Disruptive Behavior in School

Disruptive behavior as physical movements

Ragna Lill Stavnes

Masteroppgave i spesialpedagogikk

Institutt for spesialpedagogikk

Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Vår 2014

Disruptive Behavior as physical movements in the classroom

2014

Disruptive Behavior in School

Ragna Lill Stavnes

http://www.duo.uio.no

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Summary

Background

This thesis is a part of the research project "Disruptive Behavior in School", led by Professor Liv Duesund at the University of Oslo. It is a comparative study on disruptive behavior between elementary and middle schools in Norway and the United States of America. The focus of this thesis is on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, namely physical movements observed in the classroom, and how these physical movements can be disruptive. In this thesis, disruptive behavior is defined as behavior that inhibits the student's own learning, the peers learning and/or the teachers ability to operate efficiently in the classroom. The physical movements displayed in the classroom are discussed and analyzed through use of theory and perspectives on disruptive behavior and the Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) Skill Model.

Research questions:

Two research questions are developed for this thesis. These questions give different perspectives on analyzing the physical movements observed:

1) What types of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom?
2) How can the displayed disruptive physical movements be related to the Skill Model?

Methodology

Since this thesis is written related to a research project, there were certain requirements in regards to methodology that had to be taken into consideration. It is a qualitative study, in which four qualitative observations were conducted and a pre-described observation form was employed to document the observations. The student observed was chosen through purposeful sampling. Furthermore, a semi-structured interview was also conducted as a supplement to the observations. The interview was recorded and transcribed.

Results and conclusion

It is impossible to observe and describe all physical movements that occur in a classroom; therefore a definition of what I considered to be disruptive physical movements was made. Based on this definition and the four observations, three behavior categories of disruptive physical movements were identified. The most frequent types of disruptive physical

movements observed in the classroom consisted of off-task behavior where the student in focus (made anonymous and referred to as NN) was out-of-seat or walking around without interacting with other students or teacher, and off-task behavior where the student interacted with other students and/or the teacher. Both these categories, describe a student being out-of-seat, or walking around in the classroom when other assigned activities should be performed. Walking around without interacting with others is first and foremost seen as disruptive to the student's own learning. When the student interacted (talking, touching or disturbed others) while walking around it not only disturbed the student's own learning, but was seen to disturb other students and the teacher as well. The third category of disruptive physical movements was mainly observed in the first observations, but refers to situations where the student was sitting in his seat, while displaying disruptive physical movements not related to learning, for example touching/distracting another student when other assigned tasks should be performed.

There can be several reasons for why a student displays disruptive behavior in school; I chose to analyze the physical movements displayed by NN through the use of Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) Skill Model. Skills, instruction, and becoming emotionally involved in the learning activity are seen as important aspects of this model. NN is a student who performs below average in all academic subjects in school, and is described as easily distracted. In the observations conducted in English and History class, NN displayed all three categories of disruptive physical movements. He displayed these movements when the teacher was out of the classroom, during individual work when the teacher was not nearby giving direct instructions, and in situations when other students were also up walking. I discuss if the physical disruptive movements displayed by NN can be a result of lacking the skills or adequate instructions to perform the task demanded of him in the classroom context, and if the disruptive physical behavior can be a result of not reaching stage four (proficient). I also discuss conditions that were present when NN did not display disruptive physical movements in the classroom. When NN displayed disruptive physical movements, he was not on-task or involved in the learning activity. NN seemed to need concrete instructions on what to do in order be able to stay on-task. In the third observation, in the kitchen, NN did not display disruptive physical movements. In this context, he seemed involved and was not distracted by other students in the classroom.

Acknowledgements

There are some people who should receive particular acknowledgement for making this thesis possible.

First and foremost, I wish to thank Professor Liv Duesund for the opportunity to take part in the research project “Disruptive Behavior in School”, and for giving me the opportunity to write my thesis in Berkeley, California. The semester has been inspiring and I have learned very much!

I also wish to thank Liv Duesund, Magnar Ødegård and Elliot Turiel for the help, discussions and constant support along the way.

My family also deserves to be acknowledged for their support throughout my studies. I would especially like to thank my mother, Tove Børseth, for all the times she picked up the phone when I was writing papers and needed someone to discuss it with, and Sverre Stenløkk for the support throughout the last six years.

I also have a wish to thank Stine Solberg for the moral support throughout the semester in Berkeley, and other residents and friends at International House who gladly helped me with the English grammar when I was stuck on a sentence.

Sincerely,

Ragna Lill Stavnes

Berkeley, May 2014

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Background 1

1.2 Introduction 2

1.3 Research question 4

1.4 Overview of the thesis 4

2 Theoretical Framework 6

2.1 Disruptive behavior 6

2.1.1 Disruptive behavior and the classroom context 8

2.1.2 Cultural expectations and the social relativity of disruptive behavior 10

2.2 Physical movements 12

2.2.1 Earlier literature on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior 13

2.2.2 Defining disruptive physical movements 14

2.3 The Skill Model 15

2.3.1 Five stages of Skill Acquisition 16

2.3.2 The Skill Model, the classroom, instructions and disruptive behavior 18

3 Methodology 22

3.1 Qualitative approach 22

3.2 Design 23

3.2.1 Sample 24

3.3 Observation 24

3.4 Interview 26

3.5 Implementation of observations and interview 26

3.6 Hermeneutic Analysis 28

3.7 Reliability and Validity 30

3.7.1 Reliability 30

3.7.2 Validity 31

3.7.3 Generalizing the results 34

3.8 Ethical considerations 35

4 Result and Discussion 37

4.1 Case Description 37

4.1.1 The Student 37

4.1.2 The School 38

4.1.3 Subject in which the observations took place 38
4.2 What types of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom? 40
4.2.1 Behavior categories 41
4.2.2 Results from the first observation 42
4.2.3 Results from the second observation 45
4.2.4 Results from the third observation 46
4.2.5 Results from the fourth observation 48
4.2.6 Summary of the observations 49
4.2.7 Interview 49
4.3 Discussion 51
4.4 Research question 2: How can the displayed disruptive physical movements be related to the Skill Model? 58
4.4.1 Disruptive physical movements due to lack of skills and/or instruction? 59
4.4.2 Not reaching stage four (proficient) 62
4.4.3 On-task but not involved: not displaying disruptive behavior 64
4.4.4 On-task and involved: not displaying disruptive behavior 66
4.4.5 Other considerations 68
4.4.6 Summary and answer to research question 2 69
4.4.7 Possible practical implications 70
4.5 Summary of chapter four 71
5 Conclusion 75
5.1 Final considerations 75
5.1.1 Limitations of this study and suggestions to further research 76
Bibliography 78
Appendixes 85

1 Introduction

This chapter presents the background and intentions for this thesis. The research questions are introduced, and an overview of the thesis is outlined.

1.1 Background

This thesis is a part of the research project "Disruptive Behavior in School", led by Professor Liv Duesund at the Department of Special Needs Education at the University of Oslo.
The research project "Disruptive Behavior in School" is a comparative study between elementary and middle schools in Norway and the United States. The aim of the research project is to broaden the understanding of the sources and contexts of disruptive behavior, and to generate knowledge that can be valuable for institutions educating teachers, and thereby improve education and services for students (Duesund, 2013).

Disruptive behavior in school is not a new phenomenon, but is still brought to peoples attention worldwide as a major concern (Elliot & Place, 2004). Several reports show that both teachers and students are affected by disruptiveness in the classroom. In a student survey (*Elevundersøkelsen 2007*) conducted in Norway, it is evident that much time is used on other activities than learning. 30 percent of the student that answered this survey report that other students often or always disturb them in class. Ten percent of the students asked, reported that they disturb other students that are working. One of three students also reported that the teacher has to wait, while the students are settling down and the class can begin. Much learning time is lost due to disruptions, waiting for instructions and help (Danielsen, Skaar, & Skaalvik, 2007). According to the *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS), up to 25 percent of teachers in most of the 23 countries surveyed report losing at least 30 percent of their lesson time to disruptions and administrative tasks, with an international average of 13 percent of teacher time spent on maintaining order in the classroom (OECD, 2009). As this can indicate, disruptiveness in the classroom affects learning and can emphasize the importance of researching the disruptive behavior displayed in school.

I first heard about the project "Disruptive Behavior in School" during the last year of my bachelor degree. I found it interesting and wanted to know more about the subject, and how

different types of disruptive behavior can be a challenge in the classroom. My interest in disruptive behavior continued to develop through the first year of my master degree, where I focused on Social and Emotional problems in school. My interest in the physical aspect of disruptive behavior occurred when I worked as a call substitute in a school in Oslo. In particular, movements that occur in classrooms caught my attention and peaked my interest. In a classroom one can observe a multitude of different movements. Some movements have a purpose and are planned, like fetching a book that is needed, while other movements do not. Some of the movements are on-task and some off-task, and some movements are perceived as disruptive, and some are not. In this thesis I have selected to view physical movements as a type of disruptive behavior that may occur in a classroom context. Observing physical movements in the classroom might give insight in what characterize this type of disruptive behavior and the context it occurs in.

1.2 Introduction

The term disruptive behavior as physical movements might be somewhat confounding, because not all movements that take place in a classroom may be perceived as disruptive. There is a subjective element attached to the term. Some teachers and peers might have a high tolerance limit in what they perceive as disruptive behavior, and some a lower tolerance limit. It is "in the eye of the beholder" (Book & Skeen, 1987, p. 399). The type of classroom activity the students participate in is also something that might have an effect on the perception of disruptiveness. When working independently, the disruptiveness might be more noticeable than when the students work together on a project. Another aspect that might be of interest to discuss is that in a school context the students are often expected to sit on their chairs and be attentive, to work on-task. This might not suit every student. Maybe some students experience a need to move around more than their peers (Sigsgaard, 2006). Some movements might also be out of necessity for the student, and not something that is done because he/she wants to be disruptive.

In order to review existing literature on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, I conducted a search within the databases of the libraries of the University of Oslo and the University of California, Berkeley. Most resources were found using Bibsys (The Norwegian library database) and Oskicat (UC Berkeley Library Web Catalog). The reference librarian at the University of California, Berkeley helped me locate relevant (peer-reviewed) articles on

the subject. The primary sources of articles were ERIC, PsycINFO, Scopus, JSTOR, Google Scholar and the web-page http://www.eippee.eu. Most of the literature identified on the topic was quantitative studies that underline that physical disruptive behavior is something teachers found troublesome in the classroom. I want to note that I have only been researching this subject for less than a year, and that different searches may have given different results.

In this thesis I define disruptive physical movements as: physical movements that disrupts the student's own learning, physical movements the student conduct that could disturb other students and/or the teacher. I will present categories based on this definition and the observed physical movements in the classroom. Furthermore, the physical movements will be explored through theories and perspectives regarding disruptive behavior, and aspects within the Skill Model of Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986).

The Skill Model is a five-stage model for skill acquisition. It describes how one can go from novice to expert in a skill domain. The emphasis is on learning through instruction, accumulated experience, and the importance of becoming emotionally involved in the learning activity. I will argue that the absence of skills, the instructions given and the involvement in a learning activity may have an effect on the disruptive physical movements displayed. If a student is not on-task, involved and focused due to a lack of skills to perform a task, or if a student does not receive the instructions necessary to perform the task given, it may lead to other means of engagement in the classroom (e.g. displaying disruptive physical movements). If a student has a hard time with academic subjects in school, or lacks the skills to perform a required task, is it then possible for the student to become emotionally involved in the learning activity? Can the displayed physical movements be seen as not reaching stage four (proficient) in the model? The Skill Model will be used to analyze the observed student's classroom behavior and to answer the second research question.

In this thesis the term 'students that *display* disruptive behavior' is used, instead of students *with* behavior problems'. This distinction is made because the behavior displayed is not the dominating trait of the student. A student is first and foremost a person, who in some contexts displays disruptive behavior. The student and the context are in a mutual dynamic interaction.

The arguments presented in this thesis are not meant as criticism of the teacher or the school. Rather, the arguments and theory are presented as a perspective to view the physical

movements in the classroom, and propose alternative reactions to certain situations. Teachers face several demands and challenges in the classroom besides dealing with disruptive behavior. The implication is that they do not always have the opportunity to deal with every student's need each time disruptive behavior is being displayed (Charles, 2011; Colvin, 2010; Corrie, 2002).

1.3 Research question

Based on the previous presented background and theme, I have come up with these research questions:

1. What types of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom?
2. How can the displayed disruptive physical movements be related to the Skill Model?

The first research question was made to distinguish different types of physical movements that can be linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom, and physical movements that may not be perceived as disruptive. To answer this research question I will identify the types of physical movements that I observe in the classroom, present the results and discuss these physical movements related to theories and perspectives regarding disruptive behavior in school.

The second research question will give me a different framework for discussing the physical movements identified. The focus when answering this research question will be on the observed student's displayed behavior, and since the model put emphasis on skill, instruction and becoming emotionally involved to progress in skill-development, this will be a focus point when answering this research question.

1.4 Overview of the thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters. In the first chapter, the background, theme and research questions are presented. The second chapter describes the theoretical framework of the thesis. Here, perspectives and theory on disruptive behavior and a definition of disruptive physical movements are described and the Skill Model is outlined. The third chapter will present the methodological approach of this thesis. A short theoretical description of qualitative methods, design, observation and interview will be given. Implementation of the observations and

interview will be explained. Moreover, hermeneutics as an approach to analysis will be outlined, and the reliability and validity will be discussed. This chapter concludes with ethical considerations. In chapter four the results will be presented and then discussed in light for theory presented in chapter two. The discussion will strive to answer the research questions. The fifth chapter consists of a summary of significant findings and a conclusion.

2 Theoretical Framework

This chapter will give a theoretical overview of disruptive behavior. A definition of disruptive physical movements will be presented and the Skill Model will be described.

2.1 Disruptive behavior

There is no simple way to distinguish and define disruptive behavior. It encompasses a wide register of expressions, terms and concepts. It can express itself in different forms and can be caused by several reasons (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Zionts, Zionts, & Simpson, 2002). Children who exhibit troublesome behavior have, throughout history and in diverse literature, been referred to by a variety of labels such as behavior disordered, emotionally disturbed, disruptive, maladjusted, deviant, misbehaving, or children with social and emotional problems, or emotional and behavioral disorders (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Elliot & Place, 2004; Kauffmann, Brigham, & Mock, 2004; Kauffmann & Kneedler, 1981; Rhodes, 1969). The variations in terminology can reflect concepts that are unique to history, culture and to particular professions and theoretical positions (Befring, Duesund, & Popovici, 2013; Webber & Plotts, 2008). The terminology used to label children that display problematic behavior can serve as a reminder that this is a multidisciplinary field, and that there are different perspectives existing in this field of study. In this thesis, disruptive behavior is the term that will be used even though other terms also may describe the same (or similar) phenomenon.

These labels are vague and can indicate a wide range of behaviors. A label used does not give a description of the behavior displayed. A way to conceptualize behavior exhibited in school is as internalized and externalized behavior (Kauffmann, 2013; Webber & Plotts, 2008). Students that display disruptive behavior are not a homogeneous group. Also, students tend to demonstrate characteristics across these categories; thus the categories are not mutually exclusive. The internalized profile of behavior represents difficulties of an introvert nature. It can include problems in one's self such as worries, fears and somatic complaints, which can result in social withdrawal. Unlike the children that display more externalized behavior, these children are frequently forgotten in school, since they may cause fewer problems for teachers and the class as a whole. As this behavior may not be seen as disruptive to others than the

student him/her self, this category will not be the focus of this thesis. Children who exhibit externalized behavior may intrude on the rights of others (e.g. to learn in school or teach a lesson) and can often break the norms of their environment. Displayed externalizing behavior can prevent the student and other students from learning, and the teacher from educating (Zionts et al., 2002). The students that display externalized behavior may be perceived as overactive, aggressive or disruptive. They can be often out-of-seat, talk to others and self, not pay attention to the task at hand, ignore class rules, refuse to work, be perceived as disobedient to teachers or physically bother other students. They can also be characterized as impulsive, struggling with low attention span, and get easily disturbed by their surroundings (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Kauffmann et al., 2004; Webber & Plotts, 2008; Zionts et al., 2002; Aasen, Nordtug, Ertesvåg, & Leirvik, 2002).

Displayed behavior is dynamic and can be of different scope and severity, from relatively mild and moderate transient problems, to more complex, persistent and severe behaviors (Damsgaard, 2010; Kauffmann & Kneedler, 1981; Nordahl, Sørlie, Manger, & Tveit, 2005). Students that are perceived as disruptive do not have a monopoly on problematic behavior, all children can display inappropriate or challenging behavior at one time or another. Albeit, it is inherently the behavior's frequency, intensity, duration, consistency and scope that may cause some children to be perceived as having a behavior *problem.* Their behavior often lasts longer, and is more extensive and often more intense (Cullinan, 2004; Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2009; Kirk & Gallagher, 1983; Webber & Plotts, 2008; Aasen et al., 2002).

The behaviors that frequently occur in school, and can be seen as disruptive, are behaviors that interfere with learning and teaching. These behaviors are typically school related, and may inhibit the student's own learning, other students' learning and the school as an educator. The behavior displayed might also violate the norms and rules of the social environment (e.g. classroom) and therefore be perceived as disruptive (Befring et al., 2013; Charles, 2011; Colvin, 2010; Damsgaard, 2010; Keogh, 2003; Nordahl et al., 2005; Ogden, 2009; Zionts et al., 2002; Aasen et al., 2002).

In their study Wheldall and Merrett (1988) found that teachers regarded 'talking out of turn' as the most frequent and troublesome behavior when it occurs. 'Disturbing others' or 'hindering other children' was regarded as the next most troublesome behavior in the classroom. One other type of behavior that has been identified as a concern to teachers is that

of children needlessly wandering about in the classroom (Book & Skeen, 1987; Wheldall & Merrett, 1988; Zionts et al., 2002). Wheldall and Merrett (1988) call this behavior 'out-of-seat' behavior. Seen isolated, these behaviors are not all severe disruptions, but in a classroom setting when these behaviors often occur, or occurs simultaneously, the class environment may suffer, the students' learning process and the teachers educational tasks might be made more difficult (Corrie, 2002; Nordahl et al., 2005; Wheldall & Merrett, 1988; Aasen et al., 2002).

In this thesis disruptive behavior will be seen as behavior that inhibits the students' own learning, the peers' learning and/or the teachers' ability to operate efficiently in the classroom.

2.1.1 Disruptive behavior and the classroom context

Behavior displayed in school rarely occurs in isolation, and cannot be separated from the context where it occurs. The behavior can rarely be attributed to a singular particular cause, and might reflect both the characteristics of the student and the teacher, as well as the way the classroom and instructional programs are organized and implemented (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Charles, 2011; Corrie, 2002; Keogh, 2003; Smith & Taylor, 2010).

Classrooms are complex dynamic and social environments in which students face several demands; what to do, what not do, when to talk, when to be quiet, when to be active and when to be still. The disruptive behavior may occur when a student is in a particular situation in the classroom, when seated with certain students, during long instructional periods, when expected to work on certain tasks and subjects, or when faced with particular difficult tasks (Keogh, 2003). Corrie (2002) views disruptive behavior as the end product of complex interactions that occurs in the classroom. Students are continuously in interaction with their environment, and are in turn affected by their surroundings. It is a mutual dynamic interaction.

Befring and Duesund (2012) indicate that children that display disruptive behavior in school often have developed the behavior as a result of negative attention from their environment and constant academic defeats, which could result in low self-esteem and low coping skills. The students that display the behavior might have entered a negative circle where the

behavior can induce negative attention, and the negative attention might release an even more disruptive behavior. Redl (1975) emphasizes that the source of disruption varies and that it is important to see behind the behavior displayed. He asks the question, "What does it mean?" (p. 572). A student's perception and reason for displaying the behavior may differ from the teachers' perception of the behavior displayed. Whereas a teacher may see the behavior displayed as a disruption, the reason behind the behavior may be that the student is, as an example, bored or find the task to hard, and automatically try to ward off that feeling by engaging in some substitute action. What this action may be varies; some students find it hard to stay in their seats and other students look out of the window, etc. It may therefore be important to study not only the student that displays the behavior, but also the disruptive prone situations where the behaviors occur, e.g. the classroom context (Redl, 1975).

Charles (2011) mentions several factors that may promote disruptive behavior in the classroom. He relates it to factors concerning the student, the class-peer group, the instructional environment and the teacher. According to Charles (2011) a student may disrupt the class to avoid failure or because they want attention from the teacher or peers. Conditions in the class-peer group are suggested to be provocation from other students or contagious group behavior. In the instructional environment the conditions are implied to be tedium. A student may begin to fidget or move around after a time when an instructional activity requires continued close attention, especially if the topic is perceived as hard, not appealing, and/or lack meaning. A student might grow restless when required to work on topics they do not comprehend or see as without purpose or lack of stimulation. The teacher might also be a factor that influences the student to disrupt. The teacher's behavior may for example be seen as unclear or unfair, and thus create reactions from the students in return (Charles, 2011). Greene (2009) challenges the assumptions that students just want attention or are not motivated or have a bad attitude. He sees the challenging behavior as a reaction to demands being placed on the student that exceed his/her capacity to respond adaptively to the situation, and view the behavior displayed as a reaction to the skills students may be lagging. Greene (2009) emphasizes that if the teacher identifies the skills a student is lacking, one can understand why the child is challenging in the classroom. Corrie (2002) writes that disruptive behavior may be a result of struggling with academic work in school. In other words, there are suggested several reasons and meanings behind the displayed disruptive behavior in the classroom.

2.1.2 Cultural expectations and the social relativity of disruptive behavior

Behaviors that deviate from the cultural expectations (i.e. school and classroom culture) are often perceived as disruptive (Algozzine, 1977; Rhodes, 1969; Webber & Plotts, 2008). Be it implicit or explicit, each culture has its own moral code, standards and expectations of behavior. The seriousness of certain types of behaviors is more or less seen as constant across cultures, e.g. hitting teacher or peers. The seriousness of other types of behavior may vary from one group to the next. Teacher, school and student characteristics have been shown to play an important role in teachers' perception and reaction to the behavior displayed (Borg, 1998). Several studies bring up the social relativity of disruptive behavior (Algozzine & Curran, 1979; Elliot & Place, 2004; Frude & Gault, 1984; Webber & Plotts, 2008; Zionts et al., 2002). A student defined and perceived as 'disruptive' by one teacher might not be defined this way by another. Also, teachers (and peers) may have different thresholds for labeling a students action as disruptive, and differ in their opinion of what is acceptable behavior in the classroom and what is not. An action, considered to be 'disruptive', has in some cases been shown to be relative to the particular student as well. Some students may come to be labeled as 'disruptive' by teachers and peers, and this might influence their actions to be more readily seen as disruptive (Frude & Gault, 1984). The teachers' experience has also been portrayed to be an important source of influence on how serious a behavior is perceived to be. In Borg's (1998) study, the least experienced teachers interpreted the behaviors more severely than the more experienced teachers. This was related to the assumption that experienced teachers grew more tolerant. Students can also be perceived as disruptive under the tutelage of one teacher, and appear fairly 'normal' in another class, with another teacher (Rhodes, 1969). Which may emphasize the contextual aspect of behavior.

The context in which the behavior occurs is also an important factor in the perception of disruptiveness. A student running around in the Physical Education class is likely not to be seen as disruptive. But a student walking around during silent reading, may disturb other students and the teacher, and may therefore be seen as disruptive.

Redl (1975) underlines the fact that even the most unintentional and harmless behavior might produce disruptive effects. Almost anything that could be viewed as harmless, or even a positive trait, can become disruptive when circumstances elevate it to such a level.

According to Frude and Gault (1984) there is convincing evidence that show aspects of school organization and climate that might contribute to the frequency of disruptive incidents. This led them to suggest that there are 'disruptive schools' (and classrooms) and not only 'disruptive students'. Students that display disruptive behavior receive a great deal of attention in the school context. The expectations that exist in some school cultures for homogeneity, harmony and functionality might provide limited room for "deviant" behavior (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Damsgaard, 2010). Kauffmann (1989) also mentions that rigidity and failure to tolerate differences in the school context is something to take into account. He notes that by making the same behavioral and academic requirements of all students, school can force students who are only slightly different from others into the roles of social deviants or academic failures. Through inflexibility and insistence on sameness, schools might create conditions that inhibit or punish healthy expressions of individuality. Furthermore, in an atmosphere of repression/control, students might express resentment, hostility or passive resistance to the system. Thus, by suppressing individuality and demanding uniformity, schools might contribute to learning and behavior problems instead of facilitating optimum development (Kauffmann, 1989).

The problematic behavior displayed can thus be a reflection on the demands some children meet in school, like the need to function collectively and to be able to conform to written and unwritten rules and demands. The school is, in a marked degree, a place to 'sit and listen', and not often adapted to students need for activity (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Corrie, 2002). According to Befring and Duesund (2012) disruptive behavior in school can be considered as an imbalance between cerebral and physical activity, where the emphasis in school is often on intellectual activities, thus neglecting practical learning and physical learning activities. In this point of view, one might interpret the disruptiveness as a reaction related to unspent energy. Research also suggest that boys, in a traditional classroom, seem to have a need for more freedom to move around, and might need a more informal social setting than girls (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Corrie, 2002; Way, 2011; Wheldall & Merrett, 1988). This can reflect that boys often have a more visual, tactile and kinesthetic learning style. It can be claimed that the traditional school context can be a more severe challenge for boys than for girls, and thus they may disrupt the learning more often, (e.g. walking around in the classroom).

2.2 Physical movements

Disruptive behavior can be of both verbal and physical character (Befring & Duesund, 2012). In this thesis the focus are on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, namely physical movements in the classroom and how these movements can be seen as disruptive. Out-of-seat behavior, moving about the room, wandering, fidgeting, and turning in the seat, disturbing others, are some of the terms I came across in literature. These terms are some examples on physical movements that can be seen as disruptive physical movements in this thesis.

One way to conceptualize the physical movements is to characterize the movement displayed as on-task and off-task. According to Colvin (2010) two of the most essential expectations teachers have toward their students are cooperation and on-task behavior. On-task behavior is related to following the teachers' directions and engaging in the assigned classroom activity. From a learning perspective, all activities not directed towards learning can be viewed as off-task behavior (Kilian, Hofer, Fries, & Kuhnle, 2010). Off-task behavior can therefore refer to any behavior in which the teacher's instructions are not followed and are not connected with engagement in and completion of the required task (Colvin, 2010; Shumate & Wills, 2010; Zentall, 1980). Normally, when students follow their teacher's directions, working on-task, and productively engage in the activities, learning will likely occur. By contrast, if the students are not following directions, are off-task, and not engaged or involved in the classroom activities, the intended learning do not occur, and behavior problems, like disruptive behavior, can arise (Colvin, 2010). Students that are doing things not related to the task given, (e.g. walking around the classroom, being out of ones seat, disturbing others) without performing tasks related to the teachers instructions, are thus considered as being off-task and may be interpreted as disruptive by the teacher and other students.

According to Hofer (2007) off-task behavior can be active or passive. Active off-task behavior is described as behavior that disturbs teaching and learning and is likely to affect other students or the teacher, thus impairing the instructional process as a whole. This definition is similar to the one used for disruptive behavior in this thesis (see page 8). Passive off-task behavior is described as being disengaged, but not intentionally disturbing the surroundings. This can also be viewed as relevant when looking at physical movements in relation to disruptive behavior, since a student who walks around without disturbing or interacting with the teacher or other students may disturb his/her own learning by exhibiting the physical movement, even though he/she seemingly do not disturb anyone else.

If disruptive behavior is viewed as interfering with the students' learning, impeding instructional delivery or both, the definition of off-task behavior and disruptive behavior is not mutually exclusive, but one may note that a student can be off-task and not disruptive to others, or disruptive while doing an assigned task (Shumate & Wills, 2010).

There can be sliding transitions between off-task and on-task behavior. Since human beings are complex, there may not be an easy way to define which actions are on-task and what is simply a shift of task. Hofer (2007) suggests that a switch in behavior occurs when a student is actively learning and doing on-task related activities, but is for example disturbed or feel tempted by an attractive distraction, and thus switch from on-task to off-task behavior. This shift in behavior may also occur if a student wants to avoid the task at hand, or judge the forthcoming task as to challenging.

Disruptive behavior can diminish or expand as a consequence of the conditions present in the classroom environment (Befring & Duesund, 2012). Colvin (2010) mentions prerequisite conditions in the classroom that are positive contributors to defusing disruptive behavior and that can help students to stay on-task. These are clear classroom expectations, making sure the students have the necessary skills, that transitions are carefully planned, the task requirement are clearly presented, adequate time is allocated for task completion, on-task directions is checked and that procedures for students requiring help are established.

2.2.1 Earlier literature on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior

Through search for literature about the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, quantitative studies of which classroom behaviors teachers found most troublesome and frequently occurring in the classroom dominated. Functional analysis of behavior and research which included different hypothesizes on why behavior occurs and are maintained in the classroom was also prominent. Even though qualitative studies of the physical aspect of disruptive behavior was not found, the quantitative studies indicate that physical disruptive behavior is a frequently occurring phenomenon in the classroom, which may inhibit the learning process and affect the classroom context.

The articles found conceptualize the physical disruptive behavior differently. As an example, Patterson (2009) writes that out-of-seat behavior is a common behavior and is viewed as a

disruptive problem for classroom teachers. The behavior is seen on a continuum. In its mildest form, students simply leave their seats, and wander about the classroom not disturbing others. In its most severe form, students leave their seats while simultaneously cursing, throwing objects, and/or distracting other students. In Patterson's (2009) study out-of-seat behavior is defined as the student leaving his/her seat without the teachers permission, and walking around the room while class was in session. But if the student got up from his chair to sharpen a pencil and returned immediately to his desk, without interacting or disturbing others, then an out-of-seat event was not recorded, since this was an on-task movement. In his study Zentall (1980) also have a category he calls 'out-of-seat' behavior. His criteria for this behavior are that it occurs when the normal sitting surface of neither buttock is applied to the student's seat. Since he uses both categories, off-task and out-of-seat behavior in his study, he points out that the observer should not judge the behavior additionally off-task if the student is out of his/her seat. Book and Skeen (1987) also view off-task behavior and out-of-seat behavior as mutually exclusive in their study, this because in their definition of off-task behavior the student can only be counted as off-task when seated, and if the student is out-of-seat and off-task, the student should only be counted as being out-of-seat. As this paragraph can illustrate, there are several ways to operationalize the physical aspect of disruptive behavior. I use both terms, wandering and out-of-seat, in this thesis. Wandering is mainly used when the student is walking around in the classroom. Out-of-seat is primarily used when the student is not far from his/her seat. I have made my own definition of physical movements that are seen as disruptive.

2.2.2 Defining disruptive physical movements

When defining disruptive physical movements in this case, the following will be included: physical movements that disrupt the students' own learning, physical movements the student conduct that could disturb other students and/or the teacher. This includes both gross and fine motor skills (e.g. walking around, being out of seat, disturbing others and touching or fidgeting with objects). The physical movements will be characterize as linked to disruptive behavior if the student's movements interferes with his/her own learning, interferes with other students learning, or movements that interferes with the teacher ability to operate efficiently in the classroom context. If the student is out-of-seat, but on-task, the movement will not be characterized as disruptive if it does not disturb other students or receive a reaction from peers or teacher.

In chapter four, categories of physical movements observed in the classroom that could disturb the student himself, other students and/or the teacher will be made based on the distinctions above.

2.3 The Skill Model

In this section the Skill Model will be described while also outlining the five stages of this model. Furthermore, I will describe how this model can be seen as applicable to the classroom context and related to disruptive physical movements.

Hubert and Stuart Dreyfus (1986) developed a model to describe how one through specific instruction and accumulated experience can progress from novice to expert in a particular skill. The Skill Model encompasses both explicit rule following and intuition. It describes a progression from the analytic behavior of a detached subject, a novice learning through instruction of context-free elements and combining the facts by context-free rules, to emotionally involved skillful behavior at the higher skill level, where intuitive knowledge is generalized from prior experiences. The five stages in the model describes how the student can move from the rule based context-free understanding of a skill to a holistic and intuitive understanding and response to the situation and demands. The dependency of rules and slow analysis of the situation, which characterize the first two steps in the model, is in the later stages replaced by an intuitive, interpretive and holistic way of approaching a situation.

Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) emphasize that learning is a dynamic process, but to explicit explain the process the model is divided into stages. In the next section a description of these five stages will be presented. These stages are: 1.Novice, 2.Advanced beginner, 3.Competent, 4.Proficient and 5.Expert.

Although I will apply this model to an academic school context, I will use Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) examples of a student learning to drive a car to illustrate some of the stages.

2.3.1 Five stages of Skill Acquisition

Stage 1: Novice

At the first stage of learning a new skill, the novice learn, through instruction, to recognize various objective facts an context-free features relevant to the skill, and acquires rules for determining action based on these given context-free facts and features. At this stage the teacher decomposes the learning task into features (e.g. facts, rules and characteristics) the novice student can recognize and apply without having the desired skill or knowledge about the context. Through these instructions the student learn the different rules and procedures that are necessary to perform the task. The beginning automobile driver learning to operate a stick-shift car is told at what speed (a context-free feature) to shift gears, for example change to second gear when the speedometer is over 20km/hour. Elements that should be treated as relevant for the student are at this level so clearly and objectively defined that the student can recognize and understand what to do, without reference to the overall situation (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Dreyfus, 2009).

Stage 2: Advanced beginner

Through gained experience with actually coping with real situations, the novice begins to notice, or the teacher points out, examples of other situational features that are relevant to the skills domain. After more experience, the student learns to recognize these new features and their relevance. At school, the information given becomes more contextualized, so that the student is able to develop a growing understanding of its significance. The rules learned through instruction can at this level be related to new, but similar, situational features, recognized by the student because of experience as well as the objectively defined, context-free features that the novice also can apply (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999; Dreyfus, 2009). A driving student at the advanced beginner stage has on the novice level been given context-free rules on when to shift gears, it must be done when he reaches a certain speed. But after enough driving experience the student will notice, or the teacher points out, that the engine make different sounds when its racing or straining, thus the student can apply the previously learned context-free rules about gear shifting to the sound of the engine. The student at this level uses the engine sounds (situational) as well as speed (context-free) in deciding when to shift gear. Still, at this stage, learning can be carried out in a detached, analytic frame of mind, as the student follows instructions and is given examples (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Dreyfus, 2004).

On both stage one and two (novice and advance beginner) the student is rationally involved in the skill being learned. If the outcome is not what the student hoped for, the student can at these levels attribute the cause to inadequate rules or not being provided with sufficient instruction (Dreyfus, 2009; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999).

Stage 3: Competence

With even more experience, the number of potentially relevant elements and procedures that the student is able to recognize and follow may become overwhelming. At this point, because a sense of what is important is missing, the performance of the skill can become exhausting, and the student may feel frustrated (Dreyfus, 2009). To cope with this overload, and to progress towards competence, the student learns, through instruction or experience, to choose a perspective and develop a plan to discriminate between the features that are important to the situation, and those who are not (Dreyfus, 2009; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999). As students learn to limit themselves to only a few of the available number of possibly relevant features and aspects, understanding and decision-making becomes easier (Dreyfus, 2004). To avoid mistakes and to decide which plan or perspective that should be used in the specific context, the competent student seeks back to learned rules and procedures. However, since it exists several possibilities and outcomes of an action, the student has to choose, and the choice has consequences for the outcome. Given this uncertainty and since the result depends on the perspective and plan adopted by the student, coping may become frightening. The student, at this stage cannot merely attribute the outcome on lack adequate rules, and begins to feel responsible for the choice and thus becomes emotionally involved in the task (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999). Often, a student's choice can lead to confusion and failure, but sometimes it works out well. As Dreyfus (2004) points out: "for embodied, emotional beings like us, success and failure matter. So the learner is naturally frightened, elated, disappointed, or discouraged by the result of his or her choice of perspective..." (p.178). The competent performer feels responsible for, and therefore becomes emotionally involved in the product of his choice. While the competent both understands and decides in a detached manner, he finds himself involved in what occurs after.

To progress from the level of competence to the level of proficiency, the student needs to accumulate experiences and must be involved in the task. When the student progresses towards proficiency it may become harder to draw back and use the novices objective and context-free rules when acting. If the rule-guided action is replaced by involvement it leads to

further development. Not accepting the risk and responsibility on this stage can lead to stagnation and the end result may be boredom or regression (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999).

Stage 4: Proficient

At this stage the student sees each situation from an intuitive, more holistic perspective, and have accumulated an overview of the situational aspects that are important. On this level, the student is able to identify what the problem is, but has to find the solution. Since the student, at this time, do not have enough experience with all the possible outcomes and possible responses to react to the context automatically, the student will fall back on detached rules learnt, but this analytical decision-making happens after an intuitive understanding of the situation. When the proficient student consciously decides on a course of action, he is no longer absorbed in the task, but analytically thinking about what to do. As Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) put it "The spell of involvement in the world of the skill will thus be temporarily broken" (p.29).

Stage 5: Expert

When reached this stage, the student know what needs to be done and how. The student is engaged in the performance, and has learned how to separate between situations that demand one type of action and the situations that demands another. This enables the student to intuitively react to the situation and demands. The expert does what he know through experience have worked before and is involved in the situation (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999; Dreyfus, 2009). "An expert driver becomes one with his car, and he experiences himself simply as driving, rather than driving a car…" (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986, p.30)

2.3.2 The Skill Model, the classroom, instructions and disruptive behavior

In this thesis the focus is on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior. As described in section 2.1 there are several reasons for why a student displays disruptive behavior in the classroom. The classroom is a dynamic and social environment were several things occurs simultaneously. Students in a classroom are a heterogeneous group, they learn at different speed, and have different needs for support. In a diverse and complex classroom, the teacher, as an instructor, faces several demands on meeting students' individual needs (Riggs & Gholar, 2009). Learning through instruction and accumulated experience is seen as an important aspect with the Skill Model, and may therefore be seen as applicable in a

traditional school context, were much learning is done through instruction (Kvale & Nielsen, 2003). Also, most of what is taught in the traditional school context today is not necessarily referred to as a skill in the practical sense of the word, but skills in a more abstract and academic sense. One may ask if this model can be seen as relevant for the academic school context. Duesund and Jespersen (2004) emphasize that when Dreyfus and Dreyfus talk about skills, they include all skills that can be required through instruction, regardless of domain. Duesund (1995) illustrates that the embodiment of skills can be transformed to the academic area through her example of a student learning to read. When a student has learned to read, the books incomprehensible letters is no longer chaotic, but an entry to experience and insight, the letters then make contextual sense, and the skill of reading is incorporated in the body.

The Skill Model was originally developed for adult skill acquisition. Even so, I will apply this model to the classroom context since the main issue of learning through instruction and accumulated experiences, and becoming emotionally involved in the learning activity is something that can be seen as relevant for students in middle school as well as adults. As Duesund (1995) points out, a model will always be an abstraction to the processes described.

In a classroom, the teacher's role as an instructor is important. In the Skill Model, the teacher plays an essential role at the first three stages in the model, not only for supporting the student's skill development and providing context-free rules and experiences, but also for encouraging involvement. For a student to improve their skills, they have to become emotionally involved in the activity. As Dreyfus (2009) underlines, only emotionally involved and embodied human beings can become proficient and experts. So while teaching specific skills, albeit a practical or an academic skill, the teacher must incarnate and encourage involvement. Since students tends to imitate their teacher, the teacher plays a crucial role in whether the students will withdraw into being disembodied minds or become involved in the learning situation (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Dreyfus, 2009). To further relate this model to the displayed disruptive physical movements, one may argue that if a student struggles with the subjects in school, or if the student find the subject to easy, i.e. not adapted to the students skill-level, it may become difficult to become emotionally involved in the learning activity, and disruptive behavior may be displayed as a consequence. If a student during class is displaying disruptive behavior (i.e. in this case walks around, being out-of-seat and/or disturb others) one may assume that the student is not involved in the learning activity.

The third stage in the model (competent) can be seen as a vulnerable stage, since a student at this stage can either become involved in the task, or may stagnate or regress in the skill-development (Dreyfus, 2009). A student needs to become emotionally involved in the task to be able to progress to the level of Proficient. One may ask if all students can reach the level of proficiency. Do all students need to become experts? Can the displayed disruptive physical movements be a result of not reaching the fourth stage in the model?

A classroom environment where students feel safe and supported may be especially important for students that display disruptive behavior in school (Corrie, 2002; Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2009; Riggs & Gholar, 2009). A safe classroom environment may also make it easier to take the risk and move away from context-free rules and become emotionally involved in the learning activity.

Distinction between on-task and involvement

Being on-task and emotionally involved is terms that may seem similar, but I would like to clarify that I do not see them as the same. A student is on-task in the classroom when performing the task required by the teacher, thus a student may be on-task regardless of skill-level. A students on stage one (novice) or stage two (advanced beginner) may be more concerned with following the context-free rules and may be more motivated to produce the wanted results than in the activity itself (Dreyfus, 2004). A student can thus be on-task but not emotionally involved. A student becomes emotionally involved in the activity when the outcome of the choices has meaning for the student. But to become emotionally involved in the activity, the student needs to be on-task.

The proximal zone of development and the Skill Model

The proximal zone of development is defined as "[t]he distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). In relation to the Skill Model, adapting instruction and tasks to the student's development level, or skill-level, can be seen as relevant to help the student becoming emotionally involved, and for giving the student the necessary instructions and support to progress from one stage to the next. If a student does not have the adequate skills to perform the task at a competent level, it is likely to think that he/she may have problems with progressing to the level of proficiency. As Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986)

points out, someone at a particular stage of skill acquisition can always imitate the process characteristic for a higher stage, but will perform badly when lacking instruction, practice and concrete experience. This may imply the importance of actually working in the student's proximal zone of development, since the student needs to learn the skills through instruction at the level he is on, and become involved in the learning activity to be able to progress to the higher levels in skill development. Without support from the environment and tasks adapted to the student's skill level, becoming emotionally involved in the learning process may in some cases become difficult. To stay on-task, adapted tasks to the student's skill level, involvement and clear instructions from the teacher can be seen as important (Colvin, 2010; Riggs & Gholar, 2009). Benner (2004) mentions the usefulness of the Skill Model for understanding the learning needs, and styles of learning at different levels of skill acquisition.

3 Methodology

This thesis is a part of the research project "Disruptive behavior in School". Since this thesis is written related to a research project, there were certain requirements in regards to methodology that had to be taken into consideration. I was required to use qualitative observation as a method to gather data, and a pre-made observation form when collecting and writing down my observations. A semi-structured interview was also conducted. The interview is a supplement to the observations and will only be referred to when applicable.

This chapter includes a short theoretical description of qualitative methods, design, observation and interview, and how the data will be analyzed. Moreover, implementation of the observations and interview will be explained, and the reliability and validity will be discussed. This chapter concludes with ethical considerations.

3.1 Qualitative approach

Qualitative research in education has roots in several academic disciplines, including the social sciences, the humanities and interdisciplinary studies. Moreover, qualitative research has been influenced by the postmodern approaches to inquiry (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) qualitative methods, ranging from participant observations to interviews to discourse analysis, have become key methods of social research since the 1980s.

Since a qualitative approach is used in this thesis, it can be seen as useful to first discuss the differences between qualitative and quantitative methods. This comparison can underscore the benefits of using a qualitative approach in addressing the research questions posed in this study.

Qualitative and quantitative research differs in the nature of data that are collected. Gall et al. (2007) describe qualitative research as an inquiry that is grounded in the assumption that individuals construct social reality in the form of meanings and interpretations, and that these constructions tend to be temporary and circumstantial. Qualitative research is conducted to discover these meanings and interpretations by studying cases intensively, in their natural

setting. Qualitative researchers emphasize the value-laden nature of inquiry, and seek to answer the way social experiences are created and given meaning. The intimate relationship between the researcher and the phenomenon is viewed as important (Berg, 1995; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). By contrast, quantitative research is described as inquiry that is grounded in the assumption that features of the social environment constitutes an objective reality that is relatively constant across time and settings. Quantitative research attempts to describe and explain features of this reality by collecting samples of numerical data of the phenomenon of interest, followed by statistical analysis to establish a relationship between them. The inquiry is aimed to be within a value-free framework (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Gall et al., 2007). Applying a qualitative approach to research is seen as useful to find what is unexpected and/or special about a phenomenon, whereas a quantitative approach is better suited for finding general trends in populations.

Considering the aim of this thesis, to explore the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, a qualitative approach can be more useful to answering the related research questions. To this end a single, non-random student is observed with the aim of gaining in-depth knowledge about this specific phenomena and its context. Since a qualitative approach is flexible and seldom bound by the initial idea of the study, one can elaborate and explore other points of interest as they surface during the study (Gall et al., 2007; Merriam, 1998). Since I only found quantitative studies that mention the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, a qualitative approach may be supplementary and useful to gain deeper insight into this type of disruptive behavior. As Gall et al. (2007) underlines qualitative and quantitative research can complement each other.

3.2 Design

In educational research, case studies are one of the most widely used approaches to qualitative inquiry. Case studies may be used to cover almost any topic and type of phenomena, and the researcher can use the entire range of data collection- and analytic methods in use by qualitative researchers (Gall et al., 2007). A case study can be described as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon, a case, in-depth and within its real-world context. It allows focus on a specific case while retaining a holistic and real-world perspective (Yin, 2014). Yin (2014) emphasizes that a case study is especially relevant in situations when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be

clearly evident or when they are partly overlapping. This make an approach to a case study design particularly relevant for this thesis, since the behavior displayed in the classroom is not separable from its context. Furthermore, It may be a relevant approach to this thesis since the aim of this thesis is to gain knowledge about the physical aspect of disruptive behavior in the classroom.

When conducting a case study, one focuses on a defined phenomenon of interest. The case is a particular instance of the phenomenon. A unit is an aspect of the phenomenon that can be studied across one or more cases and the focus is the aspect of the case on which data collection and analysis will concentrate (Gall et al., 2007). In this study, the phenomenon of interest is disruptive behavior in school; the case is the classroom context in a middle school and the unit the student that display disruptive behavior. The focus is the physical movements displayed in the classroom. In this thesis I will not apply a case study design as detailed and in-depth as Yin (2014) and other authors describes the design and process. However, I will study a phenomenon and a specific case and unit applying observation and a supplementary interview as methods to collect data. The data will be analyzed and the results discussed in light of theory presented in chapter 2.

3.2.1 Sample

The student observed and interviewed in this study was selected through purposive sampling. The purpose of using purposive sampling is to understand and gain greater insight into a specific phenomenon. The selection is often based on certain criteria considered to be important with respect to the purpose of the study (Gall et al., 2007; Merriam, 1998). Accordingly, a student was selected with the help from the Special Education teacher who is the contact person at one of the participating schools in the research project. The student is considered to be most fitting, given the objectives of my study. A description of the student is found in section 4.1

3.3 Observation

The main method of collecting empirical data in this thesis is through observation. Observation is described as a systematic collection of information about the physical and social world as it appears to us through our senses (Vedeler, 2000). Observation as a research method requires the researcher to be sensitive and to have the ability to see, hear, feel and

analyze impressions gained from the observations. The observer also has to reflect on and interpret the impressions gathered (Adler & Adler, 1998; Befring, 2007; Vedeler, 2000). Observation can be both systematic and unsystematic. Damsgaard (2010) describes systematic observation as a deliberate way to get more information about a phenomenon, a situation or a problem. The unsystematic observation is less planned and concentrated around a specific phenomenon (Damsgaard, 2010; Kleven, Hjardemaal, & Tveit, 2002). In this thesis, data is gathered through systematic observation.

The observations are mediated through the researcher (Merriam, 1998). It is therefore important that the researcher is reflective and skilled in using the method, and aware of own personal biases that may distort the result (Vedeler, 2000). Qualitative research is not an objective process in the sense that it is free from subjective elements (Gall et al., 2007; Næss, 2006). To conduct impartial observations are seen as impossible, due to the personal interpretations, which, in varying degree are affected by subjective elements, such as prior knowledge about the phenomenon, cultural biases, attitudes and prior experiences. Expectations and preconceived notions can influence perceptions and interpretations, and therefore reduce the validity of the data (Befring, 2007; Gall et al., 2007; Næss, 2006). Observer bias and other observer effects can impede valid and reliable observations; this will be addressed in section 3.7

The observer role in qualitative research varies along a continuum from complete observer, through participant-observer and observer-participant (Gall et al., 2007). In this study the observations are conducted as an observer-participant. As an observer-participant, I acted primarily as an observer, entering the setting strictly to gather data and interacted only casually and non-directly with the individuals and groups while engaged in the observation (Gall et al., 2007).

One of the limitations in using observation as a method is that it may result in a partial picture of the phenomenon (Vedeler, 2000). In relation to this study, I will be able to describe the behavior observed in the classroom and the context the behavior is displayed in. Since observation alone is insufficient to determine the student's intentions, an interview is conducted with the aim of clarifying the observed behavior.

3.4 Interview

In this thesis, the interview is supplementary to the four observations and will be used with the purpose to validate some of the interpretations made from the observations. A qualitative interview often involves direct verbal interaction between the researcher and the participants. By conducting a qualitative interview, the researcher attempts to understand the world from the informants' point of view (Gall et al., 2007; Kvale, 1996). Properly conducted interviews may allow the researcher to explore issues of interest in detail, probe beneath the surface of events, and find out how people think and construct meaning. The interview has the potential to yield insight into people's life expectancies, attitudes, opinions and aspirations (Rose & Grosvenor, 2001). The result of the interview rests on the practical skill and personal judgments of the interviewer (Kvale, 1996). A semi-structured interview, as used in this thesis, utilizes a prescriptive question schedule, but allows the freedom of asking further clarification and elaboration.

The semi-structured interview conducted is used to obtain the student's own perspective on the behavior displayed in the classroom. The interview can supplement the observations by providing insight in the student's thoughts regarding the behavior displayed. The interview is therefore only referred to if applicable. The question schedule used is found in appendix 3.

3.5 Implementation of observations and interview

Some knowledge and training are important before beginning a research project (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). My training in observational methods and interviews comes from theoretical courses attended during the first year of my master degree. I was also given a course in observation from the research group, "Disruptive Behavior In School", and attended workshops with the research project, where observation and interviewing was discussed and practiced. My practical experience in observation comes from internships I attended during my bachelor degree and the first year of my master degree in Special Needs Education. Though I may have a certain degree of knowledge in how one should conduct observations and interviews, I should note that my experience as a researcher is limited; since this is the first research project I have taken part in. For this reason I will not claim that the way in which I conducted the observations and the interview was perfect, but I believe that I was able to take some measures in order for the observations and the interview to be as good

as possible given my level of experience, knowledge and training. Some of the measures taken will be described in section 3.7.

Four observations and a supplementary interview is the foundation of the gathered data. Before I collected the data, I met with the 8th grade Special Education teacher at the school where the observations took place. She was given my project proposal and was told about its main focus and what was required; namely my interest in observing a student who displayed physical movements that could be perceived as disruptive in the classroom. She needed some time to think about a potential candidate, so we agreed that she would contact me when she had decided. Furthermore, before the observations and interview were executed, I formally applied to the City's school district and sent out a parent consent form (see section 3.8).

Prior to observing, I attended the class twice. These two lessons are not included in the presentation of the data, since they were only conducted in order for me to acquaint myself with the class and the student I was going to observe. Additionally I wished for the teacher and students to become more accustomed to me being present in the classroom. From attending both classes, I had the opportunity to refresh my observational skills.

The four observations were conducted on four separate days during the span of a week. They all took place in the same class, with the same teacher and group of students. The first observation was of the whole class for the duration of one class hour. The second observation focused on the selected student and his overall participation, this for the first fifteen minutes of class. The third and fourth observations had the same focus and timespan as the second, but were conducted in the middle and near the end of the class session.

I set out to conduct all four observations in the combined English and History class. During the third observation the class schedule was changed. Instead of English and History the student attended a cookery class. Since I was interested to see if the selected student's behavior changed when attending a more practical subject, I continued with my studies.

I entered the classroom before each class began. Though I was only actively observing for 15 minutes, I decided to be present for the entirety of the class, as I did not want to disturb the class unnecessarily. This approach may have reduced the observer effect. However, this decision could on the other hand enhance observer bias. This will be mentioned further in

section 3.7. While observing, I placed myself in the back of the classroom. The selected student sat in the front row near the door. For me, this may not have been the most optimal position, but under the circumstances I saw no other place I could sit without being either too far from the student or too obtrusive. However, regardless of my position in the classroom, I could see the student clear enough to observe what he was doing and which interactions occurred. I did not want the teacher to change the students sitting position either, since that might have changed the student's behavior and thus the outcome of the observations.

Throughout the overall process, I took notes of what I saw, which were then directly transcribed electronically into the observation form (provided by the research project). During this time, I made sure to describe the student's exact actions, rather than interpreting his assumed intentions.

I did not gain permission to conduct a trial interview with a student, but practiced the interview with another researcher who also writes her master thesis for the same research project. The interview was conducted directly after the fourth observation, and lasted for approximately 12 minutes. I gave thought into how I would approach the student. I felt that I would single out the student by walking up to him, myself, after class. Hence, it was agreed, between the Special Education teacher and myself, that she would be the one to approach the student. I did not want her to approach the student beforehand, since that could possibly affect the observation. The interview was conducted in the 8th grade Learning Center. This location was selected because it was a room the student was familiar with. The interview was recorded, and transcribed in verbatim, directly afterwards.

The transcriptions from the observations and interview will not be attached to this thesis, but will be given to the research project for further use. They will be available for people, who are given the authorization to see them.

3.6 Hermeneutic Analysis

I have chosen a hermeneutic approach to analyze the data gathered through the four observations and supplementary interview. The term hermeneutics originally meant the interpretation of sacred text (Gall et al., 2007). According to Gall et al. (2007) the hermeneutic tradition in philosophy provides much of the theoretical basis for the interpretive

perspective that underlies most qualitative research. Although the subject matter of classical hermeneutics was the text of religion, law and literature, the concept of "text" has extended to include discourse, action, social customs, cultural myths and anything else that contains a message that can be "read" (Gall et al., 2007; Kvale, 1996; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Ricæur, 1973). The text analyzed and interpreted in this thesis constitutes of the written field notes from the four observations and the transcribed interview.

The hermeneutic circle is a construct that may aid in interpretation of the "text" (Gall et al., 2007). The hermeneutic circle is described as a continuous back and forth process between interpreting the meaning of each part of the text, and the text as a whole. It can be seen as a reciprocal and dynamic process (Gall et al., 2007; Hjardemaal, 2002; Kvale, 1996). Some call this process a hermeneutic spiral, which implies a continuously deeper understanding of meaning. The repeated interaction between the parts and the whole can indicate a better understanding of the text or phenomena at each turn in the spiral (Hjardemaal, 2002; Kvale, 1996). During the analysis of qualitative data, it is common to first read through the entire transcription to capture the general meaning. Then one can go back to certain themes and try to develop its meaning, and again return to the more global meaning of the data and see the whole in light of the deeper meaning of the parts, and so on. A correlation between explanation and understanding, between understanding and explanation is the "hermeneutic circle" (Ricæur, 1973).

In this thesis, when I analyzed the four observations, the hermeneutic circle/spiral was applied. This approach was chosen because it could help me improve the interpretation of the observations. The whole "text" in this case constitutes of the written field notes from the observations. The parts of the "text" are the four separate observations and aspects within these observations and interview. When analyzing the data this approach gave me the opportunity to go back and forth between the parts and the whole, and by relating it to context and theories and perspectives presented in chapter 2, I saw it as a helpful approach to gain a continuously deeper understanding of the phenomena of interest.

3.7 Reliability and Validity

Researchers should strive to make their research as valid and reliable as possible.
The quality of a research study is judged by its validity, reliability and generalizability. These exist along a continuum and can tell about a study's trustworthiness. Issues of validity and reliability can affect every aspect of a study's design and outcome (Boudah, 2011). The next sections describe a perspective of reliability and discuss why achieving high reliability can be a problem in this study. Then validity is described and related to the way personal bias may have been mitigated. Other observer effects that could influence the validity of the data are also discussed.

3.7.1 Reliability

Reliability can be seen as the degree to which a study can be repeated by other researchers, using the same procedures to arrive at similar results (Boudah, 2011; Gall et al., 2007; Merriam, 1998; Payne & Payne, 2004). It is difficult to measure reliability in social sciences because human behavior is never static (Merriam, 1998). Since qualitative researchers often see social action as complex and having its true character both in its detailed complexity and the specific setting it which it naturally occurs, it can be argued that direct re-studying is not possible (Payne & Payne, 2004). However, specific and transparent descriptions at every stage of the project better enables other researchers to read the results and the way specific conclusions were derived (Merriam, 1998).

Since I was the main research instrument the data was mediated through me, and my perceptions. Even if the same research problem and questions are addressed and similar methodologies followed, conclusions may vary since different individuals may analyze and perceive the situation differently (i.e. 3.3). Moreover, the study may be impossible to replicate since the student's behavior will vary and the context the behavior occurred in is not constant. Furthermore, the student was selected through purposive sampling, and since I only observed the class and selected student on four occasions, it may be difficult to reproduce the results of this study.

Certain strategies may be applied to enhance the reliability, like keeping detailed records and documenting the process of analysis. In this this study, I kept record of the research through the use of the observation form, field notes and the recording and transcription of the

interview. Section 3.5 describes the way the observation and interview was implemented. Through this, I can enhance the reliability by enabling the reader to follow the procedure and understand the process that lead to the drawn conclusions. These measures are taken to enhance the reliability as much as possible, even though deriving the exact same results may not be possible.

Gall et al. (2007) mention reliability decay as a threat to reliable results. Reliability decay is the tendency of data collected at later stages of observations to be less reliable than data collected on an early stage. I tried to avoid this threat by constantly reminding myself of the focus of the observations. Since only four observations are conducted, I believe it was possible to maintain the same level of attention and concentration. As I was the only one observing, it is not possible to measure the level of inter-observer reliability. Inter-observer reliability means the extent to which different observers demonstrate agreement in their observations of the same event (Gall et al., 2007).

3.7.2 Validity

The validity of a study is considered an important criterion regarding the overall value of the research (Hartas, 2010). The term validity is used differently in qualitative and quantitative research (Bogodan & Biklen, 1992; Boudah, 2011). Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) write that in social sciences validity usually means whether a study investigates what it purports to investigate. Other researchers has used validity as whether or not the research findings are true to reality, or to the degree to which the conclusions drawn by the researcher come from the study's result and not from chance or inaccurate sources (Boudah, 2011; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Merriam, 1998). Validation of ones research rests on the quality of the researchers craftsmanship throughout the investigation. To validate is not something that belongs to a separate stage in the investigation, but is a part of the entire research process (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). In qualitative research, it is important to describe the consecutive steps in the research process, in order to convince the reader that the result presented are direct and probable consequences of the research process itself, rather than from random statements (Boudah, 2011). By giving an account of the procedures, inclusion of subjects, criteria and choice of methodology and theory the researcher can provide the readers with background information so they can evaluate the credibility of the research and

knowledge claims themselves. Accordingly, the choices made in this study, are clarified with the aim of making the study as transparent as possible and thus enhance the validity.

The following sections describe some of the inaccurate sources that can reduce the validity of quantitative data, and clarifies some measures taken to reduce these sources. Sources in focus are: researchers personal bias, researcher effect and researcher intention. Gall et al. (2007) claim that the research is more valid if the sources and measures taken in order to reduce them are explained. After these sources are addressed, other aspects that may enhance the validity in this study is described.

Observer personal bias

Observer personal bias refers to errors in observational data that are traceable to personal characteristics of the researcher, such as potential attitudes and preconceived notions towards the phenomena under study (Gall et al., 2007). Payne and Payne (2004) attribute personal bias to lack of objectivity. Sources of personal bias are often present in qualitative research, since the research is mediated through the researchers perceptions, attitudes and preconceived notions (i.e. section 3.3). The researchers personal bias and other inaccurate sources are impossible to avoid, but by being aware of the threat it is possible to reduce them (Bogodan & Biklen, 1992). Throughout the course of this study, personal biases were taken into account, this especially before and during the stages of data collection and analysis. One, who has experienced a separate educational system in a different culture, can develop a certain degree of a bias, which in turn can affect the opinions made on another culture's educational system. Before I conducted the observations, I reflected over the fact that I come from another country with another culture, and that the American school system therefore may differ from the Norwegian school system. I focused on not comparing the Norwegian classroom with the American when observing. Furthermore, what I had regarded as disruptive physical movements in the classroom was something I had to put aside. I focused on observing the physical movements displayed, from a new and fresh point of view. The observations were divided between description of the observed event, and the interpretation of them. I focused on describing the behavior displayed and the context in neutral terms in my field notes, so that when reflecting back at the observations, the behavior displayed would not be interpreted falsely. This procedure may enhance validity by ensuring that the conduced observations describe the actual events as I observed them.

Observer effect and observer intentions

Other threats to the validity can be observer effect and observer intentions. An observer's presence in the classroom may affect the subjects by influencing their behavior and the class atmosphere. If the subjects are influenced by the observer's intentions (e.g. know what the researchers specific objectives are) they can modify their behavior accordingly, and affect he validity of the observations (Gall et al., 2007). I took measures to reduce the observer effect by attending two lessons in the class prior to conducting the observations. The students were told that I was present in the classroom in order to learn about the American school system. Discretion was maintained through the lessons by avoiding self-attention, as I tried to be as unobtrusive as possible in the classroom (i.e. 3.5). Moreover, the choice to stay in the classroom during the entire lesson was made. Hence, this reduces the observer effect that can occur if I suddenly turned up in the middle or at the end of class. On the other hand, this decision can be a risk for personal bias to affect interpretation, since I was present in the classroom during the whole class hour. I took measures to reduce this risk by reflecting over and focusing on only interpreting the behavior actively observed, and not let the time, before and after the 15-minute observation, affect the interpretation of the observation conducted.

If the students or teacher were made aware of the objectives of this study, they may have changed their behavior accordingly. They knew that I was there to learn, but were not specifically told what the objective of this study was (i.e. observing physical movements). But, since the objective was included in the consent form sent to the parents, I cannot be sure to which extent the students were aware of the observations specific focus.

Other aspects that may have enhanced the validity

The account of each observation was written down in a notebook, and then transferred electronically into the prescribed observation form immediately following the conclusion of the observation. Electronic transcriptions of the observations may prove helpful because it can make it easier for others (with the authority to do so) to read the notes. It also made it easier for me to have the observations transcribed, since the notes then became more organized and easier to use when I started the analysis of the observations. If observational notes are not understandable, the conclusions can seem improvised and not supported by actual events, which in turn is not beneficial for the validity of the study (Bogodan & Biklen, 1992).

The interview was recorded. By having it recorded others have the option to recheck if it was transcribed properly, and not rewritten for the purpose of getting useful statements. To have the interview recorded is useful for other reasons as well. When conducting a semi-structured interview, one often moves away from the interview schedule to probe statements made by the informant. By having it recorded it is possible to repeatedly listen to the questions asked and answers given by the informant. I could also watch the informant instead of focusing on writing down statements, and later listen to the recordings and find out what the informant put emphasis on. To validate is to check (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). During the interview, some of the questions were asked more than one time, this to check if the student changed his answer. The interview was transcribed directly after it was concluded, and written down word for word.

Writing this thesis related to the research project "Disruptive Behavior in School" may have enhanced the validity of this study. I attended an observation course given by the research group where I received training in observation and how to use the observation form designed by the research project. Other researchers have used the observation form previously. Furthermore, I also participated in the research projects workshops, where the interview schedule was agreed upon and observation and interview as a method were discussed. In these workshops, interpretation of observations was especially in focus.

The interview is supplementary to the observations. The validity of the observation study can be enhanced by the inclusion of the semi-structured interview, since the interview can be used to validate some of the interpretations made from the observations. For example, I can observe a student wandering around in the classroom and interpret the behavior as off-task, but by asking about the behavior displayed, it can be clarified that the student walked around because he/she needed to ask for help.

3.7.3 Generalizing the results

The empirical data in this thesis is based on four observations and one semi-structured supplementary interview of one student. The student selected was chosen through purposeful sampling. Since only one student was observed, the findings are not generalizable to a wider population.

3.8 Ethical considerations

In every research study with human participants, and especially children, there are ethical considerations that need to be taken into account, this throughout every stage in the research process. Two issues dominate guidelines of ethics in research with human participants. These are informed consent and the protection of subjects from harm (Bogodan & Biklen, 1992). This section will address ethical considerations related to this study, and describe how it was taken into account when conducting the research. The ethical considerations are based on the "Research ethical guidelines for social science and humanities" (my translation) (NESH, 2006).

A researchers right to "seek knowledge" should be balanced against the participants right to protect their integrity, privacy and their right to make their own informed decisions (NESH, 2006). The research conducted in this thesis is a part of the research project "Disruptive Behavior in School" which has been approved by Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelige Datatjeneste (NSD). An application for permission to gather data was sent to both the School District, where my research was to be conducted, and to all the students' parents/guardians in the class. The permission form from the School District is not included in the appendix since it would identify the school district and city. It is accessible to those with the authorization to see it.

To protect the student I must maintain his privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. I have, in this thesis, only referred to the student as NN, and referred to other students as student 1, student 2 and so on. I do not describe the students with characteristics that make them recognizable. I have also minimized the number of people that know the name of my selected student. The Special Education teacher and the class teacher are the only ones who know whom I was observing. In my field notes, which I wrote in Norwegian, I also referred to the student as NN. To further protect the student there is no mention of the school or the city where the observations took place.

Participants included in a research study have the right to get relevant information about the study so they can give informed consent. The information should be given in a manner they can understand, and language and cultural background should be taken into consideration. The participants have to be informed that they have the right to withhold their consent if they

so choose, and the consent has to be given without pressure from the researcher or other instances, like the teacher (NESH, 2006). In the consent form I explicitly wrote that all information that could be used to identify the student and school would be made anonymous. The consent form also contains information about who I am, the project and what I was going to do. I made it clear that the parents/guardians had the right to withhold their consent. I included that the interview would only take place if the student agreed to participate. I asked The Special Education Teacher if the parents would have problems with a consent form written in English. She informed me that it would not be a problem in that class (The consent form is found in appendix 1).

Before I conducted the interview the student was told about my project and what behaviors I was particularly interested in (e.g. wandering and out-of-seat behavior). The student was informed that the interview was both anonymous and confidential, and that nothing he said would be discussed with his teacher. I asked if he would be willing to answer some questions, and gave the student a chance to ask questions of his own, if he so wished.

The level of risk, for participating in this study, is small but still a possibility. As my observations are conducted without any direct contact with the students, I do not believe the observation harmed the student in question. I reflected, both before and during the observations, on the fact that the student did not know that I was solely observing him. Therefore I strived toward being as unobtrusive as possible, so it would not be so obvious to him and the other students, whom I was observing, as this can cause a certain level of discomfort for the selected student.

The collection of data and distribution of findings can also raise ethical problems (NESH, 2006). In the process I was aware of my own biases, and that I have the power to affect my research. I sought to collect and present my results with as little distortion as possible. As a researcher, I have to be competent, both academically and methodologically, so that my research is as credible as it can be.

4 Result and Discussion

This chapter will seek to answer the two research questions. First off, a case description will be given. Categories of disruptive physical movements made on the basis of the four observations will then be described. Thereafter, the data gathered through the observations will be presented, and the interview summarized. These findings will be discussed by the use of the research questions and lines will be drawn from the theoretical framework to the results of the observations as an effort to underline the points made.

4.1 Case Description

The following sections describes the student observed, the school where the observations took place, and the class and subject the student was attending during the observations. Everything in this section will be anonymous. The student will be referred to as NN, and the name of the school will not be presented. This is due to ethical considerations of anonymity and respect for the student's confidentiality and integrity, which was underlined in section 3.8.

4.1.1 The Student

NN is currently in 8th grade. At present he does not have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) or a known diagnosis. The special education teacher describes NN as the most active student on the 8th grade level, and that this behavior has given him some trouble in school. NN is known for being frequently off-task, out-of-seat, wandering around and/or talking to other students (e.g. the reason behind the selection of the student). NN is also described as impulsive and easily distracted. NN speaks Spanish at home, and is a long time English learner; which implies that the he has been learning English since he started school. He speaks and understands sufficient English to communicate well with other students and teachers, but is said to have a hard time with academic English. NN is reading on a third grade level, he does not read or do much homework at home, and his overall academic results are far below average in all academic subjects. On the wall in the classroom, the students reading progression was posted, NN was below the 25% mark. His strength in school is in practical subjects.

The Special Education teacher has the impression that NN wishes to do well in school, but due to him being easily distracted, this often becomes a problem. It is reported that teachers have tried several strategies to make the school situation easier for NN. The strategies the teachers report, as having a reducing effect on the displayed behavior, is selected seating in the classroom. The teachers has also focused on giving NN positive feedback when he does something well. Still, they report that they constantly have to redirect NN in the classroom.

4.1.2 The School

The school NN attends is the largest Middle School (6^{th} to 8^{th} grade) in the school district. The school has approximately 1000 students and about 100 staff members. Ideals of the school are as follows: Equality, Academic Excellence, Community Action, Nonviolence, Respect for self and others and Leadership based on Democratic principles. Furthermore, the school strives towards creating a dynamic learning community where every child is known and supported. The students have access to a number of facilities, one of these facilities are the school kitchen, where every class have the opportunity to attend five times each school year.

The students receive two sets of grades in every subject. The first set describes habit of work; whether the students do their homework and attend classes. Grades are given from numbers 1 to 4; 4 meaning "excellent" and 1 implying "need for improvement". The second set of grades describes how the students preform according to Standard Based Proficiency, which is the standard set by the state for that particular grade level. Here, "4" is "advanced" and "1" is "below". All 8^{th} grade students are expected to read for a minimum of 30 minutes each evening at home in addition to the reading done in school, this to achieve the goals in *Accelerated Reader*. *Accelerated Reader* is a program that tracks students' individual reading progress. There were no teaching strategies shared amongst the teachers at this school, each teacher could have their own individual teaching strategy.

4.1.3 Subject in which the observations took place

The four observations all took place in a combined English and History class, which was led by a Caucasian male teacher in his late thirties. A female assistant was present in the classroom in the last half of the class. She was mainly there to follow up on three students who, through their IEP, had the right to extra help. In the classroom the students were placed

in groups of two, facing the whiteboard. NN was placed in the front of the classroom, near the door. He shared a desk with student 1. They were not sitting far from where the teacher usually stood lecturing.

The teacher's most used strategy to defuse disruptive behavior was by deducting points. The assistant, who was asked about the strategy, believed that this method was seen as a positive procedure, since all the students entered the classroom at the beginning of class with five points each. The teacher then deducted points when the students did not follow instructions given.

The first observation was for a whole class hour. During this observation the subject taught was both History and English. In the beginning of the class the students were supposed to answer some questions in their journal about the book *Of Mice and Men* while the teacher gave out earlier assignments. Then they continued with a history lecture on US President Jackson. The teacher was using a Power Point while lecturing, and gave instructions that the students should write down the underlined sentences in their journals and that this could come up on a test. The teacher used humor, and tried to explain the topic relating it to more contemporary happenings. After approximately 40 minutes, the class continued by watching an informative cartoon about the "trail of tears". The teacher often stopped the movie to underline important points, or to explain what the movie was about. Students could ask questions if something was unclear. The last scheduled activity in this class was individual work; where the students were supposed to write down the steps on how they would do their I-search project. The I-search project is an individual assignment all students in 8th grade have to write. This project allows the students to choose their own topic, which they then research and write a paper about.

The second observation was during the first fifteen minutes of class. Here the subject matter was individual reading. Every student was reading a book of his or her own choice. The teacher was frequently out of the classroom during this observation. Individual reading and other activities where the students are expected to sit in their seats are called "silent-work".

The third observation took place in the kitchen. The students were divided into three groups on arrival. A cooking teacher led each group. The class teacher and assistant were also present in the kitchen, but did not play an active teaching role during this observation.

In the forth observation the class was supposed to edit their I-search proposal, in pairs. The students worked on laptops. The teacher decided to help NN himself, and they were sitting at one of the desktops in the back of the classroom, by the wall near the window. The teacher was sitting next to NN almost throughout the whole observation, but walked back and forth when other students needed redirecting. Students often approached the teacher asking for help.

4.2 What types of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom?

The purpose of this research question is to give a presentation of the physical movements displayed in the classroom, and why they are linked to disruptive behavior. To answer this research question, behavior categories are created to describe the physical movements observed. After the behavior categories are addressed, a descriptive presentation of the observations and interview will follow, before the results are summarized and some of the findings discussed.

The first observation was of the whole class. In this observation several physical movements linked to disruptive behavior were observed. Therefore, when discussing the first research question, the focus is not only on the physical movements displayed by NN, but also other students. When answering the second research question, NN's behavior will be explored through the use of the Skill Model.

In this thesis I have defined disruptive physical movements as: movements that disrupt the student's own learning, movements the student conduct that could disturb other students and/or the teacher. This includes both gross and fine motor skills (e.g. walking around in the classroom, being out-of-seat, disturbing others, touching other students and objects).
The physical movements are in this case characterized as linked to disruptive behavior if the student's movements interfere with his/her own learning, interferes with other students learning, or movements that interferes with the teachers ability to operate efficiently in the classroom. The reaction the behavior receives (from both teacher and other students) is considered as an indicator on how the behavior displayed is perceived by the surroundings.

To present the findings systematically, the behavior categories are presented first. By doing so, it is possible to refer to the behavior category instead of describing the physical movement each time it occurs in the description of the observation.

4.2.1 Behavior categories

The definition presented above and the distinction of off-task and on-task behavior presented in section 2.2 serve as the foundation for the categories of physical movements described. The definition and the distinctions are referred to when arguments are presented regarding how these categories of behavior may be seen as disruptive. Based on the four observations conducted, three categories of physical movements that are interpreted as disruptive behavior were observed. A fourth category is added to illustrate the difference between disruptive physical movements and physical movements that may not be perceived as disruptive. Since the student observed often interacted with other students while moving around, categories are made to distinguish the difference.

First category: off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher

As mentioned in section 2.2, off-task behavior refers to activities not directed towards learning, following the teacher's directions and activities that are not connected with engagement in and completion of the required task (Colvin, 2010; Kilian et al., 2010; Shumate & Wills, 2010; Zentall, 1980). This category refers to situations where NN or other students are off-task and at the same time out-of-seat or wandering around, without intentionally interacting (talking, touching, distracting) with other students or the teacher. By being off-task, these movements may disturb the student's own learning.

Second category: Off-task physical movement: interaction with peers and/or teacher

This category refers to situations where NN or other students are off-task and out-of-seat or wanders around while interacting (talking, touching, distracting) with other students and/or the teacher. This category refers to physical movements that may not only be disruptive to the student that display the behavior, but to students approached as well.

Third category: Off-task physical "passive" movement

This category is referred to as "passive" movement in the sense that the student displays disruptive physical movements sitting in his seat, and not out-of-seat or wandering around.

This category refers to situations where NN or other students sits in their seat, touching other students or distracts them in other ways. This category of behavior may not only interfere with the student's own learning, but interfere with other students' learning as well.

Fourth category: On-task physical movement

A student is on-task when working with the assigned subject and is focused on the task at hand (Colvin, 2010). This category refers to situations where NN or other students are walking around while preforming a school related task, and/or when they are only interacting with others in a task related manner.

4.2.2 Results from the first observation

In the first observation, the task was to observe the entire class for the duration of one class hour (from 10.30am-11.55am). The topic of this session was History and English.
The disruptive physical movements displayed in this observation occurred most frequently when the teacher did not give clear instructions on what the students were supposed to do, when there was a pause or shift in activity, when the teacher left the classroom, and when the students were supposed to work independently with their I-search project (individual research project).

In the first ten minutes of this observation, the noise and activity level in the classroom was high. The teacher gave an instruction to the class that they should find their journals and that he would start by giving back earlier assignments; this instruction was given while the teacher walked around in the classroom. These two excerpts can illustrate some of the physical movements observed in this period:

10:31: NN gets up, walks to the trash, tosses something, and walks out (He is still visible from the back of the classroom, through the doorway). NN looks around, down the hallway and behind the door. Then NN comes back in, hangs from the doorframe, swinging back and forth one time, drops down and walk slowly back to his seat. On the way NN grabs a stapler from the shelf, pretends it is a pistol and points it out in the classroom and at student 1 and makes "pistol noises" (not loudly)(…) NN stands in front of his desk. The rest of the students are at this time sitting down. Teacher remarks on this and say: "Why are you up?"

10:34: Student 2 walks around, he goes back towards his seat but talks to other students on the way, and keeps standing by his desk talking with those around him. NN gets up and goes to the door. Student 1 approaches him. They walk around in the classroom,

approach student 2 (opposite side of the classroom) and the group of students around him. On the way back towards his seat, NN knocks a boy he passes playfully in the head with a flat hand, and says, "cut your hair" (the boy is sitting down). NN smiles and walks towards his seat. Student 1 and student 2 are still walking around.

In these excerpts behavior categories one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) and two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher) are displayed. After delivering out the papers, the teacher says: *OK, sit down.* The teacher deducts points from the four students' he sees walking around; three other students are walking around, delivering out papers for the teacher. Some students look up when the students delivering papers walks past their desk.

When the lecture on President Jackson starts, the class is sitting in their seats. The students were told to write down the underlined sentences from the PowerPoint. The noise and activity level was low when the teacher was lecturing, but increased when the teacher began to illustrate points made, or ask questions.

10:54:The teacher asks a question and student 1 answers. NN hits student 1 playfully with his earphones, and they talk to each other. The teacher says: "Eyes up here" and looks at them.

In this excerpt, NN displays category three (off-task "passive" movement). The teacher continues the lecture. During this timeframe disruptive physical movements akin to category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) was observed:

11:05: NN is playing with something on his desk. He drops it, rises from his seat and picks it up. NN stands by his desk, overviewing the classroom before sitting down again. The rest of the students are sitting down and the teacher is lecturing.

11:08 Student 2 was up walking (not far from his seat). The teacher said "Sit down," and looks at the student and "Shhh" to the class.

During the informative movie about the "trail of tears" the students were told to take notes during the movie. The teacher frequently stopped the movie to explain points made, and to give the students opportunities to ask questions. During one of these pauses, physical movement akin to category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) was observed:

11:12: A student in the back (dark hair) walks to the desktop, sits down, and then walks back to his seat again, without touching the keyboard. Other students notice him, and shout out "He is hacking the computer again". The teacher looks at them.

Near the end of class, the students were told to start with their I-search proposal. The activity-level in the classroom was high. Several students were out of their seats or walking around in the classroom during this activity. The teacher used time to get the students to start working, and redirects several students who are off-task, out-of seat or walking around. NN was among the students the teacher had to redirect. When NN is back in his seat, he displays category three (off-task "passive" movement):

11:33: NN is sitting down in his seat. He turns towards student 1 and starts "pricking/touching" him. Student 1 asks him to stop. NN stops. Then student 1 slaps NN in the back playfully; they laugh and "mess around" with each other while chatting. The students nearby are writing, they look up, but continue their task.

Other incidents of disruptive physical movements did also occur during this class activity, this excerpt is an example of behavior displayed in this period:

11:40: Student 2 walks through the classroom to sharpen his pencil. He does not go directly back to his seat. Student 2 walks half a round in the classroom, stops by NN and student 1, who are both sitting down in their seats, and they talk (not loudly). Then student 2 walks towards his seat. He has to cross the whole classroom, and looks down at the other students' work while passing. The teacher approaches student 2's desk and sits down next to student 2. The teacher tells him that he does not want him walking around disturbing others even though he needed something done. The teacher points out that he saw student 2 approaching NN and Student 1 and distracting them.

In this excerpt, student 2 displays category four (on-task physical movement), category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) and category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher).

When the teacher informs the students that there is seven minutes left of class, several students are out-of-seat, walking around in the classroom. Student 1 is walking around the classroom, ending up by student 2's desk. The teacher redirects him, but student 1 continues to the back of the classroom, exchanging comments with other students on the way. When the teacher leaves the classroom, NN looks around and gets up, he walks to the back of the classroom towards student 1. Several boys walk to and from the group gathered in the back. They talk and exchange comments while looking at something outside the window. The noise

level in classroom is at this point high. NN and student 1 move around in the classroom, exchanging comments with students sitting. They keep walking around until the teacher comes back into the classroom signaling that the class is over. In this last part of class, several incidents akin to category one and two are displayed.

4.2.3 Results from the second observation

The second observation took place in the first fifteen minutes of class (10.30am-10.15am.). The topic of this session was silent reading in a book of the students' own choice. During this observation most of the students were reading silently in their seats. The teacher was walking in and out of the classroom, spending most of the time in the hallway. The noise-level was low in the classroom during this observation, even when the teacher was out of the classroom. Silent reading is something they have every week at the exact same time. NN did display some physical movements that can be linked to disruptive behavior during this observation. This excerpt is taken from the beginning of the observation:

10:31: NN goes into the hallway, looks around, goes into the classroom again, and asks the teacher "where is the stapler?" The teacher points toward the cabinet near the door where NN is standing. NN staple his paper then stamps his foot in the ground and makes a shouting sound. He walks towards his desk and stops in front of it. NN writes down a note, while glancing around the classroom. Then he gives the note to the teacher and says: "You would probably not be able to read it". The teacher answers: "I will figure it out". NN then turns and stops in front of his desk and interacts with student 1. They laugh. The teacher looks towards them. NN sits down.

This citation from the beginning of class can be described as category four (on-task physical movement) and category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher).

NN uses some time to find his book. He talks to the teacher and looks around in the classroom before he opens his book. NN then sits leaned over his desk. He looks up when a girl passes, and talks to her and he talks to student 1. The next couple of minutes, it is not perceived that NN is reading. He looks down at his book when the teacher passes him, but most of the time he sits leaned forward on his desk continuously stroking his hand over his eyes, hair and ear. NN occasionally whispers with student 1. When NN sits up, looking forward, one can see his book on his desk faced down. When the teacher arrives back in the classroom, he tells student 1 and NN that they have to start reading, or five minutes during

lunch break. The teacher then walks out to the hallway again and NN and student 1 spend time looking at NN's phone, and they turn around to whisper something to the student sitting behind them.

10:40: NN gets out of his seat and walks slowly towards the sink. On his way there he stops and picks up something on the desk he stops by. The student sitting behind the desk is reading, he looks up and gestures to get the item back. NN puts it down. Then NN continues towards the sink. Another student is drinking. NN slaps him in the back and the student drinking looks up. They exchange some comments. The student drinking walks back to his seat. NN continues walking, and walks down the row towards the back of the classroom/window. NN stops next to student 2's desk. NN looks at him, and then out in the classroom, NN does not say anything. The teacher is looking in at the class from the door. NN looks at the teacher and goes back towards the sink, then drinks. (…) NN goes slowly back to his seat. He sits down. Drags his chair, it makes a loud sound. Some other students in the row behind him say something (not loud) and NN answers loud: "What?!"

In this sequence several categories that can be linked to disruptive behavior is displayed. NN displayed behavior akin to categories two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher), and one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher). During rest of the observation, NN sits in his seat, displaying small body movements. He is looking around in the classroom and down at his book. The teacher is sitting nearby. NN looks up whenever someone is passing, and often turns around looking out in the classroom.

4.2.4 Results from the third observation

This observation was conducted for fifteen minutes in the middle of the class (11.10 am-11.25 am.). This observation was supposed to be conducted in the combined History and English class, but due to a change in the class schedule the class went to the schools kitchen instead. There were three cooking teachers present, who instructed different groups. The class teacher and the class assistant were also there. Two other volunteers were also present. In the kitchen the students were seated in three groups, approximately ten students at each table. They were divided according to numbers they got when they arrived. NN and student 1 made sure they got into the same group, and were seated on opposite side of the cooking teacher when the observation began.

11:10: The cooking teacher is talking about the ingredients they will be working with, and ask if anyone remember that they made a dish with eggs before. NN says:" I do! I made the eggs another time". The cooking teacher says: "Good, then you know how to do that!" NN expresses a wish to work with eggs again.

The cooking teacher divides the task by starting at one end of the table, and asks every student what they would like to make. NN is the first one to choose. He chose the eggs. Student 1 did as well. Then they were told to start.

11:12: NN walks straight to the wall with the equipment and finds a bowl and wisp. NN and student 1 are standing at a table with four other girls. The girls have already wisped their eggs. NN and Student 1 break the eggs into a bowl. NN starts to wisp. Student 1 tries to grab the wisp, but NN is shrugging him of with his hand.

During this observation, the noise level in the classroom was high, something that may be a result of the activities performed. All interaction between NN and other students are about the food they are making. When NN stands alone in the work area, and student 1 who walks around approaches, NN continues the assigned task until it's finished.

11:17: NN leaves the work area and walks towards student 1. Calling his name. NN stops by the cooking teacher, and shows her the eggs. She says: "Very good". Then NN approaches student 1. Student 1 smells the eggs, and say: "Ok". NN and student 1 return to the work place, and put the eggs in the heating cabinet.

Then NN walks around, interacts with others in a task related manner, and finds other tasks that need to be done, like washing equipment they had used, cleaning some knifes, and setting and decorating the table. The assistant, cooking teacher and the class teacher approached NN and gave him positive feedback on several occasions during this observation.

11:21: The class' teacher comes up and claps NN on the back. The cooking teacher approaches and does the same and says: "Nice job". NN dries the bowl. Then puts it back in the cabinet.

11:25:NN finds a flower and some centerpiece decorations in a cabinet and puts it on the table. The cooking teacher approaches: "That's good, you guys". NN nods, and smiles to the teacher.

As this observation show, the behavior displayed by NN is characterized by the fourth behavior category (on-task physical movement). NN did not during this observation express any of the other three behavior categories.

4.2.5 Results from the fourth observation

The fourth and final observation took place for the last fifteen minutes of class (11.35 am-11.50 am.). When this observation took place, the students were supposed to peer-edit their I-search proposal. The teacher decided to separate NN and student 1, and was helping NN himself. The overall impression from this observation is that the students seemed confused about what they were supposed to do. They constantly approached the teacher with questions regarding the task. The noise and activity level in class during this observation was high.

When the observation began, the teacher and NN were sitting in front of the desktop in the back of the classroom, near the windows. A typical occurrence in this observation was that every time other students approached the teacher, NN stopped working, turned around in his seat and either followed the discussion between the student(s) and teacher, or looked around in the classroom/out of the window. NN also spent some time spinning the globe that was situated on the cabinet behind him. NN was often observed sitting leaned forward or sideways on his chair. The teacher constantly redirected NN, and did this by clapping his hand down next to the keyboard and using phrases like: *now look at this, come on, focus, write that down.* The teacher also redirected him by pointing at the desktop. When the teacher gave NN direct instructions about what to change in the text and how to change it, NN conducts the task given. Each time the teacher left NN, he was immediately out of his seat. This is one excerpt from this observation when the teacher left NN alone:

10:44:The teacher walks away, NN directly leaves his seat. NN approaches a student in the next row, and they talk. While walking back towards his own desktop, NN closes the screen on two boys' laptops. NN then walks towards the sink, but does not drink. After that, he walks back towards his desktop, and closes another boy's laptop. Next, NN goes back to his chair, sits down, looks around, and then gets up again. NN approaches the boys in the row behind his seat, the ones that talked to NN before. One of the boys is displaying something on his phone. They talk and laugh about what they see on the student's phone. The teacher comes back, breaks up the gathering, and tells NN to sit down. The teacher then takes the seat next to NN. They look at the text on the desktop again. Teacher says: "Write that down". NN writes on the keyboard.

In this excerpt, NN displayed behavior akin to category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher). NN also displayed category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) in the fifteen minutes the observation lasted.

4.2.6 Summary of the observations

When summarizing the results of the four observations, it can be seen that physical movement akin to all behavior categories outlined in section 4.2.1 were displayed in the classroom. The behavior categories most frequently displayed by NN was category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) and category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher). NN displayed these behaviors more frequently when the teacher was out of the classroom, during individual work when the teacher was not nearby giving direct instructions, and in situations where student 1 and/or student 2 were also up walking around. NN was less out-of-seat or wandering when the teacher was nearby. It will be noted that NN did not display off-task behavior at all time. When given specific instructions on what to do, he performed the task. In the third observation (section 4.2.4) NN only displayed category four (on-task physical movement) and only interacted with others in a manner related to the classroom subject. NN seemed easily distracted during individual work. For example, when reading (section 4.2.3), he looked up whenever someone walked by, and when working on the desktop (section 4.2.5), he turned around every time another student approached the teacher.

4.2.7 Interview

The interview was conducted after the fourth observation and lasted approximately 12 minutes. This interview will serve as a supplement to the observations made, and will only be referred to when applicable in the discussions. The interview schedule is found in appendix 3. The physical movements in focus are wandering and out-of-seat behavior. I chose this focus because it was the behavior NN displayed most frequently in the classroom. In the next paragraphs the interview is summarized in themes of the questions asked and NN's responses.

Do you know why you sometimes walk around or are out-of-seat during class?

NN gave some general answers in the beginning, and said that: *They sometimes walk around to get water, sometimes fool around, sometimes to ask questions, or go on the computer to take a test or find a book.* By probing and asking if he knew what led him to walk around, if he sometimes felt he walked around without a purpose, he answered: *Sometimes people do that when they are reading because it get bored sometimes, it gets boring and you need to get up. Sometimes you walk around, without, like, having no idea like what you are doing, or*

something… On the question if he knew why he did that, he answered: *Actually I dunno. I don't know why, its just like, you just feel like you get bored and I just stand up and do something I guess…* By asking later in the interview if he knew why he walked around when working on the desktop, the answer given was: *I needed a break I guess…you get kind of tired so you have to get up, probably stretch or something… Some people do it like, if they don't know what to do, they walk and ask other people how do this and yeah…* Was that what he sometimes did? *I sometimes do that, I ask my friends on the other side of the room, on like, I don't know how to do a paper, so I ask them how do you do this, and then the teacher says, like, what are you doing? And I just say, I'm asking help*.

In the observations one could notice that NN approached the same students (student 1 and student 2) when he was out-of-seat or walking around. NN was asked if he always approached his friends when he asked questions: *I sometimes go to my friends and I sometimes go to the other people around me, like next to me or something*. When asked if he had a lot of friends sitting near by, or if everyone was on the other side of the classroom, he answered: *I have one friend sitting next to me, and then some of them are across the room.* According to NN it is not a stated rule not to walk around in the classroom, except when they are doing "silent work". *On Wednesdays we have odd period days, and in my third period we read in the entire class. So we can't get up, so we have to ask to get up.*

Do you think its OK or not OK for a student to be out of the seat or walking around during class?

NN answered that *from a teacher's perspective it was probably sometimes not okay, but if you were doing something that's like going to get water or go to get a test on the computer its okay*. By asking what he thought about walking around, if he thought it was okay, NN answered that *if you are gonna do something that has to do with school then it's probably okay, but just to go and talk to somebody else while everyone is reading or something… It's not oka*y. When asked what he thought the teacher felt about students walking around being out of seat during class, he responded that: *For reading, I guess its not okay for the teacher, like some of them say like why are you guys walking a lot, its getting me nervous or something, they say like, its not okay for you to walk around. Its distracting people, while reading…* When asked if that was the reason, or if he thought it was other reasons for why it's not okay he answered *Well if you like, not read a lot at home then like, need to get your reading grades up, or something, then its probably not okay.* When asked if the teacher was

right or wrong to think it's a distraction, he answered that *yeah, its probably right, because like other peoples grades are low too, so like they get distracted and like, yeah...* NN also expressed in the interview that he liked the cooking class, but history was hard and that reading sometimes became boring.

4.3 Discussion

In the previous sections I have presented behavior categories and described and summarized findings. This section will connect the findings to relevant theoretical considerations presented in section 2.1 and 2.2, and thereby, elaborate the answer to the first research question: *What types of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom?*

In this section, I will discuss the three categories of disruptive behavior. I will also discuss other aspects of the classroom context that could have an effect on disruptive behavior displayed in the classroom.

First category: Off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher

The first category, off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher, was described in section 4.2.1 as a category that first and foremost is disruptive to the student's own learning and, akin to my definition, seen as linked to disruptive behavior. The physical movement is described as off-task when the student, in situations where the movement was expressed, seemed detached from the learning activity and did not perform the required task. Hofer (2007) calls it "passive" off-task behavior when a student displays behavior that can be described as disengaged from the learning activity, but is not intentionally disturbing the surroundings.

NN is playing with something on his desk. He drops it, rises from his seat, and picks it up. NN stands by his desk, overviewing the classroom before sitting down again. The rest of the students are sitting down and the teacher is lecturing.

As seen in this excerpt, the physical movement did not seem to disrupt the surroundings. Still, a physical movement is visual, so the other students and the teacher may have noticed it, and it may have caused a distraction.

In some situations observed in the classroom, this category did disturb other students and the teacher. This is an excerpt from the first observation where the whole class was observed:

A student in the back (dark hair) walks to the desktop, sits down, and then walks back to his seat again, without touching the keyboard. Other students notice him, and shout out "He is hacking the computer again." The teacher looks at them.

In this case, the student displaying the physical movement did not actively interact with others. However, the behavior enlisted a reaction (shouting) from students and may therefore be seen as disrupting to the other students and the teacher.

It may be questioned whether it was the other students' shouting or the physical movement displayed that drew the teacher's attention in this case. Nevertheless, while the teacher was lecturing, the student who moved around distracted the other students.

When off-task physical movements evoke a verbal reaction from the teacher, it may be asked whether the verbal reaction from the teacher, in some situations, can be more disturbing to other students than the actual movement displayed. When a student is out-of-seat or wandering around and the teacher reacts verbally, it can be viewed as a double disturbance. By double disturbance, in this case, I suggest that it is not only the student out-of-seat that can cause disruptiveness in the classroom but also the reactions to the physical movement displayed. As Rhodes (1969) points out, disruptiveness in the classroom may also be caused by the reactions the behavior receives. The verbal reaction may, for example, draw students' attention away from the learning task and towards the student walking around. The teacher's intention may be to correct the behavior, not necessarily draw other students' attention to the student who is out-of-seat. But by remarking on the behavior, it may result in other students noticing the physical movement. Furthermore, the teacher's remark may have disturbed the other students more than the actual movement did. As Charles (2011) and Redl (1975) mention, it is not only students that can be disruptive; the teacher can also create disruption, and the reaction to the act may cause more disruption than the act itself. Or as Colvin (2010) underlines, the reactions may enhance disruptive behavior, depending on the way the teacher reacts.

Second category: Off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher

Category two, off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher, describes physical movements that not only disturb the student's own learning but also other students' learning and the teacher. This category of disruptive physical movements can interfere with the student's own learning, since the student is off-task and at the same time out-of-seat when other school related tasks should be performed. By interacting while moving around (i.e. by talking, touching other students or objects), the displayed behavior can also disturb other students and the teacher. According to Hofer's (2007) distinction, this category can be described as "active" off-task behavior as the behavior displayed disturbs teaching and learning. The excerpt presented in section 4.2.5 can serve as an example of this category.

...NN approaches a student in the next row, and they talk. While walking back towards his own desktop, NN closes the screen on two boys' laptops. NN then walks towards the sink, but does not drink. After that, he walks back towards his desktop, and closes another boy's laptop. Next, NN goes back to his chair, sits down, looks around, and then gets up again. NN approaches the boys in the row behind his seat, the ones that talked to NN before. One of the boys is displaying something on his phone. They talk and laugh about what they see on the student's phone. The teacher comes back, breaks up the gathering, and tells NN to sit down...

The physical movement displayed by NN in this case is seen as active off-task. NN was supposed to work on his paper at the desktop. By walking around, talking, and touching the other students' laptops, the movement displayed did not only interfere with NN's learning, but it also disturbed other students in their work. Moreover, this category can also cause a double disturbance; for instance, since the student moved around and interacted with the other students by touching their equipment and by talking to them, he interfered with his as well as the others' learning and caused a disruption in the classroom. In situations when the teacher noticed the physical movement, the behavior displayed could also be seen as a distraction and may have interfered with the teacher's ability to teach. This can be seen at the end of this excerpt when the teacher had to walk to the back of the classroom to break up the gathering.

Third category: off-task "passive" movement

The third category: off-task "passive" movement describes situations where the student displays disruptive physical movements while sitting in his seat. This category, when observed, interfered with the student's own learning as well as other students' learning and

could receive a reaction from the teacher. As these excerpts from the first observation can illustrate:

NN is sitting down in his seat. He turns towards student 1 and starts "pricking/touching" him. Student 1 asks him to stop. NN stops. Then student 1 slaps NN in the back playfully; they laugh and "mess around" with each other, while chatting. The students nearby are writing, they look up, but continue their task.

The teacher asks a question, and student 1 answers. NN hits student 1 playfully with his earphones, and they talk to each other. The teacher says: "Eyes up here" and looks at them.

When looking at these excerpts one may ask if the physical movements displayed by NN in these situations can be seen as a preliminary factor that led to further disruptive behavior, both the verbal and physical kind. NN disturbed student 1 with his actions, either by pricking/touching him, or by hitting him with his earphones. In the first excerpt, NN received a reaction from student 1. He was asked to stop. Then student 1 slaps NN in the back, and their disruptive behavior increases, which led to more physical movements and talking. Other students did in this case notice the disruptive behavior being displayed. In the second excerpt, when NN hits student 1 with his earphones, it led to talking, which the teacher noticed and reacted to. According to (Charles, 2011) contagious behavior and provocation from other students are conditions within a class-peer group that can promote disruptive behavior in the classroom.

The complexity of disruptive behavior as physical movements

When contemplating the four categories of physical movements presented in this thesis, one can note that there are sliding transitions between the identified physical movements displayed in the classroom. The categories were made to distinguish the difference between disruptive physical movements observed, but they may not have been able to capture the complexity (see p. 55) as the line between the categories overlaps. As the results may show, the students often displayed several categories simultaneously. An excerpt from the first observation can illustrate this:

Student 2 walks through the classroom to sharpen his pencil. He does not go directly back to his seat. Student 2 walks half a round in the classroom, stops by NN and student 1, who are both sitting down in their seats, and they talk (not loudly). Then student 2 walks towards his seat. He has to cross the whole classroom, and looks down at the other students' work while passing. The teacher approaches student 2's desk and sits down next to student 2. The teacher tells him that he does not want him walking around disturbing others even

though he needed something done. The teacher points out that he saw student 2 approaching NN and Student 1 and distracting them.

Student 2 can be described as first displaying category four (on-task physical movement) then category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher). The student can also be seen as displaying category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) on his way back to his seat. Thereby, sliding between these categories, the student can be seen as shifting between on-task and off-task behavior (Hofer, 2007). As human beings, there is no strict line between actions one are involved in and not. In the classroom, the student is in constant interaction with the environment. Since this can be seen as mutual dynamic processes that affect each other, sudden shifts in behavior may occur (Corrie, 2002; Hofer, 2007). There is no easy way to define what is on task and what simply is a shift of task. As seen in the excerpt, a movement can begin as on-task: the student leaves his seat to sharpen a pencil but becomes seemingly off-task after the pencil is sharpened. One can also be on-task and off-task at the same time. For example, a student walking around in the classroom seemingly off-task may just need a breath before continuing the task. One can ask if this is off-task behavior or a necessity. As NN said in the interview when asked why he walked around, "I needed a break I guess, you get kinda tired so you have to get up and probably stretch or something…" Since human beings are complex and in a mutual dynamic interaction with a changing environment, one can never fully understand this complexity (Duesund, 1995). A conceptualization of the behavior will, therefore, never capture the whole picture of the behavior or physical movements displayed in the classroom, even though it may give insight into the phenomenon, as it describes some of the physical movements that were observed in the classroom.

As mentioned in section 4.2, the reaction the behavior receives would serve as an indicator on how the movement is perceived by the surroundings. However, note that there is a subjective element in the perception of disruptive behavior (i.e. section 2.1.2). Teachers or peers may have different tolerance limits to which behavior they experience as disruptive.

The teacher often has specific expectations towards the students' behavior when lecturing and/or giving instructions. Behaviors that breach these implicit or explicit rules of the classroom environment or are displayed at the wrong time and setting may more easily be perceived as disruptive and often receive a reaction from the teacher or peers (Befring et al.,

2013; Zionts et al., 2002; Aasen et al., 2002). In the observations when students were out-of-seat when the teacher was lecturing or when the students were expected to read silently in their seats, the teacher was quick to remark on the out-of-seat behavior.

Student 2 was up and walking (not far from his seat). The teacher said, "Sit down," and looks at the student.

The student who was walking around, or out-of-seat in this context, may have breached the norms and/or expectations the teacher had for these class sessions. In the observations, the teacher did not give specific instructions about his expectations. However, from the strategies that he used, which included deducting points and reminding the students to work, and from the interview where NN expressed that during "silent work" they had to ask to get up, it may be implied that the rules of "silent work," or the classroom in general, had been stated previously or were implicitly something the students knew.

The classroom context where the physical movement is displayed may therefore be seen as important for how the behavior is perceived and experienced from the teacher's point of view. If a student is walking around in the classroom when the class is working on a project, where walking around is necessary to complete the task, the teacher or other students may not react to or be disturbed by the behavior the same way as if the student is walking around during a lecture or individual reading. The activity level in class is often related to the subject matter. It may be more ordinary to walk around when working with unstructured activities than when more structured activities are performed. If specific expectations or instructions are not given, is the behavior then disruptive? It may be disruptive akin to the definition of disruptive physical movements, but if the conditions in the classroom are not optimal for helping the students stay on-task, disruptive behavior can be seen as a result of this (Colvin, 2009).

Other considerations: Can on-task behavior also be disruptive?

Can on-task behavior also be considered disruptive? In this thesis (i.e. 2.2.1), the on-task physical movements would not be linked to disruptive behavior if it did not enlist a reaction from the teacher or peers. In the first observation, the teacher deducted points from four students who were walking around. At the same time, three other students were also walking around delivering papers for the teacher. In this situation, one may assume that the teacher made a distinction between acceptable and unacceptable behavior in the classroom (Corrie,

2002). Only the perceived off-task movements received a reaction, even though the on-task movements are just as visible to the teacher and other students. Are on-task movements less disruptive for the other students because they are seen as on-task, acceptable and not breaking rules?

On-task movements may be experienced as less disruptive for peers because it can be seen as an acceptable movement and not breaking the implicit or explicit classroom rules. In the first observation when the students helping the teacher walked around, other students looked up but did not react to the movement displayed. This may be because the movement was perceived as on-task and, therefore, acceptable. The three students walking around were doing what the teacher had told them to do, and the other students may have known that the teacher allowed it. As NN said in the interview: "if you are gonna do something that has to do with school, then it's probably okay, but just go and talk to somebody else while everyone is reading or something… It's not okay." If students move around on-task, other students can still see, and notice, the movement since it is visual. Even so, seeing that the movement has a purpose or a direction, they may be less distracted by it. It may not draw the same amount of attention and curiosity as movements with no relevance for the subject matter in class.

A physical movement can also be on-task (i.e. related to learning) from a student's perspective, but may be perceived as off-task and/or disruptive by teacher and peers. In section 2.2, off-task behaviors were described as all activities not directed towards learning, not following the teacher's instructions, or not completing the required task. NN was asked in the interview why he sometimes walked around. He answered, "Some people do it like, if they don't know what to do, they walk to ask other people how to do this." When asked if he sometimes did that, he answered, "I sometimes do that, I ask my friends on the other side of the room, on, like, I don't know how to do this paper, so I ask them how do you do this, and then the teacher says, like, what are you doing?" In situations like these, the displayed physical movement may be experienced as disruptive from the teacher's or other students' perspective but may be on-task (directed towards learning or completion of the task) from NN's own perspective. NN's intention may not be to disturb peers and the teacher, but the result of the movement can cause disruptiveness. A teacher may perceive the movement as off-task, not following instructions or breaking classroom rules, and the students that were approached can be disturbed in their learning. Redl (1975) underlines this when he writes that even the most unintentional and harmless behavior might produce disruptive effects. Almost

anything that can be seen as a positive trait, such as actually taking initiative and going to seek help when not understanding the task, can be disruptive when circumstances elevates it to such a level.

Even though the physical movements were categorized as disruptive, not all of them received a reaction from the teacher and peers. In some situations, a movement that could be on-task may receive reactions. This illustrates the complexity of interaction between human beings in a classroom context.

In this section, I have discussed disruptive behavior as physical movements, explained the most frequently displayed categories and discussed other contextual elements that may have contributed to the physical movements' disruptiveness. I will now apply the findings presented in section 4.2 to discuss the second research question: How the physical movements displayed by NN can be seen related to the Skill Model.

4.4 Research question 2: How can the displayed disruptive physical movements be related to the Skill Model?

As described in chapter 2 there can be several and complex reasons for why students display disruptive behavior in the classroom. The behavior may reflect both characteristics of the students as well as how the classroom and instructions are organized and implemented.
A classroom is a dynamic and complex social environment where several things occur simultaneously. Students in a classroom are a heterogeneous group; they learn at different speed and have different need for support. Some students that arrive in school already know how to read, while others have to learn this skill from scratch. In a diverse classroom the teacher may face several demands on meeting students' individual needs.

Dreyfus and Dreyfus' (1986) Skill Model describes how one, through instruction and accumulated experience, progress from novice to expert in a skill domain. Becoming emotionally involved in the activity is seen as important to be able to progress from stage three; competent to stage four; proficient. Being engaged in the classroom activity is also seen as an important factor for staying on-task in the learning situation (Colvin, 2010).

To answer this research question I will explore the aspect of skills, instruction and involvement, and relate this to the physical movements displayed by NN in the classroom. First, I will mainly discuss if lacking skills and instruction can be seen as contributors to the disruptive physical movements displayed. Secondly, I will discuss if the physical movements can be a result of not reaching stage four (proficient), and why it can be difficult for some students, like NN, to reach this stage. Then, I will discuss situations where NN did not display disruptive physical movements, and explore if there were other conditions present that may have had an effect on the behavior. After a short summary of this section, I will briefly outline some possible practical implications, and thereby draw lines from chapter four that can be relevant for special needs education.

Note that the teacher's objectives and NN's objectives are unknown, I will therefore not claim that the reasons discussed are the only reasons for why NN displayed disruptive physical movements in some contexts and not in others.

4.4.1 Disruptive physical movements due to lack of skills and/or instruction?

Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) describe the first two stages in the model as detached-decision making. At these stages the student does not need to be emotionally involved in the learning activity to be able to perform the task. Instructions given by the teacher on these stages should be so objectively defined that the task can be performed without knowledge about the context. For example an instruction like writing down something that is posted on a PowerPoint does not have to be related to the context to be executed by the student. However, a task, like writing an Individual I-search project may demand a higher level of skills, since it may include not only developing a plan but also making choices. The result of such a project may rest on the abilities of the student, and also the help and support the student receives from the teacher. Can the disruptive physical movement displayed by NN be a result of lacking the skills or adequate instructions to perform the activity demanded of him in the classroom?

Three observations were conducted in the classroom when the subject matter was combined English and History. In these observations, NN displayed all three categories of disruptive physical movements. As described in section 4.1, NN performs below average in all

academic subjects and is said to read at a third grade level. In the classroom, NN's reading progress was posted below the 25% mark, which may be due to not reading much at home, but may also be because he is not managing the skill sufficiently for his grade level. Connecting this to the stages in the Skill Model, one may argue that NN may be at a competent level in reading, since he can read. But compared to the level he should have been on in the eight-grade, it may be said that his skill-level is at a novice or advanced beginner stage compared to his peers.

In the interview, NN expressed that he found history hard, and that reading could be boring. Both classroom subjects, History and English, may require skills NN may be lacking, or be subjects NN needs more instructions or support to perform. Not managing these subject matters may contribute to NN performing below average, and may be why he displayed disruptive physical movements in these three observations. As Greene (2009) underlines disruptive behavior may occur when the demands placed on the student exceeds his capacity to respond adaptively to the situation.

In the second observation, when the subject matter was silent reading, NN did not seem on-task or involved in this activity for the fifteen minutes the observation lasted. He was observed looking around in the classroom, and looking up whenever someone walked by. His book was also lying on the desk faced down for a great part of this observation. When the teacher left the classroom, NN displayed disruptive behavior akin to category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher), as the excerpt presented in section 4.2.3 can illustrate. In the interview, NN expressed that reading sometimes became boring and he expressed boredom as a reason for walking around in the classroom: "Sometimes people do that (walking around) when they are reading because its get bored sometimes, it gets boring and you need to get up". The expressed boredom may be a result of not being involved in the task, and a result of not mastering the task on a proficient level. As Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1999) point out, not becoming emotionally involved on stage three (competent) can lead to stagnation in a skill-domain, and the end result may be boredom. A student may also begin to move around when an activity require close attention, especially if the topic is perceived as hard, not appealing or without purpose (Charles, 2011). If NN has not yet mastered the skill required to perform the task adequately, or the demands placed on him is higher than his skill-level, one may assume that he can experience problems with staying on-task in the learning situation, and further become involved in the learning activity. A

consequence of not becoming engaged or involved in the task may therefore be to display disruptive behavior, like wandering around in the classroom when other tasks should be performed (Charles, 2011; Greene, 2009; Redl, 1975).

To have the specific task requirement clearly presented is seen as a positive contributor to help students stay on-task, and help them get engaged in the activity. Giving direct instructions and clarifying what is expected of the students can help them stay on-task and defuse disruptive behavior. Colvin (2010) underlines the importance of the teacher ensuring that their instructions are clear and that students know what is expected of them.

In the observations one could notice that the instructions given by the teacher affected the behavior displayed. In situations when the teacher gave specific instructions on what the students were supposed to do, they stayed mostly on-task, and few displayed disruptive physical movements. In situations where no clear instructions were given, the disruptive physical movements were expressed more frequently, as seen for example in the beginning and end of the first observation. In the beginning of this observation, the directions the students received on finding their journals was given when the noise level in the classroom was high, and the teacher himself was walking around in the classroom giving back earlier assignments. Since the teacher informed the students that he would start by giving out earlier assignments it seemed unclear if the students should find their journals and begin to work, or if they should begin to work when the teacher had finished delivering out papers. At the end of this observation, when the teacher informed the students that they should work independently on their I-search, no specific instructions on how to perform this task was given and several students, including NN, was walking around. Since I only observed the History and English class on three occasions, the teacher could have given instructions on how to write the I-search proposal previously, something I cannot know. But the lack of instructions can be seen as not beneficial, since several students in situations like these did not stay on-task in the learning situation, and displayed disruptive physical movements.

NN displayed disruptive physical movements more frequently when the teacher was out of the classroom and during individual work when the teacher was not nearby giving him specific instructions on what to do. Can NN's problems with staying on-task and thereby become involved be a result of not receiving instructions or the support or encouragement he might need to perform the task adequately?

As NN is an eight-grade student, the teacher may have higher expectations towards which activities he should be able to manage on his own compared to on lower grade-levels. But even though eight-grade students often are expected to perform on an eight-grade level, individual differences do exist (Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2009; Riggs & Gholar, 2009). As seen in the fourth observation (4.2.5) when the teacher worked individually with NN on the desktop, NN received context-free directions from the teacher, which may have helped him work on-task. But when left alone by the teacher, NN displayed behavior akin to the first and second behavior category. As mentioned, to write an individual research proposal is more demanding and may acquire a higher skill-level than just writing down underlined sentences from a PowerPoint. Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) emphasize that a student can imitate the thought process on higher levels, but the performance might turn out badly, due to lack of instruction, practice or concrete experience.

As NN said in the interview: ”Sometimes you just walk around without having no idea what you are doing”. If NN’s skill-level lies at a novice or advanced beginner stage, editing his own project may be higher than his skill-level and more specific and context-free instructions provided by the teacher may be necessary for him to complete the task. When left alone one can ask if NN got the support and encouragement that seemed necessary for him in this situation. For a student with a skill-level within the two first stages (novice and/or advanced beginner) instruction is important, as the student at these stages need to follow context-free rules and procedures to be able to perform the task adequately. As Dreyfus (2009) underlines, at these stages the teacher needs to be present with the student in the actual situation of thought and action.

4.4.2 Not reaching stage four (proficient)

In section 2.4 I mentioned that stage three (competent) might be a vulnerable stage. If a student on this stage does not move away from the context-free rules and become emotionally involved in the learning activity the result may be stagnation at this level of skill-development. A consequence of this may be boredom or regression in a particular learning domain (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999). In this section I will describe why it can be difficult for some students to reach stage four (proficient), and further explore if the physical movements can be a result of not reaching this stage.

As mentioned above, NN can be described as a student who struggles with the academic subjects in school. Earlier, I discussed if the disruptive physical movement displayed by NN could be a result of lacking the skills or adequate instructions to perform the task demanded of him in the combined History and English class. I also argued that his skill-level can be seen as novice or advanced beginner in reading compared to his peers.

For some students, for example students that struggle with academic subjects in school, becoming emotionally involved in the learning process and letting go of learned rules and instructions can be experienced as challenging, frightening or maybe even impossible. For these students, like NN, tasks on stage one (novice) or stage two (advanced beginner) may be easier to cope with than stage three (competent). On the two first stages a student is given context-free rules to follow, and thus know what needs to be done to perform the task adequately. A student can at these two levels stay rational to demands in the situation, as the novice and advanced beginner apply learned rules to skill practice. Stage one (novice) and two (advanced beginner) demands less involvement and may therefore be experienced as safer and easier to cope with. Moreover, not succeeding in tasks on these levels may be attributed to inadequate rules or instructions, something that can be experienced as less threatening or personal (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1999).

Involvement in the task starts at the level of competence, where the student chooses which actions to take and becomes involved in the results of these actions. However, this does not mean that the novice is not involved at all; it just means that the novice may be more motivated or concerned with following the rules to produce the wanted results (Dreyfus, 2004). To reach the level of proficiency, the student needs to become involved in the activity itself, not just the result. If NN avoids this and does not become emotionally involved in the task, it can result in stagnation, or even regression to a lower level of skill-development, something that may not be beneficial for NN, since he already is lagging behind his peers in some skills.

All human beings will at one time or another struggle with progressing in a skill-domain. One does not become expert in everything one does (Dreyfus, 2009). For students, like NN, which may frequently fail academically in school, it can affect their belief in their own abilities, and they can protect themselves from this feeling by for example choosing to not involving

themselves in the learning activity. Furthermore, if NN is at a novice or advanced beginner stage in a skill domain he may not be able to perform the task on a competent or proficient level in school, as discussed above. Having a teacher who facilitates and encourage involvement is therefore important (i.e. 2.3.2). A safe classroom environment is also essential for students who struggle with a subject (Corrie, 2002). In a safe environment, a student may more easily try to let go of the learned rules without the same risk of failure. Not all students need to become experts, and for some it can be difficult to reach this stage. Some students need more support, positive accumulated experiences and a teacher who knows what they need at the stage they are at. Learning a skill through adequate instructions and accumulated experience can give a student a chance to practice the skill that may be challenging. In NN's case, reading can for example be seen as a skill he needs more practice in.

The special education teacher had the impression that NN wanted to do well in school, but since he was easily distracted this could be a problem (i.e. 4.1). Maybe NN was easily distracted because he could not perform the task, like editing his project, without the context-free rules and thereby not becoming involved in the learning activity they were expected to do in English and History. The results may show that NN displayed behavior of all three categories of disruptive physical movements when he was not on-task or involved in the learning activity. As I will come back to, in the kitchen, NN seemed involved, and did not display disruptive physical movements of any category. One can ask what was different in this context.

In the next sections I will discuss some of the observations where NN did not display disruptive physical movements in the classroom. It can be of interest to notice which conditions that was present when the disruptive physical movements were not expressed.

4.4.3 On-task but not involved: not displaying disruptive behavior

As the results presented in section 4.2 may show, when NN was given specific context-free instructions on what to do, for example in the first observation, when the teacher told the students to write down the underlined sentences from the PowerPoint and take notes during the movie, or in the fourth observation when NN was given specific instructions on what to write on the desktop regarding his paper, NN may be described as on-task. He followed the teacher's instructions and performed the task, and he did not display disruptive physical

movements. Was NN involved in the task performed in these situations, albeit following the teacher's context-free instructions?

I mentioned in section 2.3.2 that on-task behavior and being emotionally involved is not the same. A student may be on-task and not involved in the learning activity, but it can be hard to become involved in an activity if not working on-task. Although NN may not have been involved in the activity itself when receiving context-free directions from the teacher, i.e. writing down the underlined sentences or taking notes during the movie, or instructions on what to write on his paper, he may have been able to stay on-task because of these specific context-free instructions he received from the teacher, and thereby not displaying disruptive physical movements in these situations.

When working with the teacher on the desktop, the teacher had to constantly redirect NN to help him stay on-task, something that may also indicate that NN was not involved in the task he was expected to do. It may be asked if the disruptions from other students could have distracted NN from staying on-task in this situation, since other students often approached the teacher with questions. One may ask if this was an ideal situation for NN to work in. The teacher may not have helped facilitate or create opportunities for involvement in this situation, even though the teacher helped NN, since the constant interruptions from other students may have made it more difficult for NN to stay on-task over a longer period of time. Each time other students approached the teacher, NN turned around, and did not work on his paper. It may be said that in this observations, several students did seem confused about what they where supposed to do, and the teacher was the only one present in the classroom that could help them. Therefore, it can be seen as a necessity to leave NN alone by the desktop, even though this may not have benefitted NN.

When given context-free instructions, and thereby knowing exactly what to do, it seemed that NN was able to perform the task. These tasks, like writing the underlined sentences from the PowerPoint or correcting his I-search assignment when the teacher told him exactly what to write can be seen as tasks that lies within NN's proximal zone of development. Maybe NN needs these specific context-free instructions in situations that if left alone would exceed his skill-level? As the excerpt in observation four can illustrate (4.2.5) NN was directly out of his seat when the teacher left him alone by the desktop, but stayed in his seat, typing on the keyboard, when the teacher was closely monitoring him and sitting nearby providing support.

4.4.4 On-task and involved: not displaying disruptive behavior

The third observation, in the kitchen, may serve as an example on a situation when NN seemed emotionally involved in the task. In this observation, NN solely displayed category four (on-task physical movement), and he only interacted with others in a task related manner.

NN leaves the work area and walks towards student 1. Calling his name. NN stops by the cooking teacher, and shows her the eggs. She says: "Very good". Then NN approaches student 1. Student 1 smells the eggs, and say: "Ok". NN and student 1 return to the work place, and put the eggs in the heating cabinet.

In the kitchen, NN could have been performing a task at a proficient level, or maybe expert level, as he seemed involved and absorbed in the task he was performing. He also seemed involved in the outcome of his work, something that can indicate that he was on a higher skill-level in the kitchen compared to activities he performed in History and English. NN also worked intuitively (without a recipe), but seemed to need confirmation on the task he had performed (as seen in the excerpt above). NN also showed initiative in this observation; when finishing with one task, he found other related activities to occupy himself with, and he seemed involved in the outcome of these actions as well.

NN is described as a student with low attention span and easily distracted by his surroundings (i.e. 4.1). In the observations conducted in History and English, one could observe NN being easily distracted. It was therefore interesting to note that in the kitchen, NN did not appear to be distracted by others who approached him, or by student 1 who was walking around in the classroom some of that time.

What was different in the third observation compared to the other observations of NN? First off, one may note that this was a different classroom context, with a different teacher in charge, which may have affected NN's behavior and his ability to stay on-task. Thus the observations may not be directly comparable. However, in the kitchen, NN was given an opportunity to choose which task he wanted to perform, as seen in the excerpt from section 4.2.4:

The teacher is talking about the ingredients they will be working with, and asks if anyone remembers that they made a dish with eggs before. NN says:" I do! I made the eggs

another time". The cooking teacher says: "Good, then you know how to do that!" NN expresses a wish to work with eggs again.

Preparing eggs seemed like something NN believed he could do, and it was something he had done before. Maybe NN had positive accumulated experiences with this task, since he may have performed this task with success previously. By giving NN this choice the teacher may have enhanced and facilitated NN's involvement. Moreover, performing a task, without context-free rules as support, may not be experienced as frightening if one believes that one can manage the task given. So, by knowing it was a task he could perform, this could have contributed to give NN a feeling of coping with the situation and the safety he might need to take a risk and move away from context-free rules and procedures, which is important for becoming emotionally involved in the activity and for progressing in skill acquisition (Dreyfus, 2009).

Furthermore, in the kitchen, during the fifteen minutes the observation lasted, NN received praise from both the cooking teacher; the class teacher, and he was approached by the class assistant. As one can see from the examples presented in section 4.2.4:

The class' teacher comes up and claps NN on the back. The cooking teacher approaches and does the same and says: "Nice job". NN dries the bowl. Then puts it back in the cabinet.

NN finds a flower and some centerpiece decorations in a cabinet and puts it on the table. The cooking teacher approaches: "That's good, you guys". NN nods and smiles to the teacher.

By giving NN praise for the activities he is performing it may have encouraged NN's involvement. According to Dreyfus (2009) it is essential for the teacher to encourage and facilitate involvement in the classroom. By giving NN tasks he could perform, thereby using his strength and by giving him positive feedback, the teacher can be seen as doing that.

Befring and Duesund (2012) emphasize that disruptive behavior can diminish or expand as a consequence of conditions present in the classroom. In the setting, when NN seemed involved in the activity, he does not engage in disruptive physical movements but is focused on the task and does not get interrupted by being approached by others (as he was when working on the desktop or during individual reading). When NN leaves the workplace and approaches others, NN only engages in conversation regarding the task at hand. By giving

NN the choice, he could choose something he knew he could do. He stayed involved in the task, showed initiative, and did not need continuous redirections from the teacher. Instead the teacher can be described as encouraging NN's involvement.

4.4.5 Other considerations

In this thesis, the focus has been on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior. And physical movements as a type of disruptive behavior one can observe in the classroom.
As written above, when NN was in the kitchen he seemed involved in the activities he was performing. Can other aspects, besides those previously mentioned, have helped NN become involved in the task?

Practical subjects are described as NN's strength in school (i.e. 4.1). Thereby, practical subjects can be something NN may have the adequate skills to manage on a higher skill-level and something he as a result can become truly involved in. Preparing food (i.e. cooking eggs) can be described as a practical skill. In the kitchen, NN may have been able to use his strength, something that may have facilitated positive involvement. Furthermore, NN is described as an active student. Befring and Duesund (2012) underline that disruptive behavior can be seen as a reaction related to unspent energy. Being able to use his body or the excessive energy in this context may have reduced his need to move around, and thereby helped him stay on-task and become involved. It is also claimed that a traditional school context is often not adapted to some students need for activity. If some boys have a need for a more informal setting and more freedom to move around, a practical setting like the kitchen could have provided NN with this opportunity.

The traditional school context is criticized for being more suited for girls rather than boys, and for having a focus on theoretical subjects rather than the practical ones (Befring & Duesund, 2012; Corrie, 2002). This may have a negative effect on students like NN, who have their strength in the practical subjects in school and performs below average in the academic ones. In the school NN attended, they had the opportunity to visit the kitchen five times each school year. If emphasis is put on theoretical subjects in school, and/or neglecting practical learning, when do the practical strong student get the opportunity to accumulate positive experiences with the school as an arena to learn, if one is constantly met with academic defeats?

As previously mentioned, the kitchen could have provided NN with an opportunity to use his strength within practical subjects, and for whatever reason for not displaying disruptive behavior, the result from the third observation (4.2.4) can show that NN only displayed on-task physical movement in this context, which may imply the importance of giving students such as NN the opportunity to attend more practical subjects in school. It may seem that his involvement and focus in this setting may have kept him from becoming distracted by student 1's off-task behavior. Working with his body instead of facing demands of sitting still, may also have helped him stay on-task and become involved in the activity. Furthermore, NN's interest in the subject may have facilitated his involvement. In the Interview, NN expressed that he liked being in the kitchen.

One of the goals at the school NN attended was that they should strive towards creating a dynamic learning community where every child is known and supported (i.e. 4.1). If a school mostly focuses on academic subjects, and academic excellence is one of the ideals, is dynamic learning then upheld? If NN is constantly faced with academic tasks that are to challenging for him is he then recognized and supported?

As several authors have pointed out (i.e. 2.1.2) the expectations that exist in some school or classroom cultures for homogeneity, harmony and functionality might provide limited room for some students. All students are individuals and have different skill-levels, needs and learning styles. By making the same behavioral and academic requirements for all students, the school can contribute to force some students who are slightly different into roles of academic failures. Through inflexibility and insistence on uniformity, conditions can be created that inhibit healthy expressions of individuality. By suppressing this individuality schools may contribute to learning- and behavior problems instead of facilitating development.

4.4.6 Summary and answer to research question 2

This section will give a brief summary and answer to the second research question: *How can the displayed disruptive physical movement be related to the Skill Model?*

There may be numerous reasons for why students display disruptive behavior in the classroom. When answering this research question and relating the disruptive physical movements to the Skill Model, the emphasis was put on skills, instruction and involvement. In the three observations conducted in the combined English and History class, NN displayed all three categories of disruptive physical movements. If NN does not have the skills required to perform the assigned task, or the demands placed on him is higher than his skill-level, it may be difficult for him to stay on-task in the learning situation or become involved in the learning activity. A consequence of not being on-task or involved may be that he displays disruptive physical movements in the classroom. Instructions given by the teacher seemed to have an effect on the behavior displayed. When the teacher was nearby and told him exactly what to do, NN stayed on-task and did not engage in disruptive physical movements. In the kitchen, NN seemed involved in the task he chose to perform. He did not engage in disruptive physical movements and was not distracted from the task by being approached by others.

4.4.7 Possible practical implications

In this section I will briefly note some practical implications that may be drawn from the research questions. Benner (2004) mentions the usefulness of the Skill Model in understanding the learning needs, and styles of learning at different levels of skill acquisition. NN is described as a student who struggles with academic subjects in school. If the physical movements displayed by NN are a result of demands placed on him that are higher than his actual skill-level, it can be important that the teacher identify which skill-level NN is currently on, and adapt activities and adjust the manner of instructions given to this level. When NN displayed disruptive physical movements it may be a sign of needing more support in the learning activity. To work within NN's proximal zone of development with the support and guidance a teacher can provide, may be important for further supporting his learning progress.

Students who, as an example, reads below the designated level (as NN does), may often in school be required to use the same material as students reading at or above this level, which can lead to lower self image for students that are unable to reach some set standard. If a student is constantly met with academic challenges or defeats, it can be difficult to stay on-task or become involved in the learning activity. Negative accumulated experiences with not managing tasks, is not beneficial for the student's further learning in school (Befring &

Duesund, 2012; Kauffmann, 1989; Riggs & Gholar, 2009; Zionts et al., 2002). If NN stagnates or regresses in his skill-development, for example in reading, the result may be that he falls further behind his peers. Which is not beneficial since NN starts high school due autumn. Disruptive behavior in the classroom is complex, and there are no simple solutions for this challenge in school. In NN's case, creating opportunities for him so he is able to stay on-task or becoming emotionally involved in the assigned learning activity can be a suggestion that may reduce the disruptive physical movements he displayed in some situations.

4.5 Summary of chapter four

This section will sum up the most significant findings and give an overview of what has been described and discussed in the fourth chapter.

The first research question posed in this thesis was: *What kind of physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior in the classroom?* The purpose of this question was to distinguish different types of physical movements that can be disruptive in the classroom, and discuss why these physical movements are linked to disruptive behavior. To answer this question I categorized the most frequent physical movements displayed into four behavior categories. These categories were made on the basis of the four observations and my definition of disruptive physical movements. Then the results from the observation and interview were presented before I discussed findings.

NN displayed all three categories of disruptive physical movements in the observations, but displayed category one (off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher) and category two (off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher) more frequently than category three (off-task "passive" movement). The disruptive physical movements were more frequently displayed when no clear instructions were given, when the teacher left the classroom and when other students were up walking around.

In the discussion (section 4.3), I took a closer look at the three observed categories of disruptive physical movements. When discussing the first category, off-task physical movement: no interaction with peers or teacher, I mentioned that this category could first and foremost be interfering with the student's own learning. The student was off-task, walking

around when other assigned tasks should be performed. Although the student displaying this category of behavior did not actively interact with others, this type of physical movements were observed to receive a reaction from other students and the teacher.

When discussing the second category, off-task physical movement: interacting with peers and/or teacher, I argued that this type of physical movement could cause a double disturbance. The student was off-task and moving around in the classroom while interacting with other students, thereby not only interfering with his own learning, but also those approached.

The third category: off-task "passive" movement, referred to situations where disruptive physical movements were displayed while the student was in his seat. When this category was displayed, the student was off-task, thereby not engaged in the learning activity. By disturbing another student, the physical movement interfered with others' learning and received a reaction from the teacher. When discussing the excerpts presented, I asked if the movements displayed could be a preliminary factor that led to more disruptive behavior.

The categories are a conceptualization, and can therefore not capture the complexity of the behavior displayed in the classroom, even though it can give insight into disruptive physical movements observed. There were sliding transitions between the categories, and the students often displayed several categories simultaneously. When discussing the physical movements, I underlined that disruptive behavior in the classroom is complex. There is a subjective element attached to the perception of behavior. Not all physical movements' expressed in the classroom are perceived as disruptive, and some behaviors that are perceived as disruptive from a teachers point of view, may have a learning related purpose for the student. It is not only the student being off-task that can disrupt. Other aspects, like the teacher's verbal correction of the behavior, or other students' reaction may also affect the disruptiveness in the classroom.

The second research question posted in this thesis was: *How can the displayed disruptive physical movements be related to the Skill Model?* The purpose of this question, and the use of the Skill Model, was to give an alternate framework for discussing the physical movements identified. The Skill Model describes a process of skill acquisition. It put emphasis on learning through instruction and the importance of becoming emotionally

involved at stage three (competent) to further progress to stage four (proficient). I chose to focus on three aspects when answering this question, namely skills, instruction and emotional involvement, and I discussed how these three aspects could be related to the disruptive physical movements displayed.

In section 4.4.1 I discussed if lacking skills and instructions could be related to the disruptive physical movements displayed. NN is described as a student who performs below average in academic subjects in school, but has his strength in the practical subjects. In the three observations I conducted in the combined English and History class, NN displayed all three categories of disruptive physical movements. I argue that if NN's skill-level is at a novice or advanced beginner stage compared to his peers, or the level he should have been on in 8th grade, History and English, may require skills that are above his skill-level. If NN does not have the skills required to perform the assigned task, or the demands placed on him is higher than his skill-level, he can experience problems with becoming emotionally involved in the learning activity. A consequence of not being on-task or involved in the task can be to display disruptive physical movements as another way of engaging himself or avoiding the task at hand. Instructions given seemed to affect the physical movements displayed. When NN was given context-free instructions and support from the teacher, he did not exhibit disruptive physical movements in the classroom.

In section 4.4.2 I discussed if the disruptive behavior could be seen as a result of not reaching stage four (proficient). To reach this stage, the student needs to become emotionally involved in the learning activity. Not becoming involved may led to stagnation at the third stage (competence), and a consequence of this may be boredom or regression in a particular learning domain. Letting go of context-free rules can be challenging for some students, especially if they struggle with subjects in school. At the two first stages (novice or advanced beginner) a student is given context-free rules, and thereby knows what needs to be done to perform the task, which can be experienced as safer as one can attribute failure to inadequate instructions. A safe classroom environment and a teacher who facilitates involvement may be important when taking the risk to move away from learned rules and procedures.

In section 4.4.3 I discussed observations where NN did not display disruptive physical movements. He was on-task but did not seem involved in the learning activity. He was easily distracted from the assigned tasks and redirection and context-free instructions from the

teacher seemed necessary for him to stay on-task. The instructions and reminders from the teacher can be conditions that helped NN stay on-task in these situations.

In section 4.4.4 I discussed a context where NN seemed absorbed and involved in the activity he performed. This observation took place in the kitchen. In this context NN did not display disruptive physical movements. He was not distracted from the task he was assigned to do, even when approached by student 1. In this section I also mentioned aspects that were different in comparison to the three other observations of NN. NN chose his own assignment. He also received praise from the teachers. By giving NN the chance to choose his own assignment and giving him praise, the teacher facilitated NN's involvement.

In section 4.4.5 other considerations that may have helped NN become involved was mentioned. His strength in practical subjects, the fact that he could use his body in a learning activity, and that he liked the subject matter could have contributed and facilitated his involvement in the kitchen context.

In section 4.4.6 I gave a short summary of the second research question.

In section 4.4.7 I mentioned some possible practical implications.

5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I will summarize some of the significant findings and outline some final considerations. First, I will give an overview of the previous chapters, which can serve as a reminder of what has been assessed in this thesis. Secondly, I will present some final considerations and give a short summary before I outline some limitations of this study and suggestions to further research on the topic of disruptive behavior as physical movements.

In the first chapter, I described the background and gave a short introduction to the theme of this thesis. I also presented my two research questions. The second chapter outlined the theoretical framework. The three main topics presented in this chapter were disruptive behavior, physical movements, and Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) Skill Model. The third chapter consisted of the methodology applied in this thesis. I described a qualitative approach to research. The design was presented and I described the methods used to collect data, which were observation and interview. A presentation of how the observations and interview were implemented followed, before validity, reliability as well as ethical considerations were discussed. In the fourth chapter, behavior categories based on the definition of disruptive physical movements and the four observations were described before I presented my results from the observation and interview. The presented results were then discussed through use of the two research questions and relevant theory outlined in chapter two.

5.1 Final considerations

Through my master degree in Special Education at the University of Oslo, I received the opportunity to take part in the research project “Disruptive behavior in School”. The aim of this research project is to broaden the understanding of the sources and contexts of disruptive behavior, to generate knowledge that can be valuable for institutions educating teachers and improve education and services for students (Duesund, 2013).

When reviewing existing literature on disruptive behavior, I did not get the impression that the physical aspect of disruptive behavior has received as much attention as the verbal disruptive behavior displayed in the classroom. This made it interesting to explore the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, since not much literature was written solely on this

subject. Physical disruptive behavior is, in this thesis, viewed as physical movements. From the four observations, I identified three categories of physical movements that are linked to disruptive behavior. These categories are akin to my definition of disruptive physical movements and the distinction between on-task and off-task behavior. The disruptive physical movements that most frequently occurred in the classroom fell into the first and second behavior category and consisted of off-task behaviors where the student was out-of-seat or walking around without interacting with others students or the teacher, and off-task behavior where the student interacted with other students and/or the teacher. Both these categories describe a student being out-of-seat and walking around when other assigned learning activities should be performed. The third category, off-task "passive" movement, was not displayed as frequently as the two other categories. This category was mainly seen in the first observation, where I observed the class for a whole class session. However, this category is akin to my definition of disruptive physical movements, as physical movement displayed while sitting in one's seat also could interfere with the student's own learning and disturb others. Physical movements are visual, so either of the four categories could be seen as interfering with the student's own learning, the peers' learning, and the teacher's ability to operate efficiently in the classroom. This depends on the context the physical movement was displayed in and the reaction the behavior received.

To answer the second research question, I mainly focused on three aspects within the Skill Model, namely skills, instruction and involvement. NN was described as a student that struggled with academic subjects in school. In the History and English class, NN displayed categories of disruptive physical movements. In the kitchen, NN only displayed on-task movements. In situations where NN could be lacking the skills to perform the required task or the necessary instruction or support, he was not on-task or involved in the learning activity. Instructions given by the teacher affected the behavior displayed. When NN was given clear and context-free instructions on what to do, he performed the assigned task. In some situations, when left alone and the task could exceed his skill-level, he displayed disruptive physical movements.

5.1.1 Limitations of this study and suggestions to further research

Through the analysis and interpretation of the observations, I have used perspectives presented in chapter 2. These perspectives are not the only existing perspectives for

explaining and analyzing the behavior displayed. Furthermore, the data and results were mediated through me as a researcher, and therefore my presumptuousness. Even though I took precautions, as mentioned in section 3.7, I want to point out that this may be a limitation to this study. The empirical knowledge in this thesis is scarce, as I only observed the student in question on four different occasions over the duration of a week. Furthermore, classroom observations, which last for fifteen minutes, can only give a small sample of behavior. This may affect the results and, thereby, conclusions drawn. Also, due to the restrictions of this thesis (timeframe and page number), I had to select which observations to present and what to discuss. Through this necessary selection, all aspects of interest could not be explored.

Substantiating research on physical movements as disruptive behavior with a greater sample of students and conducting more observations and interviews can be important to get a more comprehensive picture of this type of disruptive behavior. In the classroom, one can observe a multitude of different movements, which may or may not be disruptive. By selecting some movements to focus on, other physical movements may have been overlooked. As I did not find qualitative studies on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior, there may be more insight to be gained through further qualitative studies or by combining quantitative studies with qualitative studies. I would therefore recommend further research on the physical aspect of disruptive behavior. Furthermore, it could be interesting to conduct further research on physical disruptive behavior and the opportunity students are given to use their body in the learning situation. Maybe giving students more room to move around when performing activities related to learning would affect the exhibited physical disruptive behavior in the classroom.

Bibliography

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1998). Observational Techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (pp. 79-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Algozzine, B. (1977). The Emotionally Disturbed Child: Disturbed or Disturbing? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 5*(2), 205-211. doi: 10.1007/BF00913096

Algozzine, B., & Curran, T. J. (1979). Teachers' Predictions of Children's School Success As a Function of Their Behavioral Tolerances. *Journal of Educational Research, 72*(6), 344-347.

Befring, E. (2007). *Forskningsmetode med etikk og statistikk*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Befring, E., & Duesund, L. (2012). Relasjonsvansker. Psykososial problematferd. In E. Befring & R. Tangen (Eds.), *Spesialpedagogikk* (pp. 448-464). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Befring, E., Duesund, L., & Popovici, S. (2013). *Familier og barn i krise. Rapport fra forskningsprosjektet: økningen i tilmeldte til barnevernet- En analyse av utviklingstrekk.* Oslo: Institutt for spesialpedagogikk, Universitetet i Oslo.

Benner, P. (2004). Using the Dreyfus Model of Skill Aquisition to Describe and Interpret Skill Acquisition and Clinical Judgment in Nursing Practice and Education. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 24*(3), 188-199. doi: 10.1177/0270467604265061

Berg, B. L. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (2 ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogodan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education. An introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Book, R. M., & Skeen, J. A. (1987). Behavioral observations of disruptive behaviors with referred and nonreferred elementary school students. *Psychology in the Schools,*

24(4), 399-405. doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(198710)24:4<399::AID-PITS2310240416>3.0.CO;2-1

Borg, M. G. (1998). Secondary school teachers' perception of pupils' undesirable behaviours. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(1), 67-79. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1998.tb01275.x

Boudah, D. J. (2011). *Conducting Educational Research. Guide to Completing A Major Project*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Charles, C. M. (2011). *Building classroom discipline* (10 ed.). United States of America: Pearson.

Colvin, G. (2010). *Defusing disruptive behavior in the classroom*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Corrie, L. (2002). *Investigating Troublesome Classroom Behavior*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cullinan, D. (2004). Classification and Definition of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. In R. B. Rutherford, S. R. Mathur & M. M. Quinn (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* (pp. 32-53). New York: The Guilford Press.

Damsgaard, H. L. (2010). *Med åpne øyne: observasjon og tiltak i skolens arbeid med problematferd*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademiske Forlag.

Danielsen, I.-J., Skaar, K., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2007). *De viktige få- Analyse av Elevundersøkelsen 2007*. Oxford Research. Retrieved February 13, 2014, from http://www.udir.no/Upload/Brukerundersokelser 2007/5/Elevundersokelsen_2007.pdf?epslanguage=no.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Collecting and Interpreting qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dreyfus, H. (2009). *On the internet. Thinking in action* (2 ed.). New York: Routledge.

Dreyfus, H., & Dreyfus, S. (1986). *Mind over Machine. The Power of Human Intuition and Expertise in the Era of the Computer*. New York: The Free Press.

Dreyfus, S. E. (2004). The Five-Stage Model of Adult Skill Aquisition. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 24*(117), 117-181. doi: 10.1177/0270467604264992

Dreyfus, S. E., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1999). Mesterlære og ekspertens læring. In K. Nielsen & S. Kvale (Eds.), *Mesterlære. Læring som sosial praksis* (pp. 52-69). Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Duesund, L. (1995). *Kropp, kunnskap og selvoppfatning*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Duesund, L. (2013). *A comparative Study of Disruptive Behavior Between Schools in Norway and the United States*. Project description. University of Oslo.

Duesund, L., & Jespersen, E. (2004). Skill Aquisition in Ski Instruction and the Skill Model's Application to Treating Anorexia Nevrosa. *Bulletin of Social Science, Technology & Society, 24*(225), 225-233. doi: 10.1177/0270467604265011

Elliot, J., & Place, M. (2004). *Children in Difficulty. A guide to understanding and helping.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Frude, N., & Gault, H. (1984). *Disruptive behavior*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational Research. An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearsons Education.

Greene, R. W. (2009). *Lost at school. Why our kids with Behavior Challenges Are Falling Through the Cracks and How We can Help Them*. New York: SCRIBNER.

Hartas, D. (2010). *Educational Research and Inquiry. Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hjardemaal, F. (2002). Vitenskapsteori. In T. A. Kleven (Ed.), *Innføring i pedagogisk forskningsmetode* (pp. 28-60). Oslo: Unipub forlag.

Hofer, M. (2007). Goal conflicts and self-regulation: A new look at pupils' off-task behaviour in the classroom. *Educational Research Review, 2*(1), 28-38. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2007.02.002

Kaiser, B., & Rasminsky, J. S. (2009). *Challenging Behavior in Elementary and Middle School*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.

Kauffmann, J. M. (1989). *Characteristics of Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth* (4 ed.). United States of America: Merril Publishing Company.

Kauffmann, J. M. (2013). Labeling and categorizing children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders in the USA: Current practices and conceptual problems. In T. Cole, H. Daniels & J. Visser (Eds.), *The Routledge International Companion to Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* (pp. 15-21). New York: Routledge

Kauffmann, J. M., Brigham, F. J., & Mock, D. R. (2004). Historical to Contemporary Perspectives on the Field of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. In R. B. Rutherford, S. R. Mathur & M. M. Quinn (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* (pp. 15-31). New York: The Guilford Press.

Kauffmann, J. M., & Kneedler, R. D. (1981). Behavior Disorders. In J. M. Kauffmann & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Handbook of special education* (pp. 165-194). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Keogh, B. K. (2003). *Temperament in the Classroom. Understanding Individual Differences*. Baltimore: Paul H. Bookes Publishing Co.

Kilian, B., Hofer, M., Fries, S., & Kuhnle, C. (2010). The conflict between on-task and off-task actions in the classroom and its consequences for motivation and achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 25*(1), 67-85. doi: 10.1007/s10212-009-0007-8

Kirk, S. A., & Gallagher, J. J. (1983). *Educating exeptional children* (4 ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kleven, T. A., Hjardemaal, F., & Tveit, K. (2002). *Innføring i pedagogisk forskningsmetode. En hjelp til kritisk tolkning og vurdering* (T. A. Kleven Ed.). Oslo: Unipub forlag.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews. An introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kvale, S., & Nielsen, K. (2003). Læring på kryds og tværs i praktikkens læringslandskab. In S. Kvale & K. Nielsen (Eds.), *Praktikkens læringslandsab. At lære gjennem at arbejde* (pp. 248-267). København: Akademisk Forlag.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case study Applications in Education* (2 ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

NESH. (2006). Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi. Retrieved November 25, 2013, from http://www.etikkom.no/Documents/Publikasjoner-som-PDF/Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi (2006).pdf

Nordahl, T., Sørlie, M.-A., Manger, T., & Tveit, A. (2005). *Atferdsproblemer blant barn og unge. Teoretiske og praktiske tilnærminger*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Næss, N. G. (2006). Observasjon. In K. Fuglseth & K. Skogen (Eds.), *Masteroppgaven i pedagogikk og spesialpedagogikk. Design og metoder* (pp. 90-105). Oslo: Cappelen Akademiske Forlag.

OECD. (2009). Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS: OECD Publishing.

Ogden, T. (2009). *Sosial kompetanse og problematferd i skolen* (2 ed.). Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Patterson, S. T. (2009). The Effects of Teacher-Student Small Talk on Out-of-Seat Behavior. *Education & Treatment of Children, 32*(1), 167-174.

Payne, G., & Payne, J. (2004). *Key concepts in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Redl, F. (1975). Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom. *The School Review, 83*(4), 569-594.

Rhodes, W. (1969). The Disturbing Child: A problem of Ecological Management. In P. S. Gaubard (Ed.), *Children agains schools. Education of the Delinquent, Disturbed, Disruptive* (pp. 17-30). Chicago: Follett Educational Corporation.

Ricæur, P. (1973). The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text. *New Literary History, 5*(1), 91-117. Retrieved Febrary 18, 2014, from The Johns Hopkins University Press: http://www.jstor.org/stable/468410

Riggs, E. G., & Gholar, C., R. (2009). *Strategies that promote Student Engagement. Unleashing the desire to learn* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rose, R., & Grosvenor, I. (2001). Interviews. In R. Rose & I. Grosvenor (Eds.), *Doing research in Special Education. Ideas into practice* (pp. 112-116). London: David Fulton Publishers.

Shumate, E. D., & Wills, H. P. (2010). Classroom-Based Functional Analysis and Intervention for Disruptive and Off-Task Behaviors. *Education and treatment of children, 33*(1), 23-48.

Sigsgaard, E. (2006). Ro i klassen eller Dagens børn og disciplinen. In N. Egelund, H. Jensen & E. Sigsgaard (Eds.), *Uro og disciplin i skolen* (pp. 61-92). Fredriksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Smith, S. W., & Taylor, G. G. (2010). Educating Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. In P. Peterson, E. Baker & B. McGraw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 678-687). Oxford: Elsevier.

Vedeler, L. (2000). *Observasjonsforskning i pedagogiske fag. En innføring i bruk av metoder*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman Eds.). Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Way, S. M. (2011). School Discipline and disruptive classroom behavior: the moderating effects of student perceptions. *The Sociological Quarterly, 52*(3), 346-375. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01210.x

Webber, J., & Plotts, C. A. (2008). *Emotional and Behavioral Disorders. Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearsons Education, Inc.

Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1988). Which Classroom Behaviours do Primary School Teachers say they find most Troublesome. *Educational Review, 40*(1), 13-27. doi: 10.1080/0013191880400102

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zentall, S. S. (1980). Behavioral Comparisons of Hyperactivie and Normally Active Children in Natural Settings. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 8*(1), 93-109. doi: 0091-0627/80/0300-009303.00/00/0

Zionts, P., Zionts, L., & Simpson, R. L. (2002). *Emotional and Behavioral Problems. A handbook for Understanding and Handeling Students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Aasen, P., Nordtug, B., Ertesvåg, S. K., & Leirvik, B. (2002). *Atferdsproblemer. Innføring i pedagogisk analyse*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Letter of Consent

Department of Special Needs Education

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO, NORWAY

PARENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

for the research project "Disruptive Behavior in School"

WHAT IS THIS STUDY ABOUT?

Your child is invited to take part in research to evaluate disruptive behavior in primary and middle schools and how it affects the student, classmates, teachers and learning environment. This research project is a collaboration between University of Oslo, Norway and University of California, Berkeley USA. This particular study will focus on the link between physical movements in the classroom and disruptive behavior. The research project is led by professor Liv Duesund, Ph.D, Department of Special Needs Education, University of Oslo. Ragna Lill Stavnes, a graduate student from University of Oslo, will conduct this particular study.

PROCEDURES: **WHAT INFORMATION WILL BE COLLECTED?**

The research project will collect observational data from the students participating in the study. The observations will take place on four different occasions, last 15 minutes and happen during a total span of one month in the spring 2014. The researcher will write down what she perceives happens during the observations and will not engage the students in the classroom in any way. She will take every means necessary to minimize the impact her observations may have on the students in the classroom. Also, the researcher will conduct one interview with the student after the last observation, lasting between 10 and 15 minutes, if the student agrees to this.

Participation in the research project is voluntary. Whether or not you give permission for your child to take place in the study will have no bearing on his/her standing or grades at school.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS: **HOW WILL OUR INFORMATION BE KEPT PRIVATE?**

When collecting the observational data there will be no mention of name, school or city the data is collected from. Any identifying information obtained will not be revealed or shared in any way. If information from this study is published or presented at school or scientific meetings, names and other personal information will not be used.

BENEFITS: **WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS FROM BEING IN THE STUDY?**

There are no direct benefits to you or your child from participating in this research. However, the data collected from this research will hopefully provide valuable information about disruptive behavior and physical movement, and how to best meet the needs of the student, which could influence educational research and in turn equip future teachers with better tools for meeting the needs of every student.

VOLUNTEERING TO BE A PARTICIPANT

The participation of your child is voluntary. You can refuse to have your child entered in the research and you can discontinue the participation at any time.

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS

If you have any questions about the research, you may contact Ragna Lill Stavnes, the graduate student conducting the observations at telephone: (510) 646-3018 or e-mail: ragna_lill@hotmail.com or Liv Duesund, Project Director of the study at telephone: (510) 378-8827 or e-mail: liv.duesund@isp.uio.no. If you wish to speak with someone other than the researchers about the study concerns or your child's rights as a research subject, feel free to contact the Office for the Protection of Human Subjects (OPHS) at (510) 642-7461 or by e-mail: cphs@berkeley.edu

If you prefer that your child do NOT participate in the research project, you will need to return a signed copy of this letter to your child's teacher by 1st of March.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call.
We truly appreciate your child's participation.

Sincerely,

Ragna Lill Stavnes
(510) 646-3018
ragna_lill@hotmail.com

Sign and return this page to _____ by 1st of March if you do not want your child to be included in the research project.

Please do NOT include my child in this project.

----------	----------	
Signature	Print name	Date

----------	----------
Child's name	Age/grade

Appendix 2: Observation form

OBSERVATION REPORT 2ND YEAR OF MASTERS DEGREE 2014:

GUIDELINES FOR OBSERVATION: DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL

Focus area: Students' experience of disruptive behavior in school, i.e. behavior that appear disturbing to the pupil/child him/herself, to fellow pupils/other children and/or to teacher/educator.

How and when to conduct observations:
- The researcher/student should attend two days of classroom teaching PRIOR to observing to familiarize her/himself with the class/group.
- **1st observation**: Focus on the class/group as a whole lasting for one hour.
- **2nd observation**: Individual observation of the selected student, lasting for 15 minutes in the beginning of class/group session.
- **3rd observation**: Individual observation of the selected student, lasting for 15 minutes in the middle of/during class/group session.
- **4th observation**: Individual observation of the selected student, lasting for 15 minutes at the end of class/group session.
- The researcher/student has to provide the correct time for when observation starts and ends.

What to focus on during the first observation, the whole class/group:
Describe what happens during class/group session in one hour. During the observation of the class hour, record as much as you can of what occurs: teacher teaching; types of interactions between teacher and students; types of interactions among the students; disruptive behaviors.

This may include:
- The classroom dynamics, both academically and socially
- Describe any disruptive behavior
- Focus on interaction between the student, peers and teacher
- Record teaching methods
- What is going on and who is doing what?

After your observations characterize the teaching methods used: e.g., mainly lecture, mainly student participation, combination of the two, extent of group discussion among students (entire class, smaller groups).

What to focus on during the 2nd, 3rd and 4th observation:
An individual observation of disruptive behavior of one single student/child in the group session lasting for 15 minutes each.

Describe what happens during class/group session during 15 minutes.
- Record two types of behaviors on the part of the targeted student: disruptive actions and non-disruptive actions (e.g., responses in teaching and learning contexts; cooperative behaviors)
- Be sure to record actual behaviors and any verbal utterances by the student and any verbal interactions with others. If others react to the disruptive behavior, even if it is not directed at the target student, record their behaviors and utterances.
- Record whether the disruptive student reacts to the responses from others and how.
- Behavioral descriptions alone (e.g., student put his head down on the desk) should mean that nothing was said. But do record any reactions from others if they occur.

Other relevant aspects:
- Record the actual disruptive behavior (db) and describe it thoroughly; for example was it a verbal uttering, a physical movement, did it disturb others or the student him/herself etc.
- Describe any interactions with other students and teacher around the db act.
- What happened just before the db act?
- What happened just after the db act?
- How did peers and teacher respond to the db act?
- If and how did the student displaying the db act react to the response from others?

After your observations characterize the teaching methods used: e.g., mainly lecture, mainly student participation, combination of the two, extent of group discussion among students (entire class, smaller groups).

Instructions for what to do after each observation:
- Write down any questions/comments you might have to your observations and interpretations.
- Reflect upon your recorded observations for the purpose of, if needed, making improvements for your next observation.

Interpretation during and after observations:
- It is important to distinguish between descriptions and interpretations.
- In the interpretations the researcher/student must try to assess whether the behavior described can be understood as disruptive behavior.
- Interpretation guidelines:

In recording of observations describe behaviors and interactions and do not interpret. After each observation reflect upon the recorded observation. The actual interpretations of the observations would ideally be based on a coding scheme with systematic categories. If possible, classify the disruptive actions as involving (a) moral interactions (e.g., hitting, insults, taking another´s property, statements about harm, fairness); (b) violations of classroom rules or procedures (e.g., not using teacher´s title, sitting in a certain way, standing when not supposed to).

OBSERVATION FORM – DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL

Date of the 1st observation:	**Type of institution: (school/preschool)**	**Grade/age group:**	**Subject/activity:**
Number of pupils/children in class/group:	**Observation starts at:**	**Observation ends at:**	**Total time elapsed:**

Description:	**Interpretation:**

Questions you may have to what is described and interpreted:

Date of the 2nd observation:	Type of institution: (school/preschool)	Grade/age group:	Subject/activity:
Number of pupils/children in class/group:	Observation starts at:	Observation ends at:	Total time elapsed:

Description:	Interpretation:

Questions you may have to what is described and interpreted:

Date of the 3rd observation:	Type of institution: (school/preschool)	Grade/age group:	Subject/activity:
Number of pupils/children in class/group:	Observation starts at:	Observation ends at:	Total time elapsed:

Description:	Interpretation:

Questions you may have to what is described and interpreted:

Date of the 4th observation:	Type of institution: (school/preschool)	Grade/age group:	Subject/activity:
Number of pupils/children in class/group:	Observation starts at:	Observation ends at:	Total time elapsed:

Description:	Interpretation:

Questions you may have to what is described and interpreted:

Main results

Describe what you consider to be the main results of the observations you have made, seeing the observations in relation to each other. Emphasize the results concerning disruptive behavior and your specific theme:

Submission

Completed by the student:
Observation report is submitted (in stapled paper edition) to supervisor on
……/……. 2014
Students name/signature: …….

Approval

Completed by the supervisor:
Internship report is: approved not approved.
Date: …… 2014
Supervisors signature: ……

Responsible for the composition of the observation guide:

Professor Liv Duesund, Professor Sven Nilsen and Professor Liv Randi Opdal.

Appendix 3: Interview schedule

Guidelines for interview

Interviews are to be conducted after the fourth observation. Choose a set of disruptive behaviors for the interview. The number will depend on how many occurred and the amount of time available for the interview. The interview should last for about 10 minutes.

For each act, first briefly describe what occurred in neutral terms.

Questions:

1.Why did you do (the act); what led you to act this way?
Probes: Were you trying to get the teacher to do something?
Were you trying to get other students to do something?

2. Do you think it is OK or not OK for a student to do (the act)? Why or why not?
If not OK, why do you think you did this even though it is not OK?

3. Is there a rule in the class about this type of behavior?
If yes: What is the rule?
Is it a good rule? Why or why not?
If not a good rule: Do you think the rule should be changed? Why or why not?

4. What does the teacher think about your (act)? Why does she/he think so?
Do you think the teacher is right or wrong to think that way?