

Handling Students' Destructive Behavior from The Perspective of Child-Friendly School (CFS)

Amirah DINIATY,
Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia
amirah.diniaty@uin-suska.ac.id

Akhmad MUJAHIDIN,
Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia
akhmad.mujahidin@gmail.com

Salfen HASRI
Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia
salfenhasri@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to describe students' destructive behavior in learning process at Islamic Senior High School, and teacher's action about it and also to develop a Child-Friendly School (CFS). This research was a quantitative-descriptive research. Data sources came from 124 eleventh grade students elected through random sampling and 5 teachers. The techniques of data collection were through questionnaires and interview. Data analysis was in two types; statistics percentage and descriptive-narrative. The research results describe the mean-score of destructive behavior of social-science students are higher than the mean-score of science students, language students, and religion students, with the forms of behavior that frequently occur are talking to friends when the teacher is giving explanation about the lesson. According to most of the students (71,77%), the teacher has taught well and friendly, only 1 student stated that the teacher gives punishment. Teachers are required to educate, no punishing, in order to develop a model of CFS for their school.

Keywords: Destructive behavior, Process of Learning, Child-Friendly School

Introduction

A destructive behavior in learning process is an incident serious enough that if not dealt with, will lead to further and widening management problems (Kounin & Harley, 2002). Hughes & Hughes (2003: 363) confirm destructive behavior case in learning will be found at the best schools and even in the classes with the most talented teachers. It means in each class, there will be students whose behavior will disturb the learning process.

As the consequence this destructive behavior can disadvantage the teacher and students. The teacher can be stressful (Lewiss, 1999), and must spend much time and energy for the class management (Leung and Ho, 2001). Meanwhile the teacher is required to build an effective practice of discipline and safe learning environment to ensure students' academic success (Luiselli, 2005). Weerman, Harland & Vanderland (2007) find out that destructive behavior occurrence decreases students' academic achievement. The noisy class inhibits students' learning activity, especially for the students who have less attention symptoms (Partin, 2009).

Therefore, the teacher must take action when something serious occurs in the class (Arend, 2008: 195). The teacher who wants to think concerning the factors which cause students' destructive behavior must be careful because it will spend too much of their time especially during the analysis. Arends (2013: 200) explains the reasons such as; (1) recognizing the factors which cause students' bad/disturbing

behavior even though it assists in problem analysis, it does not always bring change towards that behavior, (2) too much dealing with psychological and sociological factors for the bad behavior especially the causes which are not influenced by the teacher, can cause acceptance and/or resign. Based on this explanation, it can be said that students who disturb the activities during the learning process, require the teacher to take the right action right away and spending the time to find the causes.

The fact which occurs in educational institution, teachers' action towards students' destructive behavior in classical learning process makes the school as "punishment institution". There are some teachers contend that violence towards the students is necessary even punishment is used as the tool for education. This wrong thought of teachers is extremely unfortunate let alone if it occurs in the class of elementary level or high school level that become the main determinant of goal achievement in higher educational level (Yamin, 2012).

More fatal mistake of the teacher is a belief that a success education implements punishment on the students which at certain time it can be not proportional and out of limits (Prayitno, 2013). The form of teachers' punishment on students' mistake such as asking the students to clean the class, mopping the floor, cleaning the windows, writing the sentences "I will never do it again" for a hundred times or more sadistic is like; asking them to run around the basketball field for a couple of laps without wearing shoes and shirts; standing with one leg in front of the class until the time is over or even until suspending the students and not allowing the students to come to school (Prayitno, 2009).

The findings of KPAI in 2012 jot down that out of 1026 respondents from SD/MI (Elementary Schools), SMP/MTS (Junior High Schools), and SMA/MAN (Senior High Schools) in nine provinces, 87,6% students admit that they experienced violence action either physical or psychological at school begun from getting tweak, hit, snapped, humiliated, given negative stigma until getting hurt using sharp objects (Wardah, 2012). The class situation tends to be discipline enforcement through giving sanction and punishment instead of giving advice, strengthening, and exemplifying, until the school becomes the punishment institution and not education institution (Prayitno & Manulang, 2010).

An example of physical punishment done by the teacher towards the students until causing death, such as written by the news in Kompas Newspaper February 7th, 2015 entitled "Educational Violence, a Student Died After Punished by The Teacher". In that news, it is explained that a female student of State Junior High School 1 Palasah Majalengka Regency West Java passed out then died when undergoing the punishment from her teacher because she did not do the homework of Indonesian Subject. For male students who did not do the homework, the teacher asked them to run around the basketball field for 15 laps while female students were 10 laps. The victim fell down and passed out during the run at the second lap.

This tragic event becomes an authentic evidence that physical punishment must not be done by the teacher towards the students in learning activities with any reason. Giving punishment let alone physical one is not effective. Besides it is not relevant with the learning materials, sometimes it is not human, and also causes negative attitude on the doers. The process of self improvement does not occur, antipathy attitude or revenge intention probably grows (Prayitno, 2013).

Islamic teaching as the Prophet Muhammad Peace be Upon Him said to Aisyah (Muslim cited in Kazhim, 2011: 44); explains: *Actually Allah is very soft and loves softness and gives it to he does not give to violence and also not to others than violence itself*. This hadith confirms that teachers should be soft in organizing the education and avoids giving physical punishment to students because softness is better and more primary.

Related to that, there has been The Regulation of The Minister of Women Empowerment and Children Protection Republic of Indonesia Number 8 in 2014 about Child Friendly School Policy which is then well known as CFS. CFS is a formal education unit, non-formal, and safe, clean, healthy informal which cares about the culture and environment, life, able to guarantee, fulfill, respect the children rights and protect the children from violence, discrimination, and other wrong treatment and support the children participation especially in planning, privacy, learning, monitoring, and mechanism of report related to the fulfillment of the rights and protection of children. In other words, the accomplishment of

destructive behavior case needs to be treated kindly by the teacher and shows educated behavior and not letting or punishing the students.

There is no research about students' destructive behavior at Islamic High School in Pekanbaru and its correlation to Child-Friendly School model. Therefore, it is interesting to see it at State Islamic Senior High School 1 Pekanbaru (henceforth; MAN 1 Pekanbaru) considering this school is one of the best Islamic-based schools in Pekanbaru City, and becomes the exemplar for Child-Friendly School since 2015. This research aims to reveal: (1) the form of students' destructive behavior in learning process at MAN 1 Pekanbaru, (2) the teachers' solution towards students' destructive behavior which occurs at MAN 1 Pekanbaru, and (3) the opportunity of establishing child-friendly school with the solution taken by the teachers there.

Literature Review

Destructive behavior (Giallo & Little, 2003) or problem behavior (Ho, 2004) in the learning is defined as the behavior which damages, inhibits, and not expected to occur. Giallo & Little (2003: 134) defines : "destructive behavior can be any behavior that significantly hinders or obstructs the child's own learning, other children's learning or responses, or the teachers' capability to operate effectively".

Destructive behavior which occurs on the students at elementary level and high school level is probably because of "the wild energy" which is the problem of development and the nature tendency which becomes stronger abnormally in the students (Prayitno, 2013). Supriadi & Darmawan (2012: 163) confirms that environmental factor such as the class has characteristics which reflect the complexity and the potency of destructive behavior occurrence by the students; those factors are: (1) a class is multidimensional, it means a class is a setting for many activities started from academic ones such as reading, writing, and doing Math, until social activities such as playing, communicating with friends and debating. The teacher must jot down and make students follow this order. The task is given by the teacher and monitored, collected, and evaluated, (2) the activities which occur in the class happen simultaneously; one group of students probably works on the writing assignment, others discuss or work on another assignment, (3) the things that occur quickly in the class; the occurrence which happen among the students such as debating, complaining because there is a student who cheats, fights, and all those need quick responses from the teacher, (4) the occurrence is frequently cannot be predicted in the class; for instance there is a student who is suddenly ill, or the fire alarm rings, (5) there is only a little privacy, a class is a public place where the students see how the teacher solves the problem, look at the unexpected occurrence and experience frustration, (6) a class has its own history, each student has his/her own memory about what happens in the class in the previous time.

The most frequent form of destructive behavior which occurs at elementary school level is irregularity and forgetfulness, experienced by a teacher in Hongkong (Leung and Ho, 2001). The students talk in the class, disturb friends, and being lazy are frequently occur at high school in England (Houghton, Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988) and Australia (Little, 2005). Other forms such as selfish, talking during teachers' explanation, and too active are reported as the most frequent behaviors and make the teacher difficult in teaching in three provinces in China (Shen, Zhang, Zhang, Caldarella, Richardson & Szhatzer, 2009). The form of destructive behaviors showed by Indonesian students such as not paying attention towards teachers' explanation, rejecting the instruction from the teacher, inviting the students to talk in the class, and drawing something in their books (Rahmawati, 2016).

Dreikur (2004) groups destructive behavior as student's individual problem such as; (a) attracting attention (attention-getting behavior), (b) seeking for power (power-seeking behavior), (c) revenge (revenge-seeking behavior), (d) displaying the incapability such as in the form of rejecting to try doing anything because they believe that failure is all they will get. According to Rahman (1998) in Mulyadi (2009: 15) that four individual's actions above will cause the forms of four behavior patterns which frequently can be seen in students during the learning process; they are (a) active-constructive pattern which is the behavior pattern which is extreme and ambiguous to be superstar in their class and try to attract teachers' anger, (b) active-destructive pattern which is the behavior pattern which is showed in the form of jokes, easy to get angry, rude, and rebel, (c) passive-constructive pattern which is the pattern

which shows the form of late behavior in order to always be helped and expects assistance from others, (d) passive-destructive pattern which is the behavior pattern which shows laziness and stubborn.

The concept of child friendly school is introduced by Unicef (2006) containing the regulations which one of them is that the teacher has position as the authority figure and learning facilitator and the students are active participants of learning in which the interaction between them must be in democracy process and respect each other. Aqib (2008) explains in the model of Child Friendly School (CFS), the teacher gives more positive assumption on the students, the teacher must realize students' different potency until in giving the opportunity to the students in choosing the activity or playing in line with students' interest.

The system of child friendly school regulates that teachers' attitude towards students covers; (1) fair treatment for the students either male or female, smart-weak, rich-poor, normal-disable, child of important person-child of unimportant person, (2) the implementation of religion norms, and local social and culture, (3) affection towards the students, giving attention to those who are weak in the learning process because giving physical or psychological punishment can make the students trauma, (4) respect child's rights, either among the students or among the teachers. The learning method that can be applied by the teacher is; (1) the learning process occurs in certain form until the students feel happy in following the lesson, there is no fear, worry, and anxious, the students become more active and creative and they do not feel inferior because of competing with other students.

Research Method

This research was descriptive quantitative research. It was conducted at MAN 1 Pekanbaru. Data were taken from 124 students of grade XI with comparisons between male and female students were 56 and 68. Based on the majors; students of science major and social major were 33 students, language major were 21 students, and religion major were 37 students. Samples were taken through purposive sampling in which the students were easy to approach and willing to fill in the questionnaires voluntarily. Beside students, 5 teachers also became the data sources of this research. They were taken through purposive sampling in which the teachers that were willing to be the teachers' data sources.

The instruments used to collect the data were questionnaires for the students with reliability level 0,953. Another technique of data collection was interview to deepen the result of students' questionnaires. The questionnaires contained indicators such as (1) the forms of destructive behavior; attention-getting behavior, power-seeking behavior, revenge-seeking behavior, and showing incapability, (2) the solution towards destructive behavior by the teacher such as just let it be, punishing, and friendly educating the students. This questionnaire was filled in with answer choices likert scales such as always, often, seldom, sometimes, and never.

The results of data collection from students' questionnaires were processed statistically with percentage until described; the type of destructive behaviors emerge in the learning and students' opinion about the solution of destructive behavior done by the teacher. Meanwhile the interview results with the teacher were described narratively until it describes the opportunity of establishing child-friendly school with the solution done by the teacher towards destructive behavior cases.

Result

Forms of Destructive Behavior

The results of the questionnaire processing filled out by students indicate that the destructive behavior cases that arise when learning in class are dominant in the form of students seeking attention. Destructive behavior is more common in social science classes, compared to natural science, language, and religion majors. This can be seen from the means of destructive behavior in social studies students who are higher than students majoring in Natural Sciences, Language and Religion.

This research also explains the difference between mean score of destructive behavior which occurs in the learning when the subject teacher and the counselor time entering the class. The main

difference conducted by the teacher is about the subject materials mastery, while the learning with the school counselor is about students' daily effective life (Prayitno, 2009). In Indonesia, the school counselor is given counseling service format as classical format (conducted for all students in the class) ideally 2 hours/class/week in accordance with The Regulation of The Minister of National Education No. 22 in 2006 about the content standard of elementary and high education unit. With this request, the school counselor has the opportunity to interact with the students in the class in the context of organizing the learning process.

The description of mean score data of students' destructive behavior in both of these types of educators is described in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Mean of destructive behavior scores

No	Majors	N	Mean-Scores of Destructive Behavior	
			The Teacher	The School Counsellor
1	Religion	34	55.68	48.82
2	Language	21	58.48	54.67
3	Science	33	68.62	61.44
4	Social-science	33	78.51	70.86

There are also differences in the types of destructive behavior in learning that can be seen from the answers of teachers and students, as shown in the following Table 2:

Table 2. Forms of destructive behavior that often occurs

Frequency	The Teacher	Students
Very Often	The students came late into the class when the learning process was already started.	The Students talked to their friends when the teacher was explaining the lesson
Often	The students talked to friends when the teacher was explaining the lesson	The students made joke/fun until other students laughed when the teacher explained the lesson

One in 5 teachers suggests destructive behavior that has not been revealed by students, namely students using a laptop when the teacher explains the subject matter. Internet network facilities that can be accessed freely by students at school, they use when the teacher explains the lesson in front of the class. The student even disturbs the concentration of other friends.

Teacher's Solution of Destructive Behavior Cases

The results of student questionnaire processing show the teacher's handling of destructive behavior cases which in the opinion of students are indicated in Table 3 as follows:

Table 3. Teacher's Solution of Destructive Behavior in Learning

No	Solution Category	Score	F	%
1	Educate friendly and explicitly until there is change on the behavior	≥ 140	27	21.77
2	Educate friendly	113 – 139	89	71.77
3	Being “weak” and it causes less serious impression on the doer	86 – 112	5	4.03
4	Let the doer do it	59 – 85	2	1.63
5	Punish the doer	32 - 58	1	0.80
		Total	124	100

According to most of the students (71,77%), the teacher has educated them friendly in the learning process. The teacher's friendly behaviors, from the results of the interview with the students, are care, keeping the self-esteem of the students who did destructive behavior, and talking to them with good language. However, students' destructive behavior occur again and again in the learning activity with the same teacher.

The change of students' behavior handled by a friendly and decisive teacher is expressed by few students (21,77%). A decisive and friendly teacher is more respected and obeyed by the students. The teacher's assertiveness is seen from his/her direct response towards all students' behavior which disturb the learning with the same treatment. The teacher confirms that the students have better potency and appreciate every single change showed by the students who did destructive behavior to be better.

The teacher's weak solution towards destructive behavior case is seen from the answer of a small proportion of students (4,03%). This teacher's form of behavior is slow in responding students' destructive behavior and according to the students it is not assertive. The teacher is impressed of not dare to rebuke the students who did destructive behavior in the class. The solution was only done towards certain students until it seems like that student is the trouble maker in the class, as the consequence that student does not change to be better. He/she turns to hate the teacher.

Apparently there are teachers who just let destructive behaviors occur in the class (1,6%), in which the teacher keep delivering the lesson materials when the class was so noisy. According to the students, usually this is done by the new teacher who still does not have teaching experience yet.

The results of this research also find out that few students (0,80%) state that the teacher punished the students who did destructive behavior in the class. This is interesting that this statement is said by one student only. The form of punishment done by the teacher, according to this student, was using rude language towards the students' making trouble in the class, calling his/her name with the name of something, or that student was asked to stand up in front of the class.

Opportunities for The Implementation of Child-Friendly Schools with The Solution that Has Been Carried Out by Teachers

The teacher's views related to student answers about the form of handling destructive behavior in the class, very much depends on the individual teacher of each. Usually the senior teacher is more disciplined and very concerned about student bullies in the class. While new teachers are often ignored by students so the teacher continues to deliver the subject matter even though the class is in a noisy atmosphere. New teachers have more difficulty in dealing with cases of destructive behavior than senior teachers (have more than 3 years of teaching experience).

Five teacher respondents in this study agreed that physical punishment is not a solution in handling destructive behavior cases. However, there is teacher doubt in handling cases of destructive behavior related to the concept of child-friendly and disciplinary schools. The teacher still questions the concept of child-friendly schools and disciplinary efforts. When students break the rules in the classroom, then the teacher disciplines whether this will contradict the concept of child-friendly schools? Enforcement of anti-violence and child protection laws, so that when teachers discipline students they will be considered as committing violence. Conversely students will underestimate if the teacher does not show assertiveness. Respondents tell examples of cases of teachers who were beaten by students because they reminded their students to stop sitting on the table in class.

Teachers who are not assertive will be underestimated by students, while teachers who are disciplined with assertiveness are also at risk of being hated by students. This condition is a dilemma for teachers. For this reason, the five teachers who became respondents said the need for socialization and training in strategies for handling destructive behavior cases in the context of creating child-friendly schools.

Discussion

The frequency of destructive behavior is higher among students in the Department of Social Sciences (IPS) compared to exact sciences, language and religion, which is a form of behavior that violates discipline. This finding is in accordance with the results of James Coleman's research (Arends, 2008: 158) on 10 high schools in America in the 1950s that found the influence of adolescent peer groups supporting social popularity rather than academic achievement.

Teachers as implementers of learning are the spearhead of handling destructive behavior cases. Educating is the art of displaying the personality, spontaneity, and emotions of a teacher (Henson & Eller, 2012). In order for teachers to succeed in class, teachers do not only teach academic skills but also help students realize how and why they behave. It requires some time and attention that positively impacts the achievement of learning outcomes (Khalsa, 2008: 32).

The classroom ecology approach (Arends, 2008: 179) explains the students' bad behavior should be thought of by the teacher as an action that disrupts the learning activities. The teacher's intervention on bad behavior should be done quickly, lightly and intended so that learning activities continue to run smoothly and students change their behavior to be positive. Analysis of the handling of the teachers who were respondents of this study was done by using the class ecology approach.

Difficulties are found by novice teachers or new teachers, who tend to let disruptive behavior while learning takes place. This is understandable because the problem of classroom management is the most important challenge faced by novice teachers (Arends, 2008: 177). Sometimes it is difficult for novice teachers to maintain consistency in applying rules and procedures for behavior in the learning process because (1) cannot always maintain moral awareness of complex classroom environments so that they cannot always see what is happening (2) feel more easy and not really feel threatened when ignoring the destructive behavior of students even though it will cause many problems in the future.

From the description of the SRA system above, the word "punish and violence" is not a recommended action for handling destructive behavior cases. Punishment is a negative door in education, leading someone to destruction, so that they live lives in anxiety, fear, and failure (Kazhim, 2011: 27). Indeed the habit of hitting a child in educating him shows that we as adults are wrong in choosing the right method so that it can touch the soul and rectify his behavior.

The form of right solving is the firmness from the teacher. A firm teacher in educating the students with destructive behavior cases need to pay attention on the procedure effectiveness in changing the students' negative behavior. According to Jansen (2009: 214), the teacher must: (a) be able to solve recurring problems, (b) prevails for each person, (c) simple and easy to do, (d) be able to be predicted by the students on when it will happen, and (e) place the students in positive and emotional condition, not afraid, not worry, moreover stressed. Based on these effectiveness aspects, the teacher can see their action towards the students with destructive behavior cases categorized into firmness or educating or punishing. When the students are at emotional, stressed, and scared position, then their negative behaviors that are expected to change to be positive ones will not happen. The differences between the firmness of teacher in educating and in punishing mentioned in the following Table 4 (Prayitno, 2013):

Table 4. The Difference Between Firm Action and Punishing

No	Aspects	Decisive and Educated Action	Punishing
1	Energy and Educators' Basic Principles	Positivity, affection, confession, acceptance and softness	Negative, offended, and disadvantaged
2	Educators' point of view	The students are prevented from doing mistake	Educators can do anything
3	Purposes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The doer knows which one is wrong and which one is right 2) Getting awareness that he/she can 3) Feeling himself/herself not being underestimated 4) Building positive attitude 5) Owning commitment 	Making conditional compliance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obey the authority and its cause 2. Deterrent and not repeating the wrong deeds 3. Obey the rules 4. Knows who is in charge Revenge and Prevention
4	Function	Understanding, solving, preventing of conformity internalization.	
5	Effect	Positive Conditions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Knowing which one is wrong and which one is right 2. Self-awareness and able to be better 3. Feeling respected 4. Taking action to think, feel, and build good attitude 5. Ownint commitment 	Discrepancy: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Underestimated and injured 2. Rejection, Revenge 3. Damaged personal relationship

Conclusion

Most muslims must be convinced that students are the God's creature who are actively learn, likewise the educators. Learning activities are always done by each human being because they are given the power and energy to learn. In the holy book Al-Qur'an, it is believed by muslims that Allah SWT said, "... the people who have knowledge will have higher degree than those how do not, as the result of the learning process (Al-Mujadalah, Verse 11). Islamic teaching even asks the human to learn started from when they were born, until they pass away.

Students' amazing power to learn comes from themselves (Harmin, 2012: 8). Related to that, Prayitno (2009: 226) explains that learning activity needs certain energy. The stronger an activity, then the bigger the energy needed. An educator needs to understand that in handling students' destructive behavior. The important keyword is that the power and energy to learn are actually live in the students, it is just a matter of how the learning process organized by the teacher can optimize them until they have positive impact towards the students at that time and their future.

This research is only limited on one school with limited number of samples until it can be investigated further with a bigger number of respondents. However, from the results of this research, it can be concluded that as an educator, we need to do introspection and evaluation towards our pedagogical competence, character, and social when finding students' destructive behavior in the learning process. Therefore, based on the results of this research, it can be recommended to the teachers that they should train on how to be firm towards the doers of destructive behavior and not giving punishment to them. Teachers' firm education on destructive behavior doers create Child-Friendly School in accordance with the values of Islamic Education.

A firm teacher in educating in the context of Islamic Education Institution must be more capable in implementing the values of teaching from Allah and Prophet Muhammad Peace be Upon Him in preparing the next generation through Child-Friendly School Program. Therefore, Islamic School indeed must be the pilot project of implementing this CFS. The results of this research also recommends the

implementation of CFS at Islamic schools under the Ministry of Religion, Republic of Indonesia, one of them is from destructive behavior aspect.

The demand of the teacher alone that must be wise in dealing with cases of *destructive behavior* is not a guarantee that learning activities will fully run smoothly. Students are required to respect the teacher in classical learning (Khon, 2014: 105). Students should be ethical in class when learning takes place that is sitting politely, calmly, humbling and respectful, listening and watching without looking everywhere unless there is a need, not reaching out or arms, not banging the table, not picking his nose, and not saying much. Students should enter the study room in a neat and clean condition both clothes and body (Khon, 2014).

Acknowledgment

Thanks to Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Riau for support this research.

References

- A.G. Hughes & E.H.Hughes. 2003 . *Learning & Teaching Pengantar Psikologi pembelajaran Modern*. Bandung: Nuansa.
- A, Z. 2008. *Child Friendly School*. Jakarta: Yrama Widya
- A, Richard I. 2013. *Learn to Teach 9th Edition Book I*. Translation by Made Feida Yulia. Jakarta: Salemba.
- C. Ho and J. Leung. 2002. *Disruptive Classroom Behaviors of Secondary and Primary School Students*, Educational Research Journal, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 219–233.
- E. Little.2005. *Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Problem Behaviours*, Educational Psychology, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 369–377
- Giallo & Little. 2003. *Classroom Behavior Problems: The Relationship Between Preparedness, Classroom Experiences, and Self-Efficacy in Graduate and Student Teachers*. Australian Journal of Education & Developmental Psychology, 3, 21-34.
- H, Joan C & Sidney T Rowland. 2002. *Behavior Modification for Teacher*. Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- I.To.Ho. 2004. *A Comparison of Australian and Chinese Teachers' Attributions for Student Problem Behaviors*. Journal Educational Psychology. Volume 24.
- J. K. Luiselli, R. F. Putnam, M. W. Handler, and A. B. Feinberg.2005. *Whole-School Positive Behaviour Support: Effects on Student Discipline Problems and Academic Performance*, Educational Psychology, vol. 25, no. 2-3, pp. 183–198.
- J. Shen, N. Zhang, C. Zhang, P. Caldarella, M. J. Richardson, and R. H. Shatzer, 2009. *Chinese Elementary School Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Classroom Behaviour Problems*, Educational Psychology, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 187–201.
- E, Jensen, 2010. *Super Teacher and Super teaching*. Translation by Benyamin Molan. Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- L.A. Johnson. 2009. *Creative and Interesting Teaching*. Translation by: Dani Dharyani. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.
- Jones, V., & Jones, L. 2009. *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems* (9th ed). New York: Prentice Hall.

- K, Muhammad Nabil. 2011. *Successful in Educating Kids Without Violence*. Solo: Samudra
- S.S. Khalsa. 2008. *The Teaching of Discipline and Self-Esteem*. Translation by: Hartati Widiastuti. Jakarta: PT Indeks
- P. Marais&C, Meier. 2010. *Desruptive Behavior in The Foundation Phase of Schooling*. South African Journal of Education Vo.30 No.1, 41-57.
- J, Morin & Battalio, R. 2004. *Construing Misbehavior: The Efficacy Connection in Responding to Misbehavior*. Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention, 6, 251-254.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10983007040060040601>
- Mulyadi. 2009. *Classroom Management*. Malang: UIN Malang Press.
- Prayitno and Belferik Manulang. 2010. *Character Education in Building a Nation*. Medan: Graduate Program of Medan State University.
- Prayitno. 2009. *Basic Theory and Practice of Education*. Jakarta: Grasindo
- Prayitno. 2013. *The Scientific Principle of Education in Teaching and Learning*. Padang: UNP Press.
- R. Dreikurs. 2004. *Discipline Without Tears: How to Reduce Conflict and Establish Cooperation in the Classroom*. Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Mississauga.
- J. Russell. Skiba., Robert, S., Michael, A., Carroll, N., & Reece L. P. 2002. *The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment*. Journal The Urban Review, Vol. 34, No. 4, December2002.<http://link.springer.com/sci-hub.org/article>.
- S. Houghton, K. Wheldall, and F. Merrett, 1988. *Classroom Behavior Problems Which Secondary School Teachers Say They Find Most Troublesome*, British Educational Research Journal, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 297–312.
- S, Didi & Darmawan, Deni. 2012. *The Communication of Learning*. Bandung: PT Remadja Rosdakarya.
- UNICEF. 2006. *Manual Child Friendly School*. New York: Unicefs Devison Communication
- W, Fathiyah. 2012. *KPAI Asks The Government to be More Serious in Overcoming The Violence Towards Kids in Education Environment*, (online). (<http://m.voaindonesia.com/a/1562622.html>)
- Y. Moh. 2012. *The School Which Sets Free*. Malang: Madani.