Psicothema

Teachers' perception of disruptive behaviour in the classrooms

Eva Álvarez Martino, Marina Álvarez Hernández, Pilar Castro Pañeda, María Ángel Campo Mon
and Carmen González González de Mesa
Universidad de Oviedo

Abstract

Background: Disruptive behaviour is becoming more frequent in the classroom and is specifically associated with behaviours that hinder and obstruct the teaching-learning process. The main purpose of this paper was to investigate teachers' perceptions of this question. More specifically, we sought to observe how teachers rate the measures proposed to improve teaching, to find out which forms of schooling are preferred so as to address disruption, to identify its causes and to analyse whether there are differences arising from teacher characteristics. **Method:** 346 participants completed a disruptive-behaviour Likert-scale. The average age is 43.47, 82.9% female and 13.6% male. **Results:** All measures are widely accepted, but there are differences in the priority given, the ideal forms of schooling is ordinary centres, although differences still exist depending on teacher characteristics; all the causes of increased problems are highly rated, with the absence of rules and limits in the family standing out. **Conclusions:** Teachers are calling for improvements and institutional support. Any forethought on how to improve the quality of the education system should take into account the results of this study.

Keywords: Disruptive behaviour, school coexistence, education, and forms of schooling.

Resumen

Percepción de los docentes sobre las conductas disruptivas en las aulas de Educación Primaria. **Antecedentes:** el fenómeno de la disrupción es cada vez más habitual en las aulas y se asocia específicamente a conductas que dificultan y obstaculizan el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje. El objetivo principal de esta investigación consiste en analizar la percepción del profesorado sobre esta cuestión. Específicamente se trata de observar qué valoración dan a las medidas propuestas para mejorar la docencia, examinar qué modalidades de escolarización consideran más idóneas para afrontar la disrupción, determinar sus causas y analizar si existen diferencias según las características del profesorado. **Método:** 346 participantes respondieron a una escala de conductas disruptivas tipo Likert. La edad media es de 43,47, siendo el 82,9% mujeres y el 13,6% hombres. **Resultados:** las medidas propuestas para la mejora de la docencia son ampliamente aceptadas, existiendo diferencias en su priorización; la modalidad de escolarización idónea es la de centros ordinarios, existiendo diferencias de opinión, según las características del profesorado; y todas las causas del incremento de problemas son altamente puntuadas, destacando la falta de normas y límites en el entorno familiar. **Conclusiones:** los profesores demandan mejoras y necesidad de apoyo institucional. Toda reflexión previa sobre cómo mejorar la calidad del sistema educativo podría tener en consideración los resultados de este estudio.

Palabras clave: conductas disruptivas, convivencia escolar, educación, modalidades de escolarización.

Coexistence problems are major challenges faced by the education system in the 21st century. Following a sweeping change in society, the education community must now operate with an increasingly diverse student body, both in social and cultural terms and as regards varying intellectual abilities (Council of Europe, 2006 and 2011; MEC, 2011). Indeed, reality proves both rich and complex. On the one hand, diversity itself has beneficial effects, as it fosters student development and provides a varied and fertile soil for growth; education as a right and Education for All programmes lay the groundwork for educational quality and supportive, just, and tolerant societies. This is the major challenge at all school stages, which can be seen as agents of social change (UNESCO, 2014). On the other hand, diversity is a multifaceted reality with more troubling aspects, as manifold influences can transfigure it and give rise to situations of conflict. The manifestations of social disintegration, xenophobia, racism and bullying are but some of the many faces that rear up daily and reveal that something is wrong. Situations of conflict and poor coexistence at school have turned into a serious concern and range widely from quotidian problems to behavioural disorders covered by international classifications (WHO, 2015). Such phenomena take myriad names: disruption, conflict, violence, behavioural problems and behavioural disorders; ultimately, though, they point to a relatively new and growing problem which has taken root in education. Clear proof of this growing concern is reflected in the 1998 creation of the European Observatory of Violence in Schools, a benchmark in the study of these phenomena. In Spain, this problem is dealt with by the State Observatory of Coexistence in Schools (MEC, 2007), which aims to contribute to actively

building a suitable living environment and develop strategies and measures to correct and prevent violence.

The results of the latest Teaching and Learning International Survey (OECD, 2014) also reflect this situation. A platform to define and review educational policies, this survey examines certain indicators relating to education, including an assessment of the school climate. The report's findings reveal that disruptive behaviour is one of teachers' main concerns. In it, one in three teachers reported having more than 10% of students with behavioural problems in their classes. Furthermore, there are clear differences among countries - in Norway and Japan, approximately 10% of teachers reported having 10% of disruptive students, while in Brazil and Spain, this number reached 60% and approximately 30% of teachers, respectively (OECD, 2015). Further proof of this concern is the latest report issued by the Spanish Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo*, 2007), which indicates that the main problem for teachers is when a student's behaviour hinders their ability to teach. Numerous studies confirm this perception (Busquets, Martín, Rosselló, & Sáez, 2010; Díaz-Aguado & Martínez, 2013; Díaz-Aguado, Martínez, & Martín, 2010; Simón, Gómez, & Alonso-Tapia, 2013; Urbina, Simón, & Echeita, 2011) and a substantial number of teachers cite behavioural problems as one of the most serious obstacles to teaching (Álvarez-Hernández, Castro-Pañeda, Campo-Mon, & Álvarez-Martino, 2005; Álvarez-Martino, Álvarez-Hernández, Castro-Pañeda, Campo-Mon, & Fueyo-Gutiérrez, 2008).

Associated with behaviours that hinder and obstruct the teaching and learning process, disruption is increasingly common in classrooms and can be explained as hostile behaviour that tests education. Most authors dealing with this issue have come to agree that such behaviours should be included under this label (Fernández, 2001; Gotzens, Castelló, Genovar, & Badía, 2003; Torrego & Moreno, 2003; Urbina et al., 2011; Uruñuela, 2010). Disruptive behaviours are also highly complex, as the most heterogeneous factors come into play. Galtung (1996) uses the concept of the "triangle of violence" to represent the dynamics of violence arising in social conflicts. Applying the metaphor of an iceberg, he holds that visible or direct violence -the tip of the iceberg- is but a small part of the conflict, while resolution involves acting on all types of violence, including structural violence, which deters the satisfaction of needs, and cultural violence, which creates a attitude-based framework that legitimises violence. Pinpointing their origin and preventing and solving them is more difficult. The emergence of disruptive behaviour in the classroom is one of the most important problems faced by the education system, since it is probably the most immediate phenomenon of this general trend. This is demonstrated by the large body of research published in Spain (Díaz-Aguado & Martínez, 2013; Foces, Marugán, & Caño, 2002; Gotzens, Badía, Castelló, & Genovard, 2007; Gotzens-Busquets, Badía-Martín, Genovard-Roselló, & Dezcallar-Sáez, 2010; Gotzens et al., 2003; Lucas-Molina, Pulido-Valero, & Solbes Canales, 2011; Marchesi, 2005; Moreno & Soler, 2006). In 2006, the Education Organic Law (LOE, 2006), on coexistence plans, set out a basic agreement seeking to foster and improve such plans. As a follow-up to that agreement, the State Observatory of Coexistence in Schools was created, which has provided a tool for self-diagnosis to establish comparisons with the aim of understanding the changes in coexistence at schools. Recently approved, the new education law (LOMCE, 2013) regards teachers as public authorities and strengthens penalties, thereby changing course and adopting a new project in relation to coexistence, while

leaving actions to foster coexistence somewhat to the side. This new law looks to separate students with greater difficulties from an early age through selective channels that eliminate common learning in the mandatory stages and that, from our point of view, undermine equal opportunities.

Accordingly, the problem of classroom discipline is highly current, with numerous programmes and plans emerging and being implemented at many schools. Education authorities have clearly become more aware of this fact and have deployed new measures in an attempt to address the problem. In Spain, special programmes have been created to intervene in key aspects to improve coexistence at schools and prevent conflicts (MEC, 2011). The latest report from the State Observatory of Coexistence in Schools (Díaz et al., 2010) notes the importance of procedures making it possible to assess coexistence on a comprehensive basis. As such, disruptive behaviours require in-depth analysis so as to prepare prevention and resolution strategies.

Against this backdrop, the main objective of this paper is to analyse teachers' perception of disruptive behaviour. A new scale was developed to conduct the research (Álvarez-Hernández, Castro-Pañeda, González-González-de-Mesa, Álvarez-Martino, & Campo-Mon, pending publication), since there was no specific scale with these characteristics in Spain, although there are instruments that evaluate the social climate and violent behaviour at schools (Álvarez, Álvarez, González, Núñez, & González, 2006; Álvarez-García, Núñez, & Dobarro, 2013; Andrés, 2009; Debarbieux, 1996; Fernández, 2010; Haynes, Emmons, & Comer, 1993; Trianes, Blanca, Morena, Infante, & Raya, 2006). Recent research (Gotzens-Busquets et al., 2010) compares three samples of teachers belonging to different autonomous communities and provides insight into the importance they place on disruptive behaviours and how they affect everyday activities. There are other scales that address this issue (Merrell, 2002; Arias, Ayuso, Gil, & González; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004), but they approach the problem from a perspective different to our own. Four specific objectives are posed in this paper: a) observe the rating given by teachers to the measures proposed to improve teaching in the classroom; b) examine what forms of schooling are considered most appropriate to deal with disruption in the classroom; c) determine the causes of increased problems in the classroom, according to teachers; and d) examine whether there are differences of opinion based on various teacher characteristics: sex, age, specialisation and attachment to different schools (public, private, integration-based and special education).

Based on this approach, we look to verify the following hypotheses: 1) all the measures proposed to improve teaching in the classroom will be amply accepted and statistically significant differences will observed in the options chosen; 2) the ideal form of schooling will be that of ordinary schools, and the other forms will receive significantly lower scores; and 3) all the causes of increased problems in the classroom will be given high scores, and the general change in society will receive scores significantly higher than the average.

Method

Sample

The sample (see Table 1) consists of 346 teachers in Asturias belonging to non-university schools. All of them work or have worked with students with specific educational needs. Data was

collected throughout the 2013-2014 academic year at ordinary and specific-need public and subsidised schools.

Teachers from all the specific-need schools (28.3%) and ordinary schools (71.7%) in Asturias participated. They are grouped into specialisations: teachers specialising in special education (therapeutic pedagogy) (24.6%), primary school teachers (21.4%), preschool teachers (18.8%), teachers of the speech and hearing handicapped (13.3%), counsellors (8.1%), technical educational assistants (5.8%), social-attention teachers (1.4%) and other specialisations (4.6%). Their ages range from 24 and 68, with an average of 43.47. Of these, 82.9% are women and 13.6% men.

The years of experience range from 0 to 42 in ordinary schools and 0 to 33 in specific-need schools.

Instrument

A disruptive behaviour scale (DBS) was used (Álvarez-Hernández et al., pending publication), which is composed of 15 items grouped into three subscales. The items take the format of a Likert-type scale and fall into five categories. The first subscale, Proposals for the Improvement of Teaching, groups together six items relating to proposals for improving teaching. The second, Forms of Schooling, encompasses three items relating to various proposals for disruptive students. The third, Opinion on the Causes of Increased Problems in the Classroom, groups together six items that represent different possible causes. In this study, the DBS presented proper internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .709 for the entire questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha for the three subscales of the DBS was as follows: .856 (subscale 1), .615 (subscale 2) and .677 (subscale 3).

Procedure

Forty-two schools in Asturias participated: 10 specific-needs schools and 32 ordinary ones. The scales were handed out by

members of the research team. Once they were handed out, the teachers involved were explained the goal of the research. It was emphasised that participation was strictly voluntary and respondents were assured of the anonymity of all the information they provided. They were collected in person by team members.

Data analysis

Firstly, Levene's test was applied to determine whether variance homogeneity was met. As this test was satisfactory, ANOVA was used. The SPSS 19.0 statistical package (IBM Corp., 2010) was used.

Results

Proposals for the improvement of teaching

It should be noted that all the measures for improvement were amply scored (see Table 2), although there were differences in the priorities given, notably: improvement of the coordination between different services (M = 4.36), improvement of teacher training (M = 4.23), the creation of specific, targeted programmes and the need to change classroom methodology (M = 4.21, respectively), improvement of the coordination between school teachers (M = 4.17) and, lastly, flexibility in classroom organisation (M = 4.08).

Forms of schooling

Respondents were asked whether it would be advisable to create specific-need classrooms at ordinary schools or at specific-need schools or to provide schooling in a combined model in order to properly respond to the educational needs of students with behavioural problems. The forms of schooling other than ordinary schooling received lower scores - all were below the average (see Table 2).

Causes of increased problems in the classroom

All the causes were scored above the average, although there were differences in the priority given to them (see Table 2). Teachers first attributed this increase to the lack of rules and limits in the family (M = 4.25) and then to the lack of rules and limits at school (M = 2.64). Between these possible causes, in order of priority, were: a general change in society (M = 3.84), the lack of coordination between family and school (M = 3.47), the use/abuse of social networks (M = 3.22) and abuse of mobile applications (M = 3.11).

Differences of opinion based on teacher characteristics

As regards gender (see Table 3), although there were no major differences, subsequent univariate analyses showed that women scored higher in the measures for improvement [$F_{(1, 332)}$ = 7.443, $p<.05$], thereby evidencing that women are more in favour of introducing new measures (M = 4.19 vs. M = 3.90). As regards the forms of schooling and the causes of increased problems in the classroom, no gender-based differences were found.

As regards specialisation (see Table 3), differences were found [$F_{(4, 334)}$ = 7.104, $p<.001$], with counsellors being those who scored highest on measures for improvement (M = 4.52). Differences

		n	%
Gender	Male	47	13.6
	Female	287	82.9
	No response	12	3.5
School	Ordinary	248	71.7
	Specific	98	28.3
Specialisation	Primary school teacher	74	21.4
	Preschool teacher	65	18.8
	Special education	85	24.6
	Hearing and speech	46	13.3
	Social-attention teacher	5	1.4
	Counsellor	28	8.1
	Educational assistant	20	5.8
	Other	16	4.6
	Failed survey	7	2.0
		Minimum	**Maximum**	**Average**
Age	24	68	43.47
Experience at specific-need schools	0	33	4.49
Experience at ordinary schools	0	42	13.87

Table 1
Description of the sample

also emerged in respect of the forms of schooling [$F_{(4, 334)} = 3.057$, $p<.005$], with social-attention teachers and educational assistants and other specialists being those who scored highest (M = 3.02). No significant differences emerged in respect of the causes of increased problems in the classroom (see Table 3).

As regards the years of experience at school, significant differences were observed in the measures for improvement of teachers with experience at specific-need schools, with the teachers who had been working between one and five years being the group that scored the highest [$F_{(3, 342)} = 5.148$, $p<.001$]

Table 2
Measures of central tendency, dispersion and discrimination index of the variables of the Disruptive Behaviour

	Av.	σ	Min.	Max.	Skew.	Kurtosis	D
Proposals for the improvement of teaching							
1. Create targeted specific programmes	4.21	.825	1	5	-.642	.425	.357
2. Change teaching methodology in the classroom	4.21	.825	1	5	.295	-.683	.234
3. Flexible classroom organisation	4.08	.861	1	5	-.925	.426	.364
4. Improve teacher training	4.23	.944	1	5	-.155	-.214	.584
5. Improve coordination of services	4.36	.811	1	5	-.052	-.276	.556
6. Improve coordination between school teachers	4.17	.904	1	5	-.474	-.096	.396
Forms of schooling							
7. Specific-need classrooms in ordinary schools	2.61	1.339	1	5	.327	-.975	.426
8. Specific-need classrooms in specific-need schools	2.60	1.252	1	5	.233	-.850	.364
9. Combined model	2.66	1.192	2	5	-.652	-.554	.061
Opinion on the causes of increased problems in the classroom							
10. General change in society	3.84	.926	1	5	-.611	-.186	.357
11. Lack of rules and limits at school	2.64	1.186	1	5	-.560	-.417	.234
12. Lack of rules and limits in the family	4.25	.840	1	5	-1.179	1.035	.364
13. Use/abuse of social networks	3.22	1.028	1	5	-1.082	.729	.584
14. Abuse of mobile applications	3.11	1.031	1	5	-.904	.418	.556
15. Lack of coordination between family and school	3.47	1.084	1	5	.133	-.655	.396

Table 3
Results of the Disruptive Behaviour Scale based on teacher characteristics

Variables		Proposals for improvement				Forms of schooling				Causes			
		M	σ	F	p	M	σ	F	p	M	σ	F	p
Gender	Male	3.90	.727	7.443	.007	2.42	.864	2.345	.127	3.40	.744	.069	.793
	Female	4.19	.668			2.65	.960			3.43	.614		
Age	< 35	4.19	.665			2.66	.974			3.40	.613		
	35-50	4.07	.683	.952	.387	2.51	.881	.896	.409	3.42	.622	.336	.790
	> 50	4.14	.716			2.66	.1001			3.46	.665		
Specialisation	Primary	3.94	.718			2.58	.987			3.54	.754		
	Preschool	3.96	.412			2.58	.932			3.32	.545		
	TP and SH	4.30	.671	7.104	.001	2.63	.969	3.057	.017	3.44	.624	1.750	.137
	SAT and other	4.08	.709			3.02	.781			3.30	.504		
	Counsellor	4.52	.412			2.24	.869			3.55	.655		
School	Public	4.10	.699			2.75	.951			3.42	.649		
	Subsidised	4.12	.635	1.798	.167	2.39	.926	4.68	.010	3.57	.617	4.952	.008
	Special	4.26	.706			2.65	.946			3.30	.588		
Years of experience (ordinary)	0	4.01	.690			2.84	.863			3.22	.593		
	1-5	4.22	.623	1.248	.292	2.70	.863	1.429	.234	3.37	.650	1.937	.123
	6-15	4.21	.672			2.58	1.005			3.49	.591		
	> 15	4.10	.709			2.62	.939			3.45	.655		
Years of experience (specific-need)	0	4.07	.674			2.61	.970			3.46	.621		
	1-5	4.35	.654	3.484	.016	2.66	.918	.243	.866	3.35	.624	.694	.556
	6-15	4.14	.661			2.53	1.014			3.46	.677		
	> 15	4.23	.684			2.70	.657			3.37	.645		

Note: TP= therapeutic pedagogy, SH= speech and hearing, SAT= social-attention teachers

(M = 4.35). As regards the forms of schooling and the causes of increased problems in the classroom, no differences were found in respect of this variable (see Table 3).

As regards the type of school, there were differences [$F_{(2, 343)} = 4.680$, $p<.05$] in the forms of schooling, with teachers working in public schools scoring the highest (M = 2.75). Differences were also present in increased problems in the classroom [$F_{(2, 343)} = 4.95$, $p<.05$], with teachers working in subsidised schools scoring the highest (M = 3.57). As for the type of school, no differences were found in respect of the proposals for the improvement of teaching.

In none of the cases were there age-based differences (see Table 3).

Discussion and conclusions

This paper sought to analyse the perception that various specialists in education have with respect to disruptive behaviour in the classroom. The results, resulting from the disruptive behaviour scale (DBS) are highly revealing, although it should be noted that there is a limitation with respect to subscales 2 and 3, the alpha value of which is markedly below .70. Although these data are not as satisfactory as desired, the discrimination indices of each of the items in the questionnaire are satisfactory, as they all present a value above .20, except item 9. The measures of dispersion (standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis) are adequate, as no item exceeds a value of .200 (see Table 2).

One of our goals was to observe the rating teachers gave to the measures proposed to improve teaching in the classroom. The first conclusion of note is that our first hypothesis was confirmed. All the measures are amply scored, which shows that something is not working properly. The results indicate that there is a significant order of priority, with the most highly scored proposal being improving coordination between the different services. Disruption in the classroom is a complex phenomenon resulting from the interaction of multiple factors, some of which stand outside the classroom. Coordination is key in the face of this phenomenon and entails the creation of genuine foundations and structures that offer real solutions. The teachers' first choice is significant, and it is important to strengthen or change it, otherwise it could ossify into a type of "structural violence", to use Galtung's terminology (1996). Regional ministries of education, the teacher and resource centre (CPR), education inspection services, counselling services and schools should jointly coordinate their actions and planning. In this regard it is significant that the counsellors scored highest on all measures for improvement. The increasing complexity of our society and the requirements imposed by the education system make further measures necessary. There is a clear need to improve and provide new specialised resources for educational assessment, counselling and intervention.

In this line, it makes sense that the second most chosen measure for improvement, near the first, was teacher training. We believe this is key to improving intervention with conflictive students and their responsiveness to diversity. Education systems must provide teachers with opportunities to maintain and further develop their professional skills so that the system retains a high level of teaching quality. Unfortunately, in Spain, such a situation is far from being achieved. The results of our research are in tune with the latest findings of the TALIS (OECD, 2014). In Spain, more than seven out of ten teachers (74.4%) have not even undergone a formal induction programme, which stands in stark contrast to other countries where these programmes are practically across-the-board requirements for all teachers. In this survey, teachers were asked about the obstacles they encounter in participating in professional development activities. The case of Spain is alarming: on the one hand, Spanish teachers (59.7%) point to the incompatibility with their working hours as an obstacle (compared to an average of 53.8% in the OECD) and, on the other, 80.3% of teachers highlighted the lack of incentives to participate in development activities, much higher than the OECD average (47.8%). Coupled with this, a high proportion of teachers in Spain (61.5%) point to the lack of an adequate offer of professional development activities as an obstacle, 20 percentage points higher than the OECD average. We believe that teacher training is crucial prior to any educational action, as teachers are the main framers of failure or success at school. Recent studies have appreciated this importance (Vesa, Tiina, Peitso, & Savolainen, 2015). This lack of training does nothing to create specific, targeted programmes or to improve and change classroom methodology, which are the options sought in the third place by teachers in their responses. The coordination of school teachers and flexibility in classroom organisation also received high scores, although slightly below the foregoing. As Genovard, Gotzens and Montané (1981) note in their research, a holistic approach must be taken to the organisation and dynamics of behaviour at school and in the classroom.

In this section women obtained higher scores in the measures for improvement and seem to be more in favour of establishing new measures. While analysing these gender-based differences is not the purpose of this paper, it is something to be taken into account in future research.

Another important conclusion is that our second hypothesis was confirmed. While legislation indeed proposes various forms for education authorities to respond to educational needs, it is clear that the ideal form according to teachers is ordinary schools, with the other proposals receiving scores significantly below the average. It is noteworthy that social-attention teachers, educational assistants, other specialists and teachers at public schools are those who give higher scores to forms of schooling other than the ordinary.

The most ideal form is ordinary schools, and schooling decisions should always see that ordinary measures of attention to diversity are exhausted before resorting to extraordinary measures, and we believe that disruptive behaviours alone do not provide sufficient grounds on which to decide the form of schooling.

A critical analysis of the most suitable types of schooling or a distinction between the policies that apply to subsidised or public education is beyond the scope of this paper. We will simply stress that we should not look at a student presenting disruptive behaviour exclusively as a "problem individual", considering what has been discussed above. It should be recalled that the school and teachers are but a two elements carrying a relative weight within a vast array of elements. Prior studies (Álvarez-Martino et al., 2008; Campo-Mon et al., 2010) reach the conclusion that students with behavioural problems are the most poorly integrated and that a significant percentage of teachers would prefer not to have them in their classrooms; however, this should not prompt us to see the problem as lying in the "individual" since, as noted, specialists in education argue that integration does not work effectively, due mainly to the lack of resources and appropriate strategies. The new education law (LOMCE, 2013) is a good example of what

should not be done, with its excessive preoccupation with rules and penalties seeking to change conflictive students' attitudes. Recent studies confirm that an increase in penalties and rules brings about further disruptive behaviour, and can lead to unintended consequences (Dunlap, Wilson, Strain, & Lee, 2013; Kupchik, 2010; Way, 2011).

Third and lastly, it is important to note the partial confirmation of our third hypothesis. All the causes are scored highly and notable is the general change in society, which scores well above the average. It is, however, highly noteworthy that teachers have first chosen the lack of rules and limits in the family. Both the intensity and duration of schooling, the replacement it sometimes turns into for a large part of family-based education and the manner in which the family dumps its responsibilities on the school have gradually led to a quasi-sameness between "schooling" and "education". This fact is clearly reflected in the first choice made by teachers as the cause and, on the opposite end, as the last place below the average, namely the lack of rules and limits at school. Very near to the main cause highlighted by teachers and intimately connected to it is the lack of coordination between family and school.

Teachers also gave scores that are well above the average to other causes: the use/abuse of social networks and abuse of mobile applications. Indeed, there is a wide consensus that science and technology are crucial to explaining the dynamics of today's advanced societies. Technological changes are subtle and unpredictable (especially ideological changes, insofar as technology creates new conceptions of reality and destroys old conceptions, changing what we mean by "knowledge" and "truth"). Technology certainly invades thought and action, and has become a dominant ideology that has the ability to mire us in a state of technological somnambulism (Winner, 1986). Accordingly, in the field of education we must always remain alert, for we have formed a global civilisation in which the most crucial elements depend heavily on technologies. It is crucial for us to find a way to use such technologies in the best possible way and insert them in the context of human culture. As Domingo-Moratalla (2013) has noted, there is a generational gap brought on by the digital age: young people are digital natives born in an era in which new technologies have established their natural environment. At the same time, digital immigrants (parents and teachers) live alongside these natives and are forced to learn to move into an environment different from theirs. However, the fact that the former group better masters the codes and languages of the new era is no guarantee of greater competence for responsible use. It is here where education takes its place, as it reflects on the changes in the transmission of values, on the mechanisms of socialisation of new generations and, ultimately, on changing habits.

Nearly twenty years have passed since UNESCO's Delors report (1996), but it remains more alive than ever. It concludes that the family educates, the school shapes and society adjusts. As mentioned above, the phenomenon of disruption in the classroom is one of the most important problems in the current education system, since it is the most immediate phenomenon of this general trend manifested in the global education system and society. We have seen that teachers are clearly calling for improvements and support from the various institutions. Sent through our research, this message should guide any forethought on how to improve the quality of the education system and society in general.

References

Álvarez-García, D., Núñez, J.C., & Dobarro, A. (2013). Cuestionarios para evaluar la violencia escolar en Educación Primaria y en Educación Secundaria: CUVE³-EP y CUVE³-ESO [Questionnaires to asses school violence in primary and secondary school education: CUVE³-EP and CUVE³-ESO]. *Apuntes de Psicología, 2*, 191-202.

Álvarez-Hernández, M., Castro-Pañeda, P., Campo-Mon, M., & Álvarez-Martino, E. (2005). Actitudes de los maestros ante las necesidades educativas específicas [Teachers' attitudes towards specific educational needs]. *Psicothema, 17*(4), 601-606.

Álvarez-Hernández, M., Castro-Pañeda, P., Conzález-González-de-Mesa, C., Álvarez-Martino, E., & Campo-Mon, M. (en prensa). Disruptive behaviours from teacher's perception: Validating a scale. *Anales de Psicología*.

Álvarez-Martino, E., Álvarez-Hernández, M., Castro-Pañeda, M.P., Campo-Mon, M.A., & Fueyo-Gutiérrez, E. (2008). Funcionamiento de la integración en la Enseñanza Secundaria Obligatoria según la percepción del profesorado [Functioning of integration in secondary school according to teachers' perception]. *Psicothema, 20*(1), 56-61.

Álvarez, L., Álvarez, D., González, P., Núñez, J.C., & González, J.A. (2006). Evaluación de los comportamientos violentos en los centros educativos [Evaluation of violent behaviours in secondary school]. *Psicothema, 18*(4) 686-695.

Andrés, M.S. (2009). *Los sistemas de ayuda entre iguales como instrumentos de mejora de la convivencia en la escuela: evaluación de una intervención* [Helping systems among peers as tools for improving coexistence at school: Evaluation of an intervention]. Madrid: MECD.

Arias, A., Ayuso, L.M., Gil, G., & González, I. (2006). *ACE. Alteración del comportamiento en la escuela* [Disturbed behaviour at school]. Madrid: TEA.

Busquets, C.G., Martín, M.B., Rosselló, C.G., & Sáez, T.D. (2010). Estudio comparativo de la gravedad atribuida a las conductas disruptivas en el aula [A comparative study of the seriousness attributed to disruptive classroom behaviours]. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 8*(20), 33-58.

Campo-Mon, M.A., Castro-Pañeda, M.P., Álvarez-Martino, E., Álvarez-Hernández, M., & Torres-Manzanera, E. (2010). Funcionamiento de la integración en la enseñanza según la percepción de los maestros especialistas en Pedagogía Terapéutica [Performance of school integration according to the perception of specialist teachers in therapeutic pedagogy]. *Psicothema, 22*(4), 797-805.

Council of Europe (2006). *Violence reduction in schools - how to make a difference*. Belgium: Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe (2011). *High-level expert meeting, "Tackling violence in schools"*. Oslo: Council of Europe Publishing.

Debarbieux, E. (Coord.) (1996). *La violence en milieu scolaire. 1. État des lieux*. Paris: ESF.

Defensor del Pueblo (2007). *Violencia escolar: maltrato entre iguales en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria 1999-2006* [School Violence: Bullying among peers in obligatory secondary education 1999-2006]. Madrid: Defensor del Pueblo.

Delors, J. (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro* [*Education: The treasure within*]. Madrid: Santillana, Unesco.

Díaz-Aguado, M.J., & Martínez, R. (2013). Peer bullying and disruption-coercion escalations in student-teacher relationship. *Psicothema, 25*(2), 206-2013.

Díaz, M. J., Martínez, R., & Martín, J. (2010). *Estudio estatal de la convivencia escolar en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria* [Government study of school coexistence at secondary school education]. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación.

Domingo-Moratalla, A. (2013). *Educación y redes sociales. La autoridad de educar en la era digital* [Education and social networks. Authority to educate in the digital age]. Madrid: Encuentro.

Dunlap, G., Wilson, K., Strain, P., & Lee, J. (2013). *Prevent-teach-reinforce for young children: The early childhood model of individualized positive behavior support*. Baltimore: Paul. H. Brookes.

Fernández, G. (Coord.) (2010). *La conflictividad escolar en Asturias. Propuestas de intervención* [Educational conflict in Asturias. Proposals for intervention]. Gijón: Consejería de Educación y Ciencia del Principado de Asturias.

Fernández, I. (Coord.) (2001). *Guía para la convivencia en el aula* [*Guide for coexistence into the classroom*]. Barcelona: Praxis.

Foces, J., Marugán, M., & Caño, M. (2002). Análisis y tratamiento de la conflictividad en un centro de Educación Secundaria [Analysis and treatment of conflict in a secondary school center]. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado, 5*(1), 1-5.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means. Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. Oslo: IPRI.

Genovard, C., Gotzens, C., & Montané, J. (1981). *Psicología de la educación. Una nueva perspectiva interdisciplinaria* [Educational psychology. A new interdisciplinary perspective]. Barcelona: CEAC.

Gotzens, C., Badía, C., Genovard, C., & Dezcallar, M.T. (2010). Estudio comparativo de la gravedad atribuida a las conductas disruptivas en el aula [A comparative study of the seriousness attributed to disruptive classroom behaviors]. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 8*(20), 33-58.

Gotzens, C., Badía, M.M, Castelló, A., & Genovard, C. (2007). La gravedad de los problemas de comportamiento en el aula vista por los profesores [Teachers' perception about the severity of the behaviour problems in the classroom]. *Revista Portuguesa de Pedagogía, 2*, 103-120.

Gotzens, C., Castelló, A., Genovard, C., & Badía, M. (2003). Percepciones de profesores y alumnos de E.S.O. sobre la disciplina en el aula [Secondary education teachers' and students' perceptions about classroom discipline]. *Psicothema, 15*(3), 362-368.

Haynes, N. M., Emmons, C.L., & Comer, J.P. (1993). *Elementary and middle school climate survey*. New Haven: Yale University Child Study Center.

IBM Corp. (2010). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19.0*. Armonk, New York: IBM Corp.

Kupchik, A. (2010). *Homeroom security: School discipline in an age of fear*. New York: NYU Press.

LOE (2006). Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación [Organic Law 2/2006, 3rd of may, Education]. B.O.E. 4/05/2006.

LOMCE (2013). Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad de la educación [Organic Law, 9 December, to the improvement of quality in education]. B.O.E. 10/12/2013.

Lucas-Molina, B., Pulido-Valero, R., & Solbes-Canales, I. (2011). Peer harassment in primary school: The role of peers and its relationship with sociometric status. *Psicothema, 23*(2), 245-251.

Marchesi, A. (2005). *Controversias en la educación española* [Controversies concerning Spanish education]. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

MEC (2007). Real Decreto 275/2007, de 23 de febrero, por el que se crea el Observatorio Estatal de la Convivencia Escolar [Royal Decree, 23rd of February, State Observatory for Co-existence at School]. BOE, 17/3/2007.

MEC (2011). *Actuaciones para el impulso y la mejora de la convivencia escolar* [Measures for encouraging and improving school coexistence]. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación.

MEC (Spanish Ministry of Education) (2006). *La convivencia en las aulas: problemas y soluciones* [Classroom coexistence: Problems and solutions]. Madrid: Instituto Superior de Formación del Profesorado.

Merrell, K.W. (2002). *PKBS-2. Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales. Second Edition*. Austin, Texas: PRO·ED.

Moreno, A., & Soler, M. P. (Coords.) (2006). *La disrupción en las aulas: problemas y soluciones* [Classroom disruptions: Problems and solutions]. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.

Muñiz, J. (2010). Teoría clásica y teoría de respuesta a los ítems [Classical theory and item response theory]. *Papeles del Psicólogo, 31*(1), 57-66.

OECD (2014). *New Insights from TALIS 2013. Teaching and Learning in Primary and Upper Secondary Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2015). *Teaching in Focus Improving School Climate and Students' Opportunities to Learn*. Accessed 27 June 2015 at http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/

Reynolds, C.R., & Kamphaus, R.W. (2004). *BASC-2. Behavior Assessment System for Children. Second Edition*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Pearson.

Simón, C., Gómez, P., & Alonso, J. (2013). Prevención de la disrupción en el aula: papel del clima motivacional de clase y de las estrategias de afrontamiento [Prevention of classroom disruption: The roles of motivational environment and coping strategies]. *Cultura y Educación, 25*(1), 49-64.

Torrego, J., & Moreno, J. (2003). *Convivencia y disciplina en la escuela. El aprendizaje de la democracia* [Discipline and coexistence at school. Learning of democracy]. Madrid: Alianza.

Trianes, Mª. V., Blanca, M. J., Morena, L., Infante, L., & Raya, S.(2006). Un cuestionario para evaluar el clima social del centro escolar [A questionnaire to assess school social climate]. *Psicothema, 18*(2), 272-277.

UNESCO (2014). *UNESCO education strategy 2014-2021*. Paris: UNESCO.

Urbina, C., Simón, C., & Echeita, G. (2011). Teachers' conceptions about disruptive behaviours: Analysis from an inclusive perspective. *Infancia y aprendizaje: Journal for the Study of Education and Development, 34*(2), 205-217.

Uruñuela, P. M. (2010). La disrupción en las aulas [Classroom disruptions]. In J. J. Gázquez & M. C. Pérez (Eds.), *La convivencia escolar. Aspectos psicológicos y educativos* (pp. 171-175). Granada: GEU.

Vesa, N., Tiina, K., Peitso, S., & Savolainen, H. (2015). Reducing disruptive behaviours and improving learning climates with class-wide positive behaviour support in middle schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 30*(2), 274-285.

Way, S. M. (2011). School discipline and disruptive behaviour: The moderating effects of students perceptions. *Sociological Quarterly, 52*(3), 345-375.

WHO (2015). *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems. ICD-10: Version 2015*. Accessed 28 June 2015 at *http://apps.who.int/classifications/icd10/browse/2015/en*

Winner, L. (1986). *The whale and the reactor*. Chicago: Chicago Press.