



---

## **CLASSROOM BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS OF LEARNING DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED CHILDREN AT SECONDARY LEVEL**

**RAIHANA MALIK (DR)** ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, MAULANA AZAD NATIONAL URDU UNIVERSITY  
HYDERABAD

**SAMEEN ABASU(DR)** ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, MAULANA AZAD NATIONAL URDU UNIVERSITY  
HYDERABAD

---

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper aims to investigate the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled and non-disabled children at secondary level. Descriptive survey method was employed in the present investigation. A sample of 70 learning disabled and non-disabled children were chosen at random from six different schools of District Srinagar. A questionnaire about classroom behavior problems was used as a data collection tool. The findings revealed that learning disabled children have more classroom behavioral problems than non-disabled children. Classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls are more than learning disabled boys.

**Keywords: Learning Disabled, non-disabled children, classroom behavioral problems**

### **INTRODUCTION**

When the phrase "learning disability" was first introduced into the Indian educational system a decade ago, it was nearly non-existent. While most teachers have witnessed it in the classroom, only a minority are aware of how serious it is or are equipped to deal with it effectively. It is possible for a child with a learning disability to appear inadequate in the classroom, leaving the child and parents puzzled, upset, overwhelmed, and angry as a result of the presence of the child in question (UNESCO MGIEP, New Delhi). An individual who has trouble learning in the conventional fashion is classified as having a learning impairment. This classification includes numerous disorders in which a person has difficulty learning in the conventional manner, usually as a result of an unknown factor or factors. The unknown factor is a neurological condition that impairs the brain's capacity to receive and process information in a timely manner. A person's intelligence has absolutely nothing to do with their learning problem. We have the success stories of Walt Disney, Graham Bell, Winston Churchill, and Stephen Hawking to draw inspiration from. Learning

disability is classified as a cognitive impairment, which means that it is a condition of thinking and reasoning that is not easily obvious and is considered to be caused by a malfunction in the central nervous system. When compared to someone who is not affected by such a difficulty, learning becomes more difficult as a result of these complicated sets of challenges. As a general rule, learning disabilities are characterised by weaknesses in academic success (reading, writing, and mathematics), as well as in language or communication skills. Children with LD, on the other hand, have considerable difficulties in a variety of areas, including social relationships and emotional maturity, attention and hyperactivity, memory, cognition, metacognition, motor skills, and perceptual abilities, among others. As is well known, learning disabilities (LD) are caused by central nervous system dysfunction, and their characteristics can manifest throughout the lifetime, from early childhood to adulthood (Bender,2008: McNamara ,2007). It is possible to have mild, moderate, or severe learning difficulties. Students also differ in terms of their ability to cope with stressful situations. The NASET Learning Handicap Report (2012) states that some people learn to adjust to learning disabilities so effectively that they can pass as having no disability, while others struggle throughout their life to complete even the most basic of tasks. Most typical aspects of learning handicapped are: Academic deficiencies, language development, memory, socio emotional maturity, motor abilities and coordination, perception, metacognition cognitive, attention and hyperactivity. Learning disabilities have been studied extensively, but the majority of the research has concentrated on academic underachievement, perceptual and cognitive ability deficits, and oral and written language disorders. Little attention has been paid to the social, emotional, and behavioural development of learning disabled students. Researchers and educators have developed methods and tools for the early identification and assessment of children with learning disabilities. However, because it is a "hidden disability," with no physical manifestations or sensory markers, the greatest challenge for early identification is that it is a "hidden disability" with no physical manifestations or sensory markers. A variety of screening tests are employed for this purpose, but there is inadequate empirical data to support their utility, making it difficult to detect children who are suffering from behavioural disorders. All Every action has a corresponding significance. despite the fact that it is difficult to tell what the meaning is. Behavioral patterns do not emerge in a vacuum. There are always external factors that have an impact on one's behaviour. They can be derived from either people or the environment. Psychological and behavioural disorders are among the most common chronic health conditions that affect children during their childhood, and they can have major effects for a child's scholastic progress as well as their social development. Classroom behaviour encompasses all behaviours taken by students in the classroom, both verbal and nonverbal, as well as the outcomes of interactions between students and teachers. Regular classroom contact includes the

teacher asking questions, praising or accepting students' ideas, and the students responding in like. Many acts, such as nodding or writing on a blackboard, are performed without the need of words. Intellectual impressions, such as a high or low level of thinking, can also have an impact on behaviour, whether they are concrete or abstract in nature. As a result, we can observe a variety of classroom behaviours. All of these activities, whether overt or covert, are considered to be part of classroom behaviour. Effective classroom management necessitates the establishment of expectations for student behaviour by teachers. This means that teachers must be aware of what type of behaviour is appropriate and what is not before they begin teaching. Class activities include whole-class, small-group, and individual seatwork, with the children participating in a variety of activities during the day. Recitations, student presentations, teacher presentations, and discussions are examples of what is expected. Children leave the classroom for a variety of reasons, including laboratory, library, lunch, recess, and other activities. Students are required to take unique actions in order to complete the majority of these tasks. It is as a result that teachers can no longer rely on a few broad standards (such as "respect for others") to carry the day. When students walk into the classroom, they must be aware of what they are supposed to do. Occasionally, the bell may be rung quietly during the course of attendance. In order to succeed in class, students must pay close attention when the lecturer or another student speaks, raise their hands and wait to be recognised before speaking, and obey all instructions. Interrupting during class is strictly prohibited. There is no talking when the teacher is speaking. After being told, students should not rearrange classroom objects or leave their desks until further instruction is given ( Duggal, 2007). Reading, writing, and responding to questions, enquiring about what others are doing, and watching are all examples of regular classroom activities. However, the specifics of each activity vary based on the circumstances of the class. It is extremely vital for the children to learn the appropriate classroom behaviour that is expected of them based on their academic grade as well as the expectations of the teachers in the classroom. However, when they do not learn or do not perform at the level that is expected of them, the majority of these youngsters engage in other disruptive behaviours in the classroom. The youngsters experience unhappiness and tension as a result, and they do not adjust to their new environment adequately. It is also possible that the adjustment difficulties of the learning challenged children have an impact on the behaviour relationship between the instructor and the peer group. Many of these youngsters engage in other disruptive behaviours in the classroom as well as in the hallway. As a result, the current inquiry appears to be fruitful.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Cavioni et al (2017) address the critical significance that social and emotional learning programmes have in the lives of children with learning disabilities (LD). Finally, the author

emphasises the importance of universal social and emotional learning as a means of ensuring the academic and social inclusion of students with learning disabilities. Consequently, the topic in this paper is an appeal for the development and evaluation of universal socio-emotional learning programmes that also target the social and academic inclusion of students with learning disabilities (LD) within diverse educational settings. According to Sridevi et al (2015), 19 percent of children in the schools were suffering from some form of learning difficulty. Behavioral difficulties, such as hyperactivity and hostility, were significantly more prevalent in children with learning challenges than in typically developing children. When it comes to children with learning disabilities, there is also a gender difference in hyperactivity and violence. Students with classroom behaviour problems and classroom learning difficulties, according to the findings of a study conducted by Johanna et al (2014), experienced significantly greater levels of social rejection in first grade. Professor Beaman's research (Beaman, 2007) validates previous results that classroom misbehaviour is a source of widespread concern for teachers; yet the main sources of disruption, while common, are frequently trivial in character (in particular, "talking out of turn" behaviours). However, despite the fact that prevalence rates for bothersome pupils vary from class to class, boys are consistently characterised as being more troublesome than females. A study conducted by Frederickson et al. (2007) found that students who were transferred from special to mainstream schools reported favourable social results and that none were rejected by their peer groups. It was discovered that the former special school students had positive social acceptability outcomes. The outcomes for mainstream students with exceptional educational needs, on the other hand, were less encouraging. According to Infantino and Little (2005), 'speaking out of turn' was the only behaviour that was seen as the most bothersome and frequent by both teachers and students. As a result, it was determined that both teachers and students require education in order for successful management tactics to be established and implemented by teachers. Handwerk and Marshall (1998) found that students with serious emotional disturbance were rated as more impaired than students with learning disabilities on all Teacher Report Form scales, with the exception of Attention Problems, and on three of the eight Child Behavior Checklist scales, compared to students with learning disabilities. Children with LD varied from those with SED mostly in terms of the intensity of their problems, rather than the sort of problem they were experiencing. Conclusion: Students with co-morbid LD and SED are underrepresented in special education systems because they are not properly identified and served by the current system. According to Geisthardt and Munsch (1996), adolescents with learning difficulties were more likely than their non-learning challenged counterparts to indicate that they had failed a class and less likely to report that they had been selected for a school activity than their non-learning disabled peers. However, there was no difference between the two

groups of students when it came to their perceptions of the stressfulness of any of the relevant school events. When faced with an academic stressor or an interpersonal problem, students with learning disabilities reported relying on cognitive avoidance as a coping strategy more heavily than non-learning disabled students. They also reported mobilising fewer peers for social support when faced with an academic stressor or an interpersonal problem. Using the Child Behavior Checklist and the Teachers' Report Form, McConaughy et al (1994) discovered that children with major emotional disturbance scored significantly higher than children with learning difficulties on all but one of the scales used. Teacher-reported aggressive behavior was the best predictor of SED versus LD classification. Attention issues, delinquent conduct, social problems, thought problems, and disengagement were all strong predictors of delinquent behaviour as well. According to McIntosh (1993), just a few differences existed between mainstreamed students with learning impairments and students without learning disabilities in terms of teacher behaviour and classroom methods. Student behaviours, on the other hand, were shown to be different. Students with learning difficulties interacted with the teacher, other students, and classroom activities at a significantly lower rate than other students, on average, according to the findings. Students with learning difficulties and low achievement, according to Vaugh (1993), displayed much weaker social skills and higher levels of behaviour problems than their peers with average or high achievement. Toro and colleagues (1990) discovered that children with learning difficulties and children without learning disabilities differed on three dimensions of variables: social problem-solving skill, teacher-rated school behaviour and competence, and academic achievement. More precisely, the children with LD demonstrated greater overall classroom behaviour difficulties as well as lower levels of personal and social competence in a range of areas, according to their instructors' assessments. Using data from Cullinan et al (1981), it was discovered that school behaviour problems differed by gender and pupil type, and that learning handicapped girls and boys demonstrated much worse maladjustment on the Personality Problem dimension than normal girls and boys. Bryan (1974) indicated that the learning disabled children spent significantly less time engaged in attending behavior for a variety of school subjects and that learning disabled children had different interpersonal relationships with teachers and peers than did comparison children.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To identify the learning disabled students at secondary level.
- To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled and non disabled students..

- To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled boys and girls at secondary level.
- To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled boys and non disabled boys at secondary level.
- To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls and non disabled girls at secondary level.

### **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

1. There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of learning disabled and non disabled students.
2. There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled boys and girls.
3. There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of learning disabled boys and non disabled boys.
4. There is no significant difference between the behavioral problems of learning disabled girls and non disabled girls.

### **SAMPLE**

The sample constituted 70 children of secondary schools. Using a random method of sampling 35 learning disabled and 35 non disabled children of six schools of Srinagar district were selected for the study.

**INSTRUMENTATION:** The self constructed questionnaire (classroom behaviour) consisted of behaviour related to five areas- questioning, possessiveness, permission, assisting and interaction. The investigator got required information about the identified 35 learning disabled and 35 non- disabled children from class VIII of the schools. The questionnaire was administered to both the groups i.e. Learning disabled and non disabled children separately and the required information was collected.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**Objective 1** To identify the learning disabled boys and girls at secondary level.

An identified list of learning disabled students was obtained for the study from the selected schools' the basis of the observations and various checklists developed by NCERT.

**TABLE 1 showing learning disabled and non-disabled children**

Group	Girls	Boys	N
Learning disabled	18	17	35
Non-disabled	17	18	35

**Objective 2: To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled and normal children at secondary level.**

**Ho - I :**There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled and non disabled students.

**Table 2 showing t-ratio of learning disabled and non-disabled students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	Level of Sig
Disabled	35	176.5	17.7	3.51	Significant at 0.01 level
Non-disabled	35	160.2	21		

The above table shows the mean value of learning disabled and non-disabled students as 176.5 and 160.2 respectively. The calculated t-value (3.51) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference favours learning disabled students which reveal that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled students are greater than non disabled students. Thus the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled and non disabled children” stands rejected.

**Objective 3: To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled boys and girls at secondary level.**

**Ho 2.** There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled boys and girls.

**Table 3 showing t-ratio of learning disabled boys and girls**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	Level of Sig
Disabled Boys	17	226.5	25.67	3.15	Significant at 0.01 level
Disabled Girls	18	257.6	30.88		

The above table shows the mean value of learning disabled boys and girls as 226.5 and 257.6 respectively. The calculated t-value (3.15) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference favours learning disabled girls which reveal that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls are greater than learning disabled boys. Thus the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled boys and girls" **stands** rejected.

**Objective 4:** To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled and non disabled boys at secondary level.

**Ho - 3.** There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioural problems of learning disabled boys and non disabled boys.

**Table 4 showing t-ratio between learning disabled and non-disabled boys**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	Level of Sig
Disabled Boys	17	226.5	25.67	2.73	Significant at 0.01 level
Non disabled Boys	18	193.6	40.67		

Table 4 shows the mean value of learning disabled and non disabled boys as 226.5 and 193.6 respectively. The obtained t-value is 2.73 which is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference favours learning disabled boys which reveal that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled boys are greater than non disabled boys. Thus the hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the non disabled boys and Learning disabled boys" stands rejected.



**Objective 5:** To study the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls and non disabled girls at secondary level.

**Ho - 4.** There is no significant difference between the classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled and non disabled girls.

**Table 5 showing t-ratio between learning disabled and non-disabled girls**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	Level of Sig
Disabled girls	18	257.6	30.88	5.66	Significant at 0.01 level
Non-disabled girls	17	181.8	45.72		

Table 5 shows the mean value of learning disabled and non-disabled girls came out to be 257.6 and 181.8 respectively. The obtained t-value is 5.66 which is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference favours learning disabled girls which reveal that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls are greater than non-disabled girls. Thus the hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled and non-disabled girls" stands rejected.

#### **FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:**

1. Classroom behavioral problems of Learning disabled boys and girls differ. The hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled boys' and girls'" could not be accepted and it was found that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls are greater than learning disabled boys
2. Classroom behavioral problems of Learning disabled boys and non-disabled boys differ. The hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room behavioral problems of the learning disabled boys and non disabled boys' 'could not be accepted. In fact classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled Boys are much more than non disabled boys
3. Classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls and non disabled girls differ. The hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the class-room

behavioral problems of the learning disabled girls and non disabled girls” could not be accepted and it was found that classroom behavioral problems of learning disabled girls are greater than non-disabled girls.

## REFERENCES

**Allport, (1993).** Attitude in C. Murchison (ed.)-A Handbook of social psychology, Worcester, Clerk University Press.

**Aitchison C.(2003).** From Leisure And Disability To Disability Leisure: Developing Data, Definitions And Discourses. Disability & Society 2003 12;18(7):955-969.

**Arnould, C.; Penta, M.; Thonnard, J. (2008).**"Hand Impairments And Their Relationship With Manual Ability In Children With Learning Disability". Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine 39 (9): 708–714

**Beaman R.; Wheldall K. & Kemp C. (2007)** Recent Research on Troublesome Classroom Behaviour: A Review, Australasian Journal of Special Education, Vol. 31, Issue 1, pp 45-60.

**Bryan T. S. (1974).** An Observational Analysis of Classroom Behaviors of Children with Learning Disabilities, Journal of Learning Disabilities, <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221947400700106>

**Cavioni V.; Grazzani I. & Ornaghi V. (2017).** Social and Emotional Learning for Children with Learning Disability: Implications for Inclusion, International Journal of Emotional Education, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 100-109

**Cullinan D., Epstein M. H. & Lloyd J. (1981).** School Behavior Problems of Learning Disabled and Normal Girls and Boys, Learning Disability Quarterly, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1511001>

**Geisthardt C. & Munsch J. (1996).** Coping with School Stress: A Comparison of Adolescents With and Without Learning Disabilities, Journal of Learning Disabilities <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949602900307>

**Handwerk M. L. & Marshall R. M. (1998).** Behavioral and Emotional Problems of Students with Learning Disabilities, Serious Emotional Disturbance, or Both Conditions SAGE Journals Journal of Learning Disabilities

<https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949803100402>

**Infantino J. & Little E. (2005).** Students' Perceptions of Classroom Behaviour Problems and the Effectiveness of Different Disciplinary Methods Educational Psychology, An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, Vol. 25, Issue 5, pp. 491-508

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500046549>

**Krull, Johanna; Wilbert, Jürgen; Hennemann, Thomas (2014).** The Social and Emotional Situation of First Graders with Classroom Behavior Problems and Classroom Learning Difficulties in Inclusive Classes Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, Vol. 12 No. 2 pp. 169-190

**Margalit M. & Almougy K. (1991).** Classroom Behavior and Family Climate in Students with Learning Disabilities and Hyperactive Behavior, Journal of Learning Disabilities, <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949102400705>

**Mc Conaughy S. H., Mattison R. E., & Peterson R. L. (1994).** Behavioral/emotional problems of children with serious emotional disturbances and learning disabilities, School Psychology Review, Vol. 23, Issue 1, pp 81-98.

**McIntosh R., Vaughn S., Schumm J. S. (1993).** Observations of Students with Learning Disabilities in General Education Classrooms, Exceptional Children <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299406000306>

**Ritter D. R. (1989).** Social Competence and Problem Behavior of Adolescent Girls with Learning Disabilities, Journal of Learning Disabilities Vol.22, pp 460-461

**Sridevi G., George A.G., Sriveni D. & Rangaswami K. (2015)** Learning disability and behavior problems among school going children, Journal of disability Studies, Vol. 1 No.1

**Toro P. A., Weissberg R. P., Guare J., (1990)** A Comparison of Children with and Without Learning Disabilities on Social Problem-Solving Skill, School Behavior, and Family Background, Journal of Learning Disabilities, <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949002300207>

**Vaugh S., Zaragoza N., & Hogan A. (1993).** A Four-Year Longitudinal Investigation of the Social Skills and Behavior Problems of Students with Learning Disabilities, Journal of Learning Disabilities <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949302600606>

**Wiener Judith (2004).** Do Peer Relationships Foster Behavioral Adjustment in Children with Learning Disabilities? Learning Disability Quarterly <https://doi.org/10.2307/1593629>

**UNESCO. (1994).** The Salamanca Statement and Framework on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO.

**Zigmond, N. & Baker, J.(1990).** Mainstream experiences for learning disabled students (Project MELD): Preliminary report. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 176-185