





Article History  
Received: 2023-10-13  
Accepted: 2023-11-14  
Published: 2023-11-24

Issue no: 1 | Vol no: 4 | November 2023: 390-402

## Relationship between physical classroom layout and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya

Mutua Mercy<sup>(1)</sup>   
Henry K. Kiplangat<sup>(2)</sup>   
Fredrick B. J. A. Ngala<sup>(3)</sup> 

(1,2,3) Kabarak University, Kenya.  
Main author email: [mmutua27@gmail.com](mailto:mmutua27@gmail.com)

### Cite this article in APA

Mutua, M., Kiplangat, H. K., & Ngala, F. B. J. A. (2023). Relationship between physical classroom layout and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya. *Editon consortium journal of curriculum and educational studies*, 4(1), 390-402.

<https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjces.v4i1.435>

### Abstract

This study sought to assess and recommend ways of solving the problem of students' disruptive behaviour in the classroom in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-County, Mombasa County, Kenya. The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between classroom layout practices and student disruptive behaviour in the classroom mixed secondary schools in Kisauni sub-County, Mombasa County, Kenya. The data was collected and analysed using a descriptive design, and the study's target population included 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form four students in Kisauni Sub-County. The study sampled 8 schools and 24 class teachers using both the purposive and simple random sampling techniques. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the actual students/respondents to participate in the study. Descriptive statistics computed included means, frequencies, standard deviation and percentages. In order to test hypotheses, f- and t-statistics shall be computed to test significant statistical differences at a 95 per cent significance level. Data was presented in tables, diagrams and charts. There is a moderate correlation between practices on physical classroom layout and students disruptive behaviour ( $r = .305$ ,  $p .000 < .05$ ,  $\beta = .305$ ,  $p = .000 < 0.05$ ,  $t = 4.914$ ). The study is significant in that it will help teachers understand different student disruptive behaviours in secondary school, which will give directions on how to curb such behaviours. The findings of this study shall be used by school administrators and the government.

**Key words:** Classroom layout practices, classroom management practices, disruptive behaviour, learning environment, seating.



This article is distributed under the license of a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). It is permitted to be used, reproduced and distributed in line with Editon Consortium Publishing guidelines.

## INTRODUCTION

Students' disruptive behaviour is a major concern in many parts of the world (Babinski, 2022). For decades, students and teachers have been troubled by disruptive behaviour in their classrooms (Gregory et al., 2021). Some kind of disruptive behaviour seems to be similar in character over time (Martinez & Losen, 2020). Students who engage mostly in disruptive behaviour also use drugs like Fags and alcohol (Monarque et al., 2023). Large-scale studies across many Countries in North America, Europe and the Middle East have shown that boys and girls tend to be victims of bullying at similar rates (Eijigu & Teketel, 2021). United States of America (USA) has identified disruption as the most serious problem facing the educational system of a nation. If students were bored, they were far more likely to look for ways to alleviate this boredom by talking and fighting (Explore Education Statistics, 2022).

A 2021 study found that disruptive students can lower test scores and entire classroom academic achievement (Riden et al., 2021). In an annual student survey in Norway (Hepburn & Beamish, 2021), almost 1/3 of the students claimed to have been disturbed by disruptive behaviours. The classic concept of a bully student taking other student's money for lunch was the most common disruptive behaviour described in South Africa. Brunner (2021) reported that teachers in South Africa were becoming increasingly distressed about disciplinary problems in class. In South Africa, 38.8(%) of students reported that bullying was associated with poor academic performance (Mthethwa, 2021). Botswana's director of population and development stated during the 45th session of the Commission on Population and Development that the country was very concerned about the prevalence of alcohol and substance misuse among the Country's youth and adolescents (Sebeelo, 2021). Kimanya Secondary School in Masaka district were expelled for smoking marijuana and sneaking from school in Uganda (Scheier, 2021).

School-wide approaches to disruptive behaviour involve implementing various programs by teaching staff to enforce positive behaviour and provide sanctions towards unwanted behaviour (Rafi et al., 2020). Slater and Main (2020) noted that one of the most prevalent challenges that teachers face is classroom management since disruptive pupils take up valuable learning time. Classroom management was considered a precondition for learning; effective teaching and learning cannot take place in poorly managed classrooms (Riden et al., 2021). Classroom seating has the potential to affect the classroom management level and the rate of disruptive classroom behaviour (Lintner et al., 2021). Positive behaviour, interaction, and learning environments in classrooms aim to prevent or decrease disruptive behaviour (Granero-Gallegos et al., 2020). Creating a positive class environment is important in preventing students' bad behaviour and supporting academic achievement, where the recommended ratio of praise to reprimands is 4:1 (Caldarella et al., 2021b). It is apparent that student disruptive behaviour was, therefore, a problem that affects secondary school students locally, nationally and internationally.

According to Aaas (2021), the conditions of students' disruption in secondary classes in Kenya are disheartening as violent behaviour incidences are widespread and frequent. Okumbe (2018) did a study on the management of students' behaviour in secondary schools in Nairobi County, which observed that teachers used a wide range of methods to manage student behaviour in class. It was concluded that the effectiveness of the method of maintaining student behaviour depended on the traditions and ethos of their environments.

It was clear that disruptive student behaviour was common in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-County. A student may consider talking with other students sitting beside them as perfectly normal, not aware of their effect on the other students or the class (Rogers, 2020). This has been detailed in the table below.

**Table 1: Kisauni Sub-County Suspension of Students on SDB Statistics in Mixed Secondary School from 2020-2023**

Disruptivebehavior	2020	2021	2022	SDB (%) for 3 years
Sleeping	85	100	130	29%
Drug abuse	80	90	120	27%
Fighting	60	75	100	22%
Noise making	20	40	45	10%
Bullying	35	50	62	13%

Source: Kisauni Sub-County Education Office- SDB statistics Sep 2022

This situation calls for the need to investigate relationship between physical classroom layout and student' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary in Kisauni, as there is a limited study done in the Sub-County to discover the classroom management practices to be used to deal with students' disruptive behaviour.

Disruptive behaviour was a serious problem facing secondary school students in Kenya, especially in the coastal region. Mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-County have been experiencing student disruptive behaviour problems of various forms (Kisauni Sub-County Education Office, 2022). Kisauni Sub-County was chosen for this study owing to its cases of student disruption in mixed secondary schools. In 2020, the disruptive behaviour cases increased in that 5 out of 22 schools experienced bullying, sleeping, drug abuse and fighting among students in classes (Kisauni Sub-County Director of Education, *ibid*). According to Okumbe (2018), suspension was commonly used as a disciplinary method by teachers. It has been reported that many secondary school students in Kenya engage in disruptive behaviour in class settings (Babinski, 2022). Mixed schools had more cases of disruptive behaviour than single girls or boys schools. Shier (2022) found that mixed schools had internal problems that were related to fighting and substance abuse among students. Disruptive behaviour is uncomfortable and may cause frustration, stress, and lack of motivation, as well as slow down social development (Mauliya & Rokhyati, 2020). Disruptive behaviour is particularly worrying, considering the fact that some abusers have been suspended from the classroom. The Ministry of Education had directed all schools to set up effective

physical classroom layout to deal with students' disruptive behaviour, which most of the schools were experiencing among the students (Kisauni Sub-County Director of Education, 2022). It was, therefore, imperative to investigate the relationship between physical classroom layout practices and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni sub- County, Kenya.

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

Reflective of the traditional belief, learning was considered most effective when the teacher's delivery design effectively uses rows of desks to ensure individualised learning (Tobia et al., 2022). It can be deduced, therefore, that teachers should design good seating arrangements that facilitate learning and not cause any form of misbehaviour. It was good to allow students to sit with members of a group because life skills were taught in small groups. This provides an opportunity for free and thorough exchanges of ideas and increased individual participation. Some learners were not enthusiastic about pair and group work. Shao et al. (2020) worked with a classroom teacher to rearrange the classroom physical environment by creating distinct individual versus group workspaces. Pairing and grouping students appropriately in classes had a wide variety of levels.

Rogowsky et al. (2020) found that 60(%) of one's learning style was a biological and developmental set of characteristics. Operating together reflects students' positive approach to teaching (Tobia et al., 2022). Wilburn et al.(2019) point out that classroom management is one of the most common challenges facing teachers because disruptive students take up valuable learning time. Research was lacking on how

sitting according to discussion groups, influences different forms of students' disruptive behaviour.

Classroom seating has the potential to affect classroom management levels and the rate of disruptive classroom behaviour (Tobia & Cerina, *ibid*). When teaching large classes, it is important to move students around so that they are not always next to the same partner. When students sit with group members, they can start interacting with their classmates, build better friendships and become more social (Mutua et al., 2023). Educators are obliged to develop positive relationships with all learners and help them feel a sense of belonging to other learners (Saro et al., 2022). Research was lacking on how sitting, according to discussion groups, influences different forms of drug abuse.

Teachers use different criteria to arrange seating groups. If teachers were to work with groups of children and move between these groups, it makes sense that children should be seated together as a group and also apart from other groups. The social environment has a significant impact on health and social outcomes (Asino & Pulay, 2019). Tobia (*ibid*) postulates that there was an evident consistency between what the teacher was trying to do, what the pupils were to do, the kind of interaction that was intended and the configuration of the furniture.

There are several types of seating arrangements available to choose from, including columns and rows, groups and pairs. The physical arrangement and the classroom environment features, such as seating arrangement and organisation, can influence students' behaviour and attention to academic tasks (Rogers, 2020). The students who choose to sit with their friends appear to be happier because they can sit by their friends and carry out small conversations. Class participation and better academic interaction decreased incidences of poor behaviour and (Aaas, 2021). This was an important consideration because work can be done amongst peers, including reading prior to class (Bolden et al., 2019). The physical layout of the classroom can contribute to appropriate behaviour and overall academic achievement (Shao et al., 2020). Research was lacking on how sitting according to friendship influences different forms of drug abuse in secondary schools.

Classroom seating arrangements are usually under a teacher's control and thus the teacher may choose from a variety of arrangements depending on the goals of the classroom activities (Mutua et al., 2023). Experienced teachers seemed to have a better grasp of which strategies and techniques worked (Imms & Byers, 2017). Classroom set-up relies on assigned seating where teachers create seating charts and rearrange seating permanently based on how students behave. Changing the seating arrangement has affected student behaviour (Shao et al., *ibid*). According to research, the most effective schools have a well-organised environment and high academic standards (Zhang, 2019). It was, therefore, clear that when teachers assign seats, it facilitates discipline in the classroom. Research was lacking on how permanent sitting arrangements influence different forms of drug abuse in secondary schools.

When students are given the opportunity to choose their seats in class, they will likely sit near their friends, allowing students to feel comfortable, which influences them to be more talkative. This could cause distraction in class, taking away the learning of others (Tobia et al., 2022). This interaction will enable the teacher to detect those students who disrupt others in class (Clinton & Wilson, 2019) because they do not hide their behaviour from each other (Wilburn et al., 2019). When students are given the freedom to sit in a classroom whenever they want, they will always choose the location for themselves, which is to the teacher's greatest possible disadvantage (Rogers, 2020). Barksdale et al. (2021) comments that if learners feel safe within a classroom environment, their behaviour tends to be more positive. Students who sit near the front and centre of the classroom get better grades and like the instructor more than students who sit at the back of the classroom (Tobia et al., 2020). Those students who sit further from the teacher are not singled out for communication as often as those seated at the front of the class (Clinton & Wilson, 2019). Bolden et al. (2019) found that teachers spent (70%) of their time in the centre front of the classroom, (15%) along the sides and the back and the remainder of the time in the aisles. It implies that sitting at the back was preferred by student disruptors.

### Theoretical framework

This research will be supported by the Classical/Scientific management theory. The theory guides an explanation of students' disruptive behaviour in class with classroom management practices used to handle disruptive behaviours. Fredrick Taylor believed that the reason most organisations fail is that they lack successful systematic management (Tintore et al., 2020). Larose and Chateauvert (2020) showed that the qualities of the classroom mentor were more important. Teachers are instructed that a good teacher's mark is to be in control of the class (Bokulich, 2020). Teachers should identify the cause of disruptive behaviours in the classroom, whether it is individual or collective (Kools et al., 2020). Taylor wrote that -the best management was true science resting upon clearly defined laws, principles and rules as a foundation.

The theory measures the application of five main classical management functions in the educational management process, namely planning, organising, directing, staffing and controlling. The class should come up with plans and objectives to deal with disruption in the classroom (Riden et al., 2021). Then, the class teacher is to organise and put the resources that are available in order of priority and preference. Teacher's management features were effective in solving problems (Granero-Gallegos et al., 2020). These enable teachers to shape appropriate behaviour effectively and minimise disruptive behaviours (Slater & Main, 2020). Classroom disruption is often indicated as the main cause of wasted classroom time (Babinski, 2022). Classical management theory enables teachers to help students get things done, and students see how they owe it to the amazing insights they have every day to figure out how to manage time and energy for ideas to emerge and be shared.

### METHODOLOGY

#### Research Design

A descriptive survey design was used for this study. Descriptive survey design is used in preliminary and exploratory studies (Walter, 2021) to allow researchers to gather information, summarise, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification. McCombs (2019) noted that survey research was intended to produce statistical information about an aspect of education that interests policymakers and educators.

#### Population of the Study

Casteel and Bridier (2021) define a target population as the particular entity of people, objects or units to which a researcher can reasonably generalise his or her research findings. The target population comprised all 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form four students in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-County, Kenya.

#### Sampling Procedures and Sample Size

The target population comprised all 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form-four students. Eight schools (30% of the target population) were sampled. Purposive sampling was used to sample 8 schools which are notorious for disruptive behaviour (Campbell et al., 2020). On average, each form four class has three streams. The researcher sampled an average of 3 class teachers per school to represent at least 100(%) of all form four class teachers. That is, from the 8 schools, 24 class teachers constituted the sample size (3 class teachers of form four classes in the 8 schools). Using Krejcie and Morgan's table of sample size determination (1970), a sample size of 265 was obtained from a target population of 840. A simple random sampling technique was used to select the actual students/respondents to participate in the study. The research implemented qualitative and quantitative data methods to measure the variables in the study.

Table 2: Sample Size

Population	Target population	Sample size	Percentage
Class teachers	96	29	30%
Students	840	265	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	936	294	30%



Mulisa (2022) stated that Selecting the sample was dependent upon the research problem. The sample size of this research will be 265 students, that is 30(%) of the population, at a confidence level of 95, according to the sample size calculation from Krejcie and Morgan table. According to Adam (2020), at least 30(%) of the cases per group were required for research. The actual sample consists of 840 students and 96 class teachers. This sample was a convenient sample (Berndt, 2020). Table 2 gives more details on the breakdown of schools, students, and class teachers who were sampled proportionately.

### Instrumentation

The research instruments used in this study were questionnaires. Questionnaires were the most reliable tool for collecting data on such phenomena (Alnaami & Masuadi, 2020). The researcher used the Teachers' and Students' questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to students and class teachers. Different students' disruptive behaviour was assessed using 6 items, asking participants to assess disruptive behaviour misbehaved by students in class.

### Reliability of the Instrument

The researcher used a split-half method of testing reliability. Split-half reliability measures the degree of internal consistency by checking one-half of the results of a set of scaled items against the other half (Maier & Lakens, 2020). In the split-half technique, two scores are obtained for every person by dividing the test into equivalent halves. The researcher

established the internal reliability of the instrument by using the Cronbach alpha method. It involves a single administration of the instrument, which yields greater internal consistency (Morey, 2020). By piloting the instruments, ambiguous items were removed. A reliability coefficient of 0.8 and above was considered acceptable (Willan & Thabane, 2020).

### Data Analysis, Interpretation and Presentation

Data analysis is the vehicle to generate and validate interpretations, formulate inferences and draw conclusions (Cho et al., 2021). The data collected was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Data was coded and entered for analyses using SPSS version 25.0. The descriptive statistics calculated were frequencies, means, and percentages and p-values and T-tests were used to test the hypotheses (Gradesfixer, 2019).

### RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The findings contain an analysis of the data collected with regard to the identified objectives in which the independent variables is physical classroom layout and influences on the dependent variables of students' disruptive behaviour in Kisauni Sub County, were examined.

### Response Rate

The respondents gave out a total of 294 questionnaires, of which 29 were for teachers, and 265 were for students. Of the questionnaires given to the teachers, all (100%) were duly received and found to be okay for data analysis.

**Table 3: Response Rate**

	Issued	Returned	Per cent
Teachers	29	29	100
Students	265	208	78.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>89.25</b>

Of the questionnaires given to the students, 226 were received. On examination, 18 were found to be wrongly filled with errors such as double ticks and blank areas. These were set aside, leaving 208, which were used in the data analysis, corresponding to a 78.5 per cent response rate. The overall response rate was 89.25 per cent. According to (Madson &

Cooper, 2021), this is an acceptable response rate that meets the acceptable standards of survey research. This is a sufficient response rate for providing information regarding the relationship between physical classroom layout and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub County, Kenya.

**Table 4: Responses on Practices in Physical Classroom Layout**

Item	Students Responses				Teachers Responses			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Students who interfere with others sit near each other	1	5	2.93	1.381	3	5	3.93	.593
Teachers arrange classrooms to minimise crowding	1	5	4.20	1.145	3	5	4.15	.864
Students who disrupt others are usually in the same discussion group	1	5	3.30	1.474	2	5	4.00	.964
Students who disrupt others sit behind the rest in class	1	5	3.54	1.454	2	5	3.28	1.192
Desks for students who disrupt others are placed closely	1	5	2.81	1.455	2	5	3.72	1.279
Sitting positions are never changed by the teacher during the entire year	1	5	2.93	1.483	2	5	4.21	.726
Students who disrupt others tend to sit near the window	1	5	3.10	1.470	2	5	3.21	1.082
Students who disrupt others tend to sit alone in class	1	5	1.92	1.296	2	5	3.41	1.053
<b>Overall mean</b>			<b>3.09</b>	<b>1.395</b>			<b>3.74</b>	<b>.969</b>
<b>Combined mean</b>							<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.182</b>

The results on the practices on physical classroom layout show that students had a higher mean in their agreement to two of the statements. These are teachers who arrange classrooms to minimise crowding, whereby the mean from the students was 4.20 (SD = +1.145), while that from the teachers was 4.15 (SD = +0.864). The other group was students who disrupted others and sat behind the rest in class, which had a mean of 3.54 (SD = +0.454) from the students and a mean of 3.28 (SD = +1.192) from the teachers. Students who disrupt others tend to sit alone in class, which had the lowest mean observed among students with a mean of 1.92 (SD = +1.296); thus, according to the students, this happens only rarely. Among the teachers, students who disrupt others who are usually in the same discussion group had the highest mean, 4.00 (SD = +0.964), as compared to that obtained from students of 3.30 (SD = +1.474), which means it happens frequently. This agrees with the findings by (Apostolou & Keramari, 2020) that when students sit with group members, they can start interacting with their classmates; they

build better friendships and also become more social. Educators are obliged to develop positive relationships with all learners and help them feel a sense of belonging to other learners.

The overall mean for students was 3.09 (SD = +1.395), while that for teachers was 3.74 (SD = +0.969). The combined mean was 3.41 (SD = +1.182), meaning that there is frequent occurrence of physical classroom layout practices in the schools. The results agree with those obtained from the reviewed literature, where it was found that the most effective schools are those with a well-organised environment and high academic expectations (Peled & Grinberg, 2022). Also, it was shown that students in classrooms where materials are organised and accessible have fewer disruptive behaviours than those in classrooms where materials are disorganised and in disarray (David-Ferdon, 2021).

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Practices in Physical Classroom Layout**

Item	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Mean	SD
------	-------	--------	-----------	------------	--------	------	----

Students who interfere with others sit near each other	Teachers	0(0%)	0(0%)	6(20.7%)	19(65.5%)	4(13.8%)	3.93	.593
	Students	39(18.8%)	49(22.1%)	46(22.1%)	35(16.8)	39(18.8%)	2.93	1.381
Teachers arrange classrooms to minimise crowding	Teachers	0(0%)	0(0%)	8(27.6%)	7(24.1%)	12(41.4%)	4.15	.864
	Students	6(2.9%)	18(8.7%)	29(13.9%)	30(14.4%)	125(60.1%)	4.20	1.145
Students who disrupt others are usually in the same discussion group	Teachers	0(0%)	2(6.9%)	7(24.1%)	9(31.0%)	11(37.9%)	4.00	.964
	Students	39(18.8%)	18(8.7%)	60(28.8%)	23(11.1%)	68(32.7%)	3.30	1.474
Students who disrupt others sit behind the rest in class	Teachers	0(0%)	11(37.9%)	5(17.2%)	7(24.1%)	6(20.7%)	3.28	1.192
	Students	31(14.9%)	20(9.6%)	43(20.7%)	34(16.3%)	80(38.5%)	3.54	1.454
Desks for students who disrupt others are placed closely	Teachers	0(0%)	8(27.6%)	4(13.8%)	5(17.2%)	12(41.4%)	3.72	1.279
	Students	50(24.0%)	47(22.6%)	50(24.0%)	15(7.2%)	46(22.1%)	2.81	1.455
Sitting positions are never changed by the teacher during the entire year	Teachers	0(0%)	1(3.4%)	2(6.9%)	16(55.2%)	10(34.5%)	4.21	.726
	Students	53(25.5%)	25(12.0%)	64(30.8%)	15(7.2%)	51(24.5%)	2.93	1.483
Students who disrupt others tend to sit near the	Teachers	0(0%)	10(34.5%)	7(24.1%)	8(27.6%)	4(13.8%)	3.21	1.082
	Students	41(19.7%)	32(15.4%)	63(30.3%)	10(4.8%)	62(29.8%)	3.10	1.470



window								
Students who disrupt others tend to sit alone in class	Teachers	0(0%)	5(17.2%)	14(48.3%)	3(10.3%)	7(24.1%)	3.41	1.053
	Students	114(54.8%)	48(23.1%)	13(6.3%)	15(7.2%)	18(8.7%)	1.92	1.296
<b>Overall mean</b>						<b>Teachers</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>.969</b>
						<b>Students</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>1.395</b>
<b>Combine d overall mean</b>							<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.182</b>

Students who interfere with others sit near each other, with 20.7(%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 79.3(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, 18.8(%) said it never happens, while 44.2(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and 35.6 per cent said it happens frequently or always. Teachers arrange classrooms to minimise crowding, with 27.6 per cent of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 65.5(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the student respondents, 2.9(%) said it never happens, while 22.6(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and 74.5(%) said it happens frequently or always.

Students who disrupt others are usually in the same discussion group, with 31.1(%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 68.9(%) saying it happens frequently or always. 18.8(%) of the students said it never happens while 37.5(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and 43.8(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Students who disrupt others sit behind the rest in class with 55.1(%) of the teachers said it occurs rarely or sometimes, 44.8(%) said it happens frequently or always, 14.9(%) of the students said it never happens, 30.3(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and 54.8(%) saying it happens frequently or always.

Desks for students who disrupt others are placed closely, with 41.4(%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 58.6(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, 24(%) said it never happens, with 46.6(%) saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 29.3(%) saying it happens

frequently or always. Sitting positions are never changed by the teacher during the entire year, with 10.3(%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 89.7(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, 25.5(%) said it never happens, 42.8(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and 31.7(%) said it happens frequently or always. Students who disrupt others tend to sit near the window, with 58.6 per cent of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 41.4(%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, 19.7(%) said it never happens, while 45.7(%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and 34.6(%) said it happens frequently or always. Students who disrupt others tend to sit alone in class; 65.5 (%) of the teachers said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and 34.4(%) said it happens frequently or always. Among the students, 54.8(%) said it never happens, with 29.4(%) saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and 16(%) saying it happens frequently or always.

This agrees with the findings by Greener (2020) that when students sit with group members, they can start interacting with their classmates; they build better friendships and also become more social. Educators are obliged to develop positive relationships with all learners and help them feel a sense of belonging to other learners.

The results agree with those obtained from the reviewed literature, where it was found that the most effective schools are those with a well-organised environment and high academic expectations (Hawkins et al., 2020). Also, it was shown that students in classrooms where materials are organised

and accessible have fewer disruptive behaviours than those in classrooms where materials are disorganised

and in disarray (David-Ferdon, 2021).

**Table 6: Correlation Analysis**

Variable	Students Disruptive Behavior	
Physical Classroom Layout	Pearson Correlation	.305**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	237
	Pearson Correlation	.269**

**Regression Analysis**

**Table 7: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.305a	.093	.089	.69761

a. Predictors: (Constant), Physical Classroom Layout

The model exhibits a goodness of fit, as shown by the adjusted R2 value of .089. Accordingly, it can be inferred that changes in the independent variable of Physical Classroom Layout account for about eight point nine per cent (8.9%) of the variability in

Students Disruptive Behavior. As a result, there are additional elements that contribute to the remaining 91.1 per cent of the diversity in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub County, Kenya.

**Table 8: ANOVA Test for Physical Classroom Layout**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.754	1	11.754	24.152	.000b
	Residual	114.366	235	.487		
	Total	126.120	236			

a. Dependent Variable: Students Disruptive Behavior

b. Predictors: (Constant), Physical Classroom Layout

The F test can be used to determine whether the multiple regression model as a whole is suitable (Cho et al., 2021). The F calculated value of 24.152 exceeds the F table value of 3.942 (df. 1, 235, p=.000 < .05). This result is important because it supports

the discovery made by the regression model and shows that Physical Classroom Layout is an important predictor of Students Disruptive Behaviour.

**Table 9: Regression of Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.731	.216		8.008	.000
	Physical Classroom Layout	.328	.067	.305	4.914	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Students Disruptive Behavior

The model coefficient shows that Physical Classroom Layout is an important predictor of student disruptive Behaviour in the mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub County, Kenya ( $\beta = .305, p = .000$ ). The t value = 4.914 is also significant.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**Conclusion:** The study found that practices on physical classroom layout are an important factor in the implementation of classroom behaviour rules. The Pearson Correlation between Practices on Physical Classroom Layout and Student Disruptive

Behaviour shows there is only a moderately weak correlation between practices on physical classroom layout and implementation of classroom behaviour rules. The regression model coefficient shows that Practices in Physical Classroom Layouts are an important predictor of Student Disruptive Behaviour.

**Recommendation:** The physical layout of the classroom should represent the students' diverse cultural and linguistic qualities while also being consistent with specific learning needs.

## REFERENCES

- Aaas, K. (2021). Learning through communication: exploring learning potential in teacher teams lesson study talk. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 10(1), 47-59. <https://doi:10.1108/1jll-07-2020>
- Adam, A. (2020). Sample size determination in survey research. *Journal of Scientific Research & Reports*, 26(5), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2020/v26I530263>
- Alnaami, N., & Masuadi, E. (2020). Clinical Learning Evaluation Questionnaire: A Confirmatory factor analysis. *Adv Med Educ Pract.*, 11, 953-61.
- Apostolou, M., & Keramari, D. (2020). What prevents people from making friends: A taxonomy of reasons. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 163, 110043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110043>
- Asino, T. L., & Pulay, A. (2019). Student perceptions on the role of the classroom environment on computer-supported collaborative learning. *Techtrends*, 63(2), 179-187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0353-y>
- Babinski, E. (2022). Disruptive behaviour Disorders in children and Adolescents. *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology*, 5, 412 - 423. <https://doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-8-818697-8>
- Barksdale, C., Peters, M., & Corrales, A. (2021). Middle school students' perceptions of classroom climate and its relationship to achievement. *Educ Stud.*, 47, 84-107. doi:10.1080/03055698.2019.1664411
- Berndt, E. (2020). Sampling methods. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 36(2), 24–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/080334420906850>
- Bokulich, A. (2020). -Towards a taxonomy of the model- ladenness of data, *Philosophy of Science*, 87(5), 793- 806.
- Bolden, E. C., Oestreich, T. M., Kenney, M. J., & Yuhnke, B. T. (2019). Location, location, Location: A comparison of student experience in a lecture hall to a small Classroom using similar techniques. *Active learning in higher Education*, 20(2), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417742018>
- Brunner, C. (2021). Conceptualising epistemic violence. An Interdisciplinary an Assemleage for IR. *Int. Polit.*, 9, 193-212.
- Caldarella, P., Larsen, R., Williams, L., Wills, H., & Wehby, J. (2021b). Effects of Middle school teachers' praise-to-reprimand ratio on students' classroom Behavior. *Journal of Positive Behaviour Interventions*. Advance online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007211035185>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling. Complex or simple? Research case Examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874170927206>
- Casteel, A., & Bridier, N. (2021). Describing population and samples in doctoral student Research. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 16, 33362.
- Cho, S., Weng, C., Kahn, M., & Natarajan, K. (2021). Identifying data quality dimension for person-generated wearable devices data: Multi-method study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 9(12), e31618
- Clinton, V., & Wilson, N. (2019). More than chalkboards: Classroom Spaces and Collaborative learning attitudes. *Learning Environments Research*, 22(3), 325-344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09287-w>
- David-Ferdon C. (2021). *Vital Signs: Prevalence of Multiple Forms of Violence and Increased Health Risk Behaviours and Conditions among Youths- United States*, 70, 167-173. [https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7005a4.htm?s\\_Cid=mm7005a4\\_w](https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7005a4.htm?s_Cid=mm7005a4_w)
- Eijigu, T., & Teketel, S. (2021). Bullying in schools: prevalence, bystanders reaction and associations with sex and relationships. *BMC Psychology*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00685-5>
- Explore Education Statistics. (2022). *School, Pupils and their Characteristics*. <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-andtheir-characteristics>

- Gradesfixer. (2019). *Research Methodology: Exploratory, Descriptive and Explanatory*.
- Granero-Gallegos, A., Gomez-Lopez, M., Baena-Etremera, A., & Martinez-Molina, M. (2020). Interaction effects of disruptive behaviour and motivation profiles with teacher Competence and school satisfaction in secondary school physical education. *International Journal of Environmental*, 17(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.90/ijerph17010114>
- Greener, S. (2020). *Attendance and attention*. *Interactive Learning Environment*, 28(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820>
- Gregory, A., Osher, D., Bear, G., Jagers, J., & Sprague, R. (2021). Good intentions are not Enough: Centering Equity in School Discipline Reform. *School Psychology Review*, 50(2-3), 220. <https://doi.10.1080/2372966x.2020.1861911>
- Hawkins, O., Collins, T., Haas Ramirez, L., Murphy, M., & Ritter, C. (2020). Examining the A generalisation of combined independent and interdependent group contingency for Students with emotional and behavioural disorders. *Behavioural Disorders*, 45(4), 238-251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742919888758>
- Hepburn, L., & Beamish, W. (2021). “Classroom management practices commonly used by Secondary school teachers: *Result from a Queensland Survey*.” *The Australian Educational Research*, 48(3), 485-505. [doi:10.1007/s13384-020-00402-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-020-00402-y)
- Imms, W., & Byers, T. (2017). Impact of classroom design on teacher pedagogy and Student engagement and performance in Mathematics. *Learning Environments Research*, 20(1), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-016-9210-0>
- Kisauni Sub-County Education Office, (2022). *Education Management Information System (EMIS) June 2020*.
- Kools, M., George, B., & Stajin, B. (2020). Developing schools as learning organisations- “Why” and “How”? *European Journal of Education*, 55(1), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12384>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- Larose, D., & Chateauvert, B. (2020). How does mentoring by teachers improve the adjustment of academically at-risk students in high school? *Int.J.School Educ. Psychol.* 8, 36-49. <https://doi:10.1080/21683603.2018.1509035>
- Lintner, T., & Salamounova, Z. (2021). Classroom space and student positions in peer social networks. *An exploratory study. Studia Paedagogical*, 26(2), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.5817/Sp2021-2-3>
- Madson, G., & Cooper, A. (2021). *Future of Survey Research Conference*. Duke University. <https://sites.duke.edu/surveyresearch/report/>
- Maier, M., & Lakens, D. (2022). Justify your alpha. A primer on two practical approaches. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychology Science*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ts4r6>
- Martinez, P., & Losen, D. (2020). Lost opportunities: How disparate school discipline continues to drive differences in her opportunity to learn. Palo Alto, CA/LOS, Angeles, CA: Learning policy institute; *Center for CIVIL Right Remedies at the Civil Rights Project, UCLA*.
- Mauliya, I., Relianisa, Z., & Rokhyati, U. (2020). Lack of motivation factors creating poor Academic performance in the context of graduate English department students. *Linguist: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 73-85.
- McCombs, S. (2019). *Research Design: Types, Methods and Examples*. Scribbr.
- Monarque, M., Sabetti, J., & Ferrari, M. (2023). Digital interventions for substance use Disorders in young people: rapid review. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*, 18, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13011.023-00518-1>
- Morey, R. (2020). *Power and precision*. <https://medium.com/@richardmorey/power-and-precision-47f644ddea5e>
- Mthethwa, A. (2021). Our Schools Bullying Source. *Daily Maverick*. [www.dailymaverick.co.za](http://www.dailymaverick.co.za)
- Mulisa, F. (2022). When does a researcher choose a quantitative, qualitative or mixed research approach? *Interchange*, 53(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-021-09447-z>
- Okumbe, S. (2018). *Education and Management. Theory and Practice*. Nairobi University Press.
- Peled, Y., Blau, I., & Grinberg, R. (2022). Crosschecking teachers' perspectives on learning in a one-to-one environment with their actual classroom behaviour: A longitudinal study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-24.

- Rafi, A., Ansar, A., & Sami, M. (2020). The implication of positive reinforcement strategy in dealing with disruptive behaviour in the classroom: A scoping review. *Journal of Rawalpindi Medical College*, 24(2), 173,1779. <https://doi.org/10.37939/rmc.v24i2.1190>
- Riden, B.S., Kumm S., & Maggin D. (2021). Evidence-based behaviour management for Students with or at risk of EBD. A mega review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, 43(4) 255-269. <http://doi.org/10.1177/074419325211047947>
- Rogers, K. (2020). The effects of classroom seating layouts on participation and assessment. Performance. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, (9).
- Rogowsky, B., Calhoun, M., & Tallal, P. (2020). Providing instruction based on students' learning style preferences does not improve learning. *Frontier in Psychology*, 11, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.00164>
- Saro, J., Manilinguez, M., Buar, J., Buar, A., & Almonicar, A. (2022). New normal education: strategies, methods and trends of teaching-learning on students' perspectives and its effectiveness. *Psychology and education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(4), 259-265. <https://doi:10.5281/zenodo.7242770>
- Scheier, L. M., & Griffin KW. (2021). Youth marijuana use: a review of causes and consequences. *Curr Opin Psychol.*, 38, 11-8.
- Sebeelo, B. (2021). "Undisciplined" drinking multi-sectoralism and political power. Examining problematisatory in Botswana alcohol policy. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 94(103228), 1-7.
- Shao, G., Wei, Q., & Leng, L. (2020). Synchronous classroom: Its practical significance, Existing problems and solutions. *Curr. Teach. Math. Meth.*, 40, 70-76.
- Shier, H. (2020). *Is Silencing Children Unethical? Gatekeeping Right and Ethics. Ethical Research Involving Children: Blog.* <https://childrethics.com/blog/is-Silencing-children-unethical-gatekeeping-rights-and-ethics/>
- Slater, E. V., & Main, S. (2020). A measure of classroom management: Validation of a pre-Service teacher self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(5), 616-630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1770579>
- Tintore, M., Cunha, R., & Labral, I. (2020). A scoping review of problems and challenges faced by school leaders. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 1-39. <https://doi.10.1177/1741143220942527>
- Tobia, V., Sacchi, S., & Cerina, V. (2022). The influence of classroom seating arrangement on Children's cognitive processes in secondary school: the role of individual variables. *Curr Psychol.*, 41, 6522-6533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01154-9>
- Walter, W. (2021). Survey design and significance testing: Key issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(3), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102344>
- Wilburn, V.G., Wasmuth, S., Fehr, C., brokamp, K., Shupe, M., Hursey, B., Ross, K., & Nelson, J. (2019). The implications of desk arrangement on social interaction in a third-grade classroom. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, schools and Early Intervention*, 12(1), 86–97. <https://doi:10.1080/19411243.2018.1474833>
- Willan, A., & Thabane, L. (2020). Methods for pilot studies. *Clin Trials*, 17(4), 414-9 *Approaches. The USA.* Sage publications.
- Zhang, M. (2019). If you take learning seriously, I'll assign you to a grid seat. *Moralised Seating Order and Making of Education*, 14(4), 428-447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2018.144173>



