).

c. Attention needs

The need for attention in grade III D students shows a very clear pattern of differences between male and female students. Field data show that male students, especially ZYN, show a need for attention that is direct, active, and tangible in their daily behavior. They often call teachers, speak loudly, offer to answer questions, or perform repetitive actions to get a response. Meanwhile, female students such as SBA and SNA do reveal that they want the attention of teachers, but these desires are more internal and do not appear in real behavior during learning. This difference shows that the attention needs in male students are more easily observed and have more potential to cause disruptive behavior than in female students.

4. Limitations of the study

The researchers found limitations in obtaining empirical literature that specifically addresses the differences in attention needs between male and female students. Most of the available studies only examine gender differences in hyperactivity, impulsivity, aggressiveness, or disruptive behavior tendencies, while studies on *attention need* or *attention-seeking* by gender are still very limited and have not yet to be the

focus of stand-alone research. Therefore, no research has been found that directly describes how male and female students differ in wanting, expressing, or demanding attention from their social environment. This causes researchers to be unable to present a specific literature comparison related to attention needs by gender.

Nevertheless, the findings of this study are important because they make new empirical contributions, especially in describing how attention needs arise and manifest differently in male and female students. Field data showed that male students' attention needs were more visible through active and direct behaviors, while female students showed more internal needs and were not visible in action. These findings fill a gap in literature that has not discussed the pattern of attention needs based on gender and at the same time enriches the study of student behavior in the classroom.

D. Conclusion

This study shows that disruptive behavior of students in grade III D MIN 2 Metro appears in various forms that consistently interfere with the course of learning. Efforts made by classroom teachers to overcome this include preventive strategies and a combination of repressive strategies. This combination of strategies shows that teachers are trying to restore the condition of the classroom with various strategies. The causes of students' disruptive behavior are multifactorial and interrelated. In addition, there are differences in factors that cause disruptive behavior based on gender, the majority of which arise from internal factors. Although the differences were not very significant, the behavior patterns showed that male students dominated all the differences factors.

Overall, the disruptive behavior of students in grade III D MIN 2 Metro is a multidimensional phenomenon formed from the interaction of internal student factors, social dynamics, and classroom conditions. Thus, this research contributes to enriching the study of classroom teachers' strategies in dealing with disruptive behavior in low-grade students in the madrasah environment, especially related to differences in behavior based on gender. The pedagogical implications are very clear that teachers need to implement the management and provision of classroom rules that are more consistent, adaptive, and oriented towards fostering long-term behavior in order to create a more effective and conducive learning atmosphere.

E. Acknowledgments

Thank you to the supervisors who have directed, given advice and support. Thank you also to the MIN 2 Metro educational agency, especially to the principal, class teachers, and students of grade III D MIN 2 Metro for their help in providing data to complete this article.

F. Statement of Contributions by the Author

TWJ as the first author, students who are in charge of research, design research, collect data, and analyze data. FA as the second author, a supervisor who is in charge of guiding and providing advice in writing this article.

G. References

- Abidin, A. R., Latuapo, R., & Abidin, A. M. (2023). PAI Teacher Strategies in Class Management to Improve the Quality of PAI Learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 8(2), 187–197. <https://doi.org/10.33477/alt.v8i2.6480>
- Adnani, L. S., Sugiarti, L. R., & Erlangga, E. (2025). Psikofusi: Jurnal Psikologi Integratif. *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif*, 7(10), 1–6.
- Amani, F., Bunyamin, A., Syahrul, M., Mustamin, & Wahab, A. (2025). Strategi Guru BK dalam Menangani Pelaku dan Korban Bullying SMPN 1 Kaloka Utara. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(3), 249–263. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i03.31129>
- Barkley, R. A. (2006). *Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder* (3. ed). Guilford Press.
- Bicard, D. F., Ervin, A., Bicard, S. C., & Baylot-Casey, L. (2012). Differential Effects of Seating Arrangements on Disruptive Behavior of Fifth Grade Students During Independent Seatwork. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 45(2), 407–411. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2012.45-407>
- Caldarella, P., Larsen, R. A. A., Williams, L., Wills, H. P., & Wehby, J. H. (2021). “Stop Doing That!”: Effects of Teacher Reprimands on Student Disruptive Behavior and Engagement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 23(3), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720935101>
- Charles, C. M. (2014). *Building Classroom Discipline* (Eleventh edition). Pearson.
- Cunff, A.-L. L. (2024). Distractibility and Impulsivity in ADHD as an Evolutionary Mismatch of High Trait Curiosity. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 10(3), 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-024-00400-8>

- Degeng, I. N. S., Setyosari, P., & Dwiyoogo, W. D. (2016). Strategi Guru dalam Membangun Lingkungan Belajar yang Kondusif: Studi Fenomenologi pada Kelas-Kelas sekolah Menengah Pertama di Ponorogo. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 23(1), 10–19.
- Fachriiswantoro, M., & Lismawati. (2023). The Role of Islamic Religious Education Teachers in Overcoming Student Delinquency. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(6), 837–848. <https://doi.org/10.35877/soshum2343>
- Hakim, L., & Mustafa, P. S. (2023). *Perkembangan Peserta Didik dalam Pembelajaran* (1 ed.). UIN Mataram Press.
- Hasanov, M., & Brandišauskienė, A. (2025). The Expression of Positive Discipline in the Primary Classroom: A Case Study of One School. *Education Sciences*, 15(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040490>
- Kessels, U., & Heyder, A. (2020). Not stupid, but lazy? Psychological benefits of disruptive classroom behavior from an attributional perspective. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23(3), 583–613. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09550-6>
- Khairunnisa, Gadis Putri Amelia Pratama, Intan Anggraheni Zahrin Prasetyo, & Budi Purwoko. (2025). Efektivitas Reward dan Punishment dalam Meningkatkan Disiplin dan Motivasi Belajar Siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 9(1), 2291–2300. <https://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/24589>.
- Khasinah, S. & Elviana. (2022). Jenis dan Faktor Disrupsi di Kelas, Pencegahan dan Penanganan Guru. *Jurnal MUDARRISUNA: Media Kajian Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 12(2), 489. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jm.v12i2.14786>
- Khotimah, N. (2024). Strategi Guru Mengatasi Perilaku Disruptif Siswa dalam Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Jaringan Penelitian Pengembangan Penerapan Inovasi Pendidikan (Jarlitbang)*, 10(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.59344/jarlitbang.v10i1.203>
- Lessy, L. Y., Inayah, S., Mahmud, N., & Papingka, G. K. (2024). *Pendidikan Anak Sekolah Dasar* (Vol. 1). CV. Edupedia Publisher.
- Maddeh, T., Bennour, N., & Souissi, N. (2015). Study of Students' Disruptive Behavior in High School Education in Physical Education Classes. *Advances in Physical Education*, 05(03), 143–151. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ape.2015.53018>
- Muhliawati, Y., & Purwadi, P. (2023). The effect of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior: An explanatory study. *ProGCouns: Journal of Professionals in Guidance and Counseling*, 4(1), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.21831/progcouns.v4i1.59914>

- Munir, S., Gulzar, S., & Afzal, S. (2025). Role of Classroom Learning Environment in Student's Engagement at O Levels. *Regional Lens*, 4(2), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.62997/rl.2025.42058>
- Nazla, Jihan, & Hasibuan, A. D. (2023). Upaya Guru BK dalam Mengatasi Perilaku Misbehavior Siswa. *EduInovasi: Journal of Basic Educational Studies*, 3(2), 526–539. <https://doi.org/10.47467/edui.v3i2.3302>
- Niwaz, A., Khan, K., & Naz, S. (2021). Exploring Teacher's Classroom Management Strategies Dealing with Disruptive Behavior of Students in Public Schools. *Elementary Education Online*, 20(2), 1596–1617.
- Nurdian, N., Sauri, M. S., & Fani, A. (2025). Strategi Guru Mengelola Kelas untuk Meningkatkan Disiplin dan Motivasi Belajar Siswa di Sekolah Dasar. *DIDAKTIKA: Jurnal Pemikiran Pendidikan*, 31(1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.30587/didaktika.v31i1.9470>
- Ødegård, M., & Solberg, S. (2024). Identifying teachers' reactive strategies towards disruptive behavior in classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 145, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104627>
- Pane, A., & Dasopang, M. D. (2017). Belajar dan Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman*, 03(2), 333–352. <https://doi.org/10.24952/fitrah.v3i2.945>
- Peras, G. M. M., Castro, J. C. F., & Mantog, J. A. (2023). Mitigating Students' Disruptive Behavior through Operant Conditioning. *IJARIIIE*, 9(3), 4795–4809.
- Rus, A. V., Lee, W. C., Salas, D. B. B., Parris, S. R., Webster, R. D., Lobo, A. R., Ecaterina, S., & Popa, C. (2020). Bronfenbrenner's Ecological System Theory and the Experience of Institutionalization of Romanian Children. *New Approaches in Behavioral Sciences*, 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.5000.8004>
- Sari, D. & Charlina. (2024). Upaya Guru dalam Mengatasi Perilaku Kenakalan Siswa di SMPN 11 Mandau. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 09(04), 714–726. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v9i04.20655>
- Sari, N. N., & Putro, K. Z. (2021). Karakteristik Dan Model Integrasi Ilmu Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Tarbawy : Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 8(2), 61–66. <https://doi.org/10.32923/tarbawy.v8i2.1824>
- Slobodin, O., & Davidovitch, M. (2019). Gender Differences in Objective and Subjective Measures of ADHD Among Clinic-Referred Children. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00441>
- Sun, R. C. F. (2015). Teachers' experiences of effective strategies for managing classroom misbehavior in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 46,

94-103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.11.005>

- Trisnawati, & Fauziya, D. S. (2024). Faktor Penyebab Kejenuhan Belajar Siswa SMP Kelas VIII Pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. *Aliansi: Jurnal Hukum, Pendidikan dan Sosial Humaniora*, 1(5), 214-226. <https://doi.org/10.62383/aliansi.v1i5.407>
- Ulum, M., Latipun, L., Syakarofath, N. A., & Widyasari, D. C. (2024). Peran Tekanan Teman Sebaya terhadap Perilaku Disruptif Remaja. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 20(2), 146-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24014/jp.v14i2.21519>
- Wang, H., Xu, Y., Song, H., Mao, T., Huang, Y., Xu, S., Zhang, X., & Rao, H. (2022). State Being easily bored Partially Accounts for Gender Differences in Novel Lexicon Learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.807558>
- Widyaningrum, A. N., & Fauziah, M. (2025). Analisis Penggunaan Punishment dan Reinforcement untuk Meningkatkan Sikap Kedisiplinan Siswa di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(03), 214-223. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i03.30995>
- Willcutt, E. G. (2012). The Prevalence of DSM-IV Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Neurotherapeutics*, 9(3), 490-499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13311-012-0135-8>
- Wulandari, H., Adhani, I., Hasibuan, P. C., Andini, N., Fadli, M. K., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). Aspek Perkembangan Peserta Didik Selama Masa Sekolah Dasar (6-12 Tahun). *Jurnal Yudistira : Publikasi Riset Ilmu Pendidikan dan Bahasa*, 2(1), 160-167. <https://doi.org/10.61132/yudistira.v2i1.406>
- Zentall, S. S. & Thomas R. Zentall. (1983). Optimal Stimulation: A Model of Disordered Activity and Performance in Normal and Deviant Children. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(3), 447-471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.94.3.446>