



Research Article

Investigation of Students' Destructive Behavior in Islamic Senior High Schools and The Prospect of Child-Friendly School (CFS) Program

Amirah DINIATY, Suryan A JAMRAH, Akhmad MUJAHIDIN
And Salfen HASRI

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia

Correspondence should be addressed to: Amirah Diniaty; amirah.diniaty@uin-suska.ac.id

Received date: 6 September 2019; Accepted date: 1 January 2020; Published date: 13 September 2021

Academic Editor: Sock Lee Ching

Copyright © 2021. Amirah DINIATY, Suryan A JAMRAH, Akhmad MUJAHIDIN And Salfen HASRI. Distributed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International CC-BY 4.0

Abstract

Destructive behavior cases in learning can be found at the best schools and even in the classes with the most talented teachers. The purpose of this research is to investigate students' destructive behavior in learning process at Islamic Senior High Schools in Pekanbaru and the prospect of Child-Friendly School (CFS) by handling these cases. This research was a quantitative-descriptive research. Data sources came from 124 eleventh grade students and 5 teachers selected through random sampling. The techniques of data collection were carried out through questionnaires and interviews. Data analysis was in two types; statistics percentage and descriptive-narrative. The research results found that the most frequent form of students' destructive behavior is talking to friends while the teacher is explaining the lesson. According to most of the students (71,77%), the teacher teaches well and in a friendly way, only one student stated that the teacher uses punishment. Teachers and students agree to develop a model of CFS for their school.

Keywords: Destructive behavior, Islamic Senior High School, Child-Friendly School

Introduction

Students are the most important factor for a successful learning process. They can make a destructive behavior in a form of an incident serious enough that if not properly dealt with, will lead to further and wider

management problems (Kounin & Harley, 2002). Destructive behavior which occurs by students at elementary levels and high school levels is probably because of "the wild energy" which is the problem of development and the nature tendency

Cite this Article as: Amirah DINIATY, Suryan A JAMRAH, Akhmad MUJAHIDIN and Salfen HASRI (2021), "Investigation of Students' Destructive Behavior in Islamic Senior High Schools and The Prospect of Child-Friendly School (CFS) Program' Academic Engagement", *Journal of e-Learning and Higher Education*, Vol. 2021 (2021), Article ID 332631, DOI: 10.5171/2021.332631

which becomes abnormally stronger in the students (Prayitno, 2013).

However, a destructive behavior case in learning will be found at the best schools and even in the classes with the most talented teachers (Hughes & Hughes, 2003: 363). It means that in each class, there will be students whose behavior will disturb the learning process, even in Islamic high schools. The results showed that high religious and spiritual values in life tend to make people more calm and not easily hit by anxiety (McMahon and Biggs, 2012). Religiosity is strongly associated with positive self-adjustment in individuals (Mattis, J. S. (2002).

It's very important to learn about that, as the consequences of destructive behavior can disadvantage the teacher and the students. The teacher can be stressful (Lewiss, 1999) and he must spend much time and energy in class management (Leung and Ho, 2001). Meanwhile, the teacher is required to build an effective practice of discipline and a safe learning environment to ensure students' academic success (Luiselli, 2005). Weerman, Harland & Vanderland (2007) found out that destructive behavior occurrence decreases students' academic achievement. The noisy class inhibits students' learning activity, especially for the students who have less attentiveness (Partin, 2009).

In the Islamic teaching, an hadith Prophet Muhammad said to Aisha (Kazhim, 2011: 44): *'O Aisha, Allah is gentle and He loves gentleness. He rewards for gentleness what is not granted for harshness and He does not reward anything else like it'*. This hadith confirms that teachers should be gentle in organizing their education strategies and avoid using physical punishment with students because gentleness is better and more primary. Therefore, the teacher must take an action when something serious occurs in the class (Arend, 2008: 195), but as a Muslim, he must also be gentle in organizing the class. The teacher who wants to think about the factors which cause students' destructive behavior must be careful because it will take too much of their time especially during the analysis. Arends

(2013: 200) explains the reasons as follows; (1) recognizing the factors which cause students' bad/disturbing behavior, and even though it assists in the 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 resigning. Based on this explanation, it can be said that students who disturb the learning process, require the teacher to take the right action right away and spend time to find the causes.

A more fatal mistake by the teacher is the belief that a successful education practice implements punishment on the students, which at a certain time, can be disproportionate and out of limits (Prayitno, 2013). The forms of teachers' punishment for students' mistakes are numerous, such as asking the students to clean the class, mop the floor, clean the windows and write sentences like "I will never do it again" for a hundred times or even more sadistic like asking them to run around the basketball field for a couple of laps without wearing shoes and shirts, stand on one foot in front of the class until the time is over or even suspend the students and not allow them 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% of students admit that they experienced violent actions either physically or psychologically at school beginning from getting tweaked, hit, snapped, humiliated and given negative stigmas to even getting hurt using sharp objects (Wardah, 2012). The class management tends to enforce discipline through punishment instead of giving advice, strengthening and exempling, thus the school becomes a punishment institution rather than an education institution (Prayitno & Manulang, 2010).

An example of physical punishment done by teachers towards students and causing

death, is the one mentioned in Kompas Newspaper February 7th, 2015 entitled "Educational Violence, a Student Died After being Punished by The Teacher". In that article, it is explained that a female student of State Junior High School 1 in Palasah Majalengka Regency West Java, passed out then died while undergoing a punishment from her teacher because she did not do the homework of an Indonesian Subject. For male students who did not do the homework, the teacher asked them to run around the basketball field for 15 laps and 10 laps for female students. The victim fell down and passed out during running in 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 for any reason. Applying punishment, let alone the physical one, is not effective. Besides, it is not relevant to the learning materials. Sometimes it is inhumane and it also causes negative attitude from the doers. The process of self improvement does not occur, and an attitude of antipathy or revenge shall probably grow (Prayitno, 2013).

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 well known as CFS. CFS is a formal education unit, non-formal, safe, clean and healthy which cares about the culture, environment and life. It guarantees, fulfills and respects children's rights and protects the children from violence, discrimination and other mistreatments. It also supports children's participation, especially in planning, privacy, learning, monitoring and mechanism of reports related to the fulfillment of the rights and protection children from violent. In other words, the case of destructive behavior needs to be treated kindly by the teacher showing an educated behavior without punishing the students.

There is no research about students' destructive behavior at Islamic High School in Pekanbaru or the prospect of Child-

Friendly School (CFS) in handling these cases. Therefore, it is interesting to see it at the State Islamic Senior High School 1 Pekanbaru (henceforth; MAN 1 Pekanbaru), since this school is considered one of the best Islamic-based schools in Pekanbaru City, and has become the exemplar for a Child-Friendly School since 2015. This research aims at investigating: (1) the form of students' destructive behavior in learning process at MAN 1 Pekanbaru, (2) the teachers' solutions towards students' destructive behavior which occurs at MAN 1 Pekanbaru, and (3) the opportunity of establishing a child-friendly school based on the solutions made by the teachers there.

Literature Review

Destructive behavior (Giallo & Little, 2003) or problem behavior (Ho, 2004) in the learning process is defined as the behavior which damages, inhibits and is not expected to occur. Giallo & Little (2003: 134) state that: "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".

Supriadi & Darmawan (2012: 163) confirm that environmental factors, such as the class, have 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 that a class is a setting for many activities; from academic ones, such as reading, writing and doing Math, to social activities such as playing, communicating with friends and debating. The teacher must jot down the order and make students follow this order. The task is given, monitored, collected and evaluated by the teacher, (2) the activities which occur in the class happen simultaneously; one group of students probably works on a writing assignment, others discuss or work on another assignment, (3) the things that occur quickly in the class; behaviours among the students such as debating or complaining because there is a student who cheats, fights, etc. need quick responses from the teacher, (4) the unexpected occurrences cannot be frequently predicted

in the class; for instance there is a student who is suddenly ill, or the fire alarm rings, (5) there is little privacy, a class is a public place where the students see how the teacher solves the problem, look at the unexpected occurrences and experience frustration, (6) a class has its own history, each student has his/her own memory about what happened in the class in the previous time.

The most frequent form of destructive behavior which occurs at the elementary school level, experienced by a teacher in Hong Kong (Leung and Ho, 2001), is irregularity and forgetfulness. Students' talking in the class, disturbing friends and being lazy frequently occur at high schools in England (Houghton, Wheldall, & Merrett, 1988) and Australia (Little, 2005). Other forms such as selfishness, talking during teachers' explanation and hyperactivity are reported as the most frequent behaviors that make it difficult for the teacher to teach in three provinces in China (Shen, Zhang, Zhang, Caldarella, Richardson & Szhat-zer, 2009). The forms of destructive behavior, showed by Indonesian students, are as follows; not paying attention towards teachers' explanation, rejecting instructions from the teacher, inviting students to talk in the class and drawing somethings in their books (Rahmawati, 2016).

Dreikur (2004) relates destructive behavior to students' individual problems such as; (a) attracting attention (attention-getting behavior), (b) seeking power (power-seeking behavior), (c) revenge (revenge-seeking behavior), (d) displaying incapability 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), the above four individual's actions will cause the four forms of behavior patterns which can be frequently seen in students during the learning process; they are (a) active-constructive pattern which is the behavioral pattern that is extreme and ambiguous, to be a superstar in his class and try to attract teachers' anger, (b) active-destructive pattern which is the behavioral pattern that is shown in the form of making jokes, easiness to get angry, rudness and

rebellion, (c) passive-constructive pattern which is the pattern that shows the form of late behavior in order to be always helped and expect assistance from others, (d) passive-destructive pattern which is the behavior pattern that shows laziness and stubbornness.

The concept of child friendly school is introduced by Unicef (2006) containing some regulations; one of them is that the teacher has the position of the authority figure and he is the learning facilitator, and the students are active participants in learning and the interaction between them must be in a democratic process and they should respect each other. Aqib (2008) explains in the model of Child Friendly School (CFS), that the teacher must have more positive assumptions about the students, the teacher must realize students' different potencies and give the opportunity to the students to choose the activity or play, in line with the students' interests.

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-disabled, child of an important person-child of an unimportant person, (2) the implementation of religious norms, and local and socialculture, (3) affection towards the students, giving attention to those who are weak in the learning process because applying physical or psychological punishment can traumatize the students, (4) respect the child's rights, either among the students or among the teachers. The learning method that can be applied by the teacher is as follows; (1) the learning process occurs in a certain form so that the students feel happy while following the lesson; there is no fear, worry or anxiety. The students become more active and creative and they do not feel inferior because of competing with other students.

Research Method

This research is a descriptive quantitative research. It was conducted at MAN 1 Pekanbaru. Data were taken from 124

students of grade XI (56 male and 68 female) with comparisons between them male . 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 for this research. They were taken through purposive sampling in which the teachers 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 via interviewing to deepen the result of the 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 solutions made by the teacher towards destructive behavior, such as just letting it be, punishing and educating the students in a friendly way. This questionnaire was filled in with answer choices on likert scale, such as always, often, seldom, sometimes and never.

The results of data collection from students' questionnaires were statistically processed with percentages to describe the type of destructive behaviors emerging in the learning process and students' opinions about the solutions done by the teacher towards destructive behavior. Meanwhile, the interview results with the teachers were described narratively , they describe 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 process 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 scores of destructive behaviors which occur in the learning process when the subject teacher and the counselor enter the class. The main difference is that learning conducted by the teacher is about the subject materials mastery, while learning with the school counselor is about students' daily effective life (Prayitno, 2009). In Indonesia, the school counselor is given a counseling service format which is a 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 standard content 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 Table 2:

Table 2. Forms of destructive behavior that often occur

Frequency	The Teacher	Students
Very Often	The students came late into the class when the learning process has 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 told jokes/ until other students laughed when the teacher was explaining the lesson

One in 5 teachers suggests a form of destructive behavior that has not been revealed by students, namely students using a laptop when the teacher explains the subject matter because of internet network facilities that can be accessed freely by students at school while the teacher is explaining the lesson in front of the class which even disturbs the concentration of other students.

Teacher's Solution of Destructive Behavior Cases

The results of students' questionnaire process show the teacher's handling of destructive behavior cases according to the opinion of students which 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 in 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 caring, keeping the self-

esteem of the students who did destructive behavior and talking to them in a good language. However, students' destructive behaviors occur again and again in the learning activity with the same teacher.

The change in 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 fair direct response to all students' behaviors which disturb the learning process. The teacher confirms that the students have better potency and appreciates every single change made by the students who did destructive behavior to be better.

The teacher's weak solution towards destructive behavior cases is seen from the answers of a small proportion of students (4,03%). This teacher's form of behavior is slow in responding to students' destructive behavior, and according to the students it is not assertive. The teacher is not consistent to rebuke the students who did destructive behavior in the class, and only done towards certain student until it seemed like the student is the trouble maker in the class. Consequently, the student does not change to be better, even was hate this teacher.

Apparently there are teachers who just let destructive behaviors occur in the class (1,6%), in which the teacher keeps delivering the lesson materials while the class is so noisy. According to the students, usually, this is done by the new teacher who still does not have any 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. It 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 with the students making troubles in the class, calling him/her names or asking that student 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 the student's answers about the form of handling destructive behavior in the class, very much depend on each individual teacher. Usually the senior teacher is more disciplined and very concerned about 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 (having 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 are teachers who doubt in handling cases of destructive behavior using 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 them, will this contradict the concept of child-friendly schools? The implementation of anti-violence laws and child protection in learning, makes them go awry in their attitude to discipline students for fear of being considered violent. Conversely, students will underestimate the teacher if he 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 tables in class.

Teachers who are not assertive will be underestimated by students, while teachers who discipline 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 that there is a need for socialization and training on strategies of 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) in 10 high schools in America in the 1950s that found that the influence of adolescent peer groups is based more on social popularity rather than academic achievement.

Teachers as implementers of the learning process are the spearhead of handling destructive behavior cases. Educating is the art of displaying the personality, spontaneity and emotions of the 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 they behave and why. It requires some time and attention to positively impact the achievement of learning outcomes (Khalsa, 2008: 32).

The classroom ecology approach (Arends, 2008: 179) explains that the students' bad behavior should be thought of by the teacher as an action that disrupts the learning activities. The teacher's intervention towards bad behavior should be done quickly, lightly and intentionally 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 behaviors in the learning process because (1) they cannot always maintain moral awareness of complex classroom environments so they cannot always see what is happening (2) they feel more easiness and not being really threatened when ignoring the destructive behavior of students even though it will cause many problems in the future.

From the description of the above SRA system, 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 they live in anxiety, fear and failure (Kazhim, 2011: 27). Indeed the habit of hitting a child in educating him shows that adults are wrong in choosing the right method that can touch the child's soul and rectify his behavior.

The form of right solution is the firmness from the teacher. A firm teacher in educating the students with destructive behavior cases needs to pay attention to 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) give a solution that prevails each person, (c) give a simple solution that is easy to do, (d) give a solution that can be predicted by the students in terms of when it will happen, and (e) place the students in a positive and emotional condition; not afraid, not worried or stressed. Based on these effectiveness aspects, the teacher can categorize the actions of the students with destructive behavior cases into firmness, educating or punishing. When the students are in emotional, stressful or scary positions, their negative behaviors that are expected to change into positive ones will not happen. The differences between the firmness of the teacher in educating and in punishing, are mentioned in 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 mistakes	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. Know who is in charge
4	Function	Understanding, solving, preventing of conformity internalization.	Revenge and Prevention
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 ability to be better 3. Feeling respected 4. Taking action to think, feel and build good attitude 5. Owning 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 God's creatures who actively learn, likewise the educators. Islamic teaching even asks the human to learn starting from their birth, until they pass away. 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, "...Allah will raise those who have believed among you and those who were given knowledge, by degrees. And Allah is Acquainted with what you do" ... (Al-Mujadalah, Verse 11).

Students' amazing power to learn comes from themselves (Harmin, 2012: 8). Related to that, Prayitno (2009: 226) explains that any learning activity needs certain energy. The stronger the activity, the more 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 is organized by the teacher that can optimize them until they have positive impacts towards the students at that time and their future.

This research is only limited to one school with limited number of samples so it can be investigated further with a bigger number of respondents. However, from the results of this research, it can be concluded that educators need to do introspection and evaluation towards their pedagogical competence, characters and social emotional when dealing with 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 practise how to

be firm with the doers of destructive behavior and not to punish them. Teachers' firm education strategies on destructive behavior doers create Child-Friendly School in accordance with the values of Islamic Education.

A firm teacher in the context of Islamic Education Institution must be more capable of implementing the values of Islamic teachings from Allah and Prophet Muhammad Peace be Upon Him in preparing the next generation through Child-Friendly School Program. Therefore, Islamic Schools indeed must be the pilot projects for implementing this CFS. The results of this research also recommend the implementation of CFS at Islamic schools under the Ministry of Religion, Republic of Indonesia; the need for more specific rules on how teachers should handle disruptive behavior in students so that violence does not occur in schools.

The demand for the teacher alone that he 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 the classical learning (Khon, 2014: 105). Students should be ethical in class when learning takes place by sitting politely, calmly, humbly and respectfully, and through listening, and watching without looking everywhere unless there is a need, not reaching out their arms, not banging the table, not picking their noses and not speaking too much. Students should enter the classroom in a neat and clean condition both clothes and body (Khon, 2014).

Acknowledgment

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

References

- A, Richard I. 2013. *Learn to Teach 9th Edition Book I*. Translation by Made Feida Yulia. Jakarta: Salemba.
- A, Z. 2008. *Child Friendly School*. Jakarta: Yrama Widya
- A.G. Hughes & E.H.Hughes. 2003 . *Learning & Teaching Pengantar Psikologi pembelajaran Modern*. Bandung: Nuansa.
- 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, Jensen, 2010. *Super Teacher and Super teaching*. Translation by Benyamin Molan. Jakarta: PT Indeks.
- 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, 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>
- 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. 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>.
- 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.
- Jones, V., & Jones, L. 2009. *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems* (9th ed). New York: Prentice Hall.
 - Kazhim, Muhammad Nabil. 2011. *Successful in Educating Kids Without Violence*. Solo: Samudra
 - L.A. Johnson. 2009. *Creative and Interesting Teaching*. Translation by: Dani Dharyani. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.
 - Mattis, J. S. (2002). Religion and spirituality in the meaning-making and coping experiences of African American women: A qualitative analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 309–321
 - McMahon, Brendan Tand Hebert C. Biggs. (2012). Examining Spirituality and Intrinsic Religious Orientation as a means of coping with Exam Anxiety. *Journal Vulnerable Groups & Inclusion*. Vol.3 2012.DOI: 10.3402/vgi.v3i0.14918
 - Mulyadi. 2009. *Classroom Management*. Malang: UIN Malang Press.
 - P. Marais & C. Meier. 2010. *Disruptive Behavior in The Foundation Phase of Schooling*. *South African Journal of Education* Vo.30 No.1, 41-57.
 - 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.
 - S, Didi & Darmawan, Deni. 2012. *The Communication of Learning*. Bandung: PT Remadja Rosdakarya.
 - 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.S. Khalsa. 2008. *The Teaching of Discipline and Self-Esteem*. Translation by: Hartati Widiastuti. Jakarta: PT Indeks
 - UNICEF. 2006. *Manual Child Friendly School*. New York: Unicefs Devision 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.