PATTERN, PREDICTORS AND MANAGEMENT OFSTUDENTS' CLASSROOM CONDUCT DISORDERSIN POLYTECHNICS IN NIGERIA

Dr. Goddy Chukuma[1]
Dr. Joseph Ogbu[2], Dr. Charles Thompson[2]
[1]Lead Researcher
[2]Co-Researchers

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the pattern, predictors and management of students' classroom conduct disorders in polytechnics in Nigeria. The descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. 390 randomly selected lecturers from 13 polytechnics as sample. The sampleconsisted of 236 (60.5%) males and 154 (39.5%) females, federal polytechnics 129 (33%),

state polytechnics 151 (39%) and private polytechnics 110 (28%). Three instruments (Pattern of Classroom Conduct Disorders Index, Predictors of Classroom Conduct Disorders Scale and Management of Classroom Conduct Disorders Checklist) were used for data collection. Two tailed t-test was used to test for significance on the pattern, predictors and management of classroom conduct disorders. Based on the results, significant difference was found in the mean response of male and female lecturers in the

11 (P − CCDI) subscales measured on the pattern of students' classroom conduct disorders. Also, significant difference was found in the mean response of male and femalelecturers in 3 (P − CCDS) subscales measured on the predictors of students' classroom disorders. A further significant difference was found in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 9 (M − CCDC) subscales measured on the impact of lecturers management strategies of students' classroom conduct disorders. It was recommended among others that federal and state governments should resuscitate bursary and scholarship awards for students, polytechnic management should develop. Strategies in dealing with students having personality abnormalities and polytechnic managementshould ensure that lecturers abide by the terms of their employment in order to maintain acceptable conduct.

INTRODUCTION

It was unthinkable some decades ago that students in higher institutions will exhibit classroom conduct disorders. Lindgren in Bukar (2021) sees conduct disorder as, "consisting of behaviour that is grossly disturbing to others and may in fact be directed against them, in that it is hostile, aggressive, disruptive and/or disobedient". Chukuma (2011) notes that, "conduct disorders are the type that are more likely to come to the attention of teachers". Chukuma (2011) posits further that, "any behaviour that interferes with teaching and learning can be considered a behaviour problem". That is the case with conduct disorders. These conduct disorder problems were only associated with primary school pupils. For instance, Lindgren in Chukuma (2011) reports that, conduct problems are more likely to affect the behaviour of children who are relatively free of anxiety – thatis, who do not have enough "normal anxiety" to feel any concern for the rights and feelings of others or for the consequences and implication of their behaviour. In this sense, conduct disorders in the classroom is associated with immaturity. Later, conduct disorders crept into secondary school students thereby disrupting teaching and learning. For instance, soldiers in 1977 were sent to secondary schools to maintain discipline (Chukuma, 2000; Arikewuyo & Dosumu in Bukar, 2021; Chukuma, 2011). Now, students in higher institutions are displaying the same conduct disorders usually exhibitedby pupils and students in secondary schools due to immaturity. Chukuma (2022) observed several classes where lectures took place and notes that conduct disorders are endemic in higher institutions. The concern now is that higher institution students are not supposed to be found with these conduct disorders because they are thought to bematured. The consequence of conduct disorders in the classroom is serious because it disrupts teaching and learning. This concern is also borne out of the fact that the manifestation of behavioural problems within the school system obstructs teaching and learning thereby derailing the entire purpose of the educational system; if not checked appropriately (Owusu & Manger in Cukuma, 2011).

The Problem

Polytechnic students are thought to be matured and that is why the kind of disciplinary measures taken in primary and secondary schools are not meted out on them. However, it has been observed by lecturers that conduct disorders exist among students of polytechnics in the class room thereby causing disruptions of lectures. Due to the consequences they have on teaching and learning, lecturers have been forced to manage the problem. These measures are yet to be empirically determined.

While the pattern and predictors of conduct disorders among primary school pupils and secondary school students have been determined empirically (Arikewuyo & Dosumu in Bukar, 2021; Chukuma, 2000 & Chukuma, 2011), those of the polytechnics are yet to be empirically determined. Also, it is not clear whether the management strategies of lecturers' are making impact on students' classroom conduct disorders because of their prevalence. Therefore, the present study is directed at determining the pattern, predictors and the impact of management strategies of lecturers in dealing with classroom conduct disorders of polytechnic students during lectures. It is hypothesizedthat:

a. Lecturers will not differ significantly in their opinion on the pattern of students'classroom conduct disorder.
b. There is no significant difference among lecturers in their opinion on the predictorsof students' classroom conduct disorders.
c. There is no significant main impact of lecturers' strategies on the management ofstudents' classroom conduct disorders.

Justification

The prevalence of conduct disorders among polytechnic students during lectures has been observed. The consequence is that they disrupt teaching and learning. The study can be justified because the findings will provide lecturers information on the pattern ofconduct disorders once they occur in the class room so that attention can be drawn to them. Besides, the findings of the study will assist lecturers in identifying the predictorsof conduct disorders in the class room. This will enable them to adopt effective strategies in containing conduct disorders. Sometimes, lecturers adopt some strategiesto manage classroom conduct disorders. Yet, the conduct disorders persist. The findingsof the study will expose lecturers to strategies that are effective in managing conduct disorders in the classroom during lectures.

LITERATURE REVIEW THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Conflict Theory of Conduct Disorders

There is a theoretical position supported by empirical evidence on the desirability or undesirability of conduct disorders in the classroom during lectures (Arikewuyo & Dosumu in Bukar, 2021). This position argues that conflicts, controversies, breakdown in communication and differences in perceptions among groups (including students) with regards to acceptable and unacceptable norms of behaviours, values, beliefs and expectations are normal integral parts of schools as social organizations that are located in particular socio-economic and cultural communities. Instead of being perceived as dysfunctional, these conflicts, controversies and differences in perceptions should be used to promote among teachers and students, better understanding and the development of social reasoning abilities. Rather, these conflicts should be used to create friendly, humane and cooperative classroom climates that are conducive to optimal social and emotional development, learning and teaching (Schwartz & Bilsky inBukar, 2021; Valsiner & Cairns in Chukuma, 2011; Nicholls & Hazard, 1993; Schwartz, 1994).

Reinforcement Theory of Conflict Disorders

This Theory belongs to the behaviourist school (Bruno in Bukar, 2021). It explains that the problem of the individual is one of adjustment to adaptive behaviours that conforms to the norms of society. This explanation is on learning that has nothing to do withmotivational and emotional state. The Theory is based on operant principle of conditioning in which actions are shaped by their consequences. This means, behaviours are contingent upon reinforcers.

For quite some time it has been observed that students in the polytechnic system in Nigeria have been exhibiting conduct disorders in the classroom during lectures. These have taken a toll on lecturers who have to cope with managing conduct disorders and the delivery of lectures. According to Lindgren in Chukuma (2003), "conduct problems consist of behaviour that is grossly disturbing to others and may in fact be directed against them, in that it is hostile, aggressive, disruptive and/or disobedient". It sometimes involves delinquency and psychopathology (Chukuma, 2011). Researchers such as Quay in Chukuma (2011) and Vonisser et al in Bukar (2021) posit that conduct disorder is characterized by overt aggression, both verbal and physical, disruptiveness, negativism, irresponsibility and defiance of authority – which are all at variance with the behavioural expectations of the school and other social institutions.

Non-conforming behaviours (Arikewuyo & Dosumu in Bukar, 2021) are those actions that cannot be tolerated within the school system.

They are behaviours of deviations from the set norms of the society, which are considered to be disruptive and have negative effect on educational development. Ordinary observation by Chukuma (2022) while lecturing and watching other lectures in the classroom elsewhere in polytechnics reveal late attendance, low attention, side talk, movement, distraction, hunger, poor writing material possession, excuses, sleeping, yawning and noise. Others are absent mindedness, poor grasping level, gross indiscipline, obstruction, whispering, making phone calls and watching video films from phones while lectures are on in the classroom. Chukuma (2022) also reveals that lecturers were busy managing (controlling) their classes alongside lecturing which often wear them down.

Several predictors of conduct disorders in the school system (Al-Hassan in Bukar,2021; Chukuma, 2011) have been explained as in conflict, non-conformity, familybackground, peer group pressure, rebellious disposition and gender. In all of these, lecturers are to contend with these predictors in order to prevent them from occurring (Chukuma, 2000).

In order to manage classroom conduct disorders, Chukuma (2022) observes that lecturers send students away from the class when they disturb, prevent them from entering the class when they are late, warn them, report students to authorities, counsel students, seize handsets, arrange test when some students are not in class, change their sitting positions and leave the class in protest of conduct disorders. However, there are no empirical data on the effectiveness of these classroom management strategies. Arikewuyo and Dosumu in Bukar (2021) note that, "the inability of parents, teachers and society to assess the causes and management of these behaviours may impede the development of social reasoning among adolescents in schools".

METHODOLOGY
Research Design
Descriptive survey method was adopted for the study. This method was found suitable because of the possibility of reacing the subjects in scattered locations in Nigeria (Afolabi, 1993 in Chukuma, 2022). Again, it will be possible to gather data from a sample of the population and to generalize the findings obtained from an analysis of the sample to the entire population (Afolabi, 1993 in Chukuma, 2009: 104). Osuala (2001 in Chukuma, 2000: 104) also posits that, "surveys identify present conditions and point to present needs".

Sample
Baseline socio-demographics of the participants reveal that they are made up of lecturers who are the objects of the study. 390 participants took part from 13 selected polytechnics. These consist of Federal Polytechnic, Oko 40, Federal polytechnic, Nasarawa 30, National Institute of Construction Technology, Uromi 35, Yaba College of Technology 40, Kogi State Polytechnic, Lokoja 30, Tatari Ali Polytechnic, Bauchi 35, Edo State Polytechnic, Usen 20, Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Ikot Osurua, Ikot Ekpene 40 and Adamawa State Polytechnic, Yola 30, Bellarks Polytechnic, Kwale, Delta State 20, Bolmor Polytechnic, Dugbe, Ibadan 20, Citi Polytechnic, Dutse Alhaji, Abuja 20, Kings Polytechnic, Ubiaja, Edo State 30. The participants consisted of 236 (60.5%) males and 154 (39.5%) females, federal polytechnics 129 (33%), state
polytechnics 151 (39%) and private polytechnics 110 (28%). the study was delimited to federal, state and private polytechnics in Nigeria.

Instrumentation
Te following instruments were used for data collection:
   a.   Pattern of Classroom Conduct Disorders Index (P – CCDI)
The P – CCDI was developed by the researchers as a self-report scale to identify the pattern of classroom conduct disorders among polytechnics students. The design of the P – CCDI is clustered around two sections namely socio-demographics such as gender, student, lecturer and name of institution. The other section is designed on a Likert-type five point scale with response mode of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. In scoring the items, respondents would have a possible total score of 5 ranging from 1 – 5 which represents a respondent's opinion.The higher the score, the more influenced the respondent is by the scale. Respondents would be required to trick against a response that represents their opinion. In all, the scale is a 14 item questionnaire. A test-retest reliability reported aPearson r of 0.63 for the scale. The present study adopted the P – CCDI as an effort in identifying the pattern of polytechnic students' classroom conduct disorders due to its high reliability in pilot studies.

EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)

b.   Predictors of Classroom Conduct Disorders Scale (P – CCDS)

The P – CCDS is a paper and pencil test development by the researchers as a self- report scale to identify the polytechnic students' classroom conduct disorders. The design of the P – CCDS is clustered around two sections namely socio- demographics such as gender, student, lecturer and name of institution. Te other section is designed on a Likert-type five point scale with a response mode ofstrongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Each answer in the P – CCDS is scored on a scale value of 1-5. The higher the score, the moreinfluenced the respondent is by the scale. The respondents are required to tick against the response that best represent their opinion. In all, the scale is a 9 item questionnaire. A test-retest reliability reported a Pearson r of 0.58 and was found usable in the study.

c.   Management of Classroom Conduct Disorders Checklist (M – CCDC)

The M – CCDC was developed by the researchers as a self-report scale to measure the impact of lecturers' management of polytechnic students' classroom conduct disorders. The design of the M – CCDC is clustered around two sections namely socio-demographics such as gender, student, lecturer and name of institution. The other section is designed on a Likert-type four point scale with response modes of not at all, at times, some of the time and most of the time. Each answer in the M – CCDC is scored on a scale value of $0 – 3$. The higher the score, the more influenced the respondent is by the scale. The scale was developed as a paper and pencil test that would require the respondents to tick against a response that represents their opinion. In all, the scale is a 13 item questionnaire. A test-retest reliability reported aPearson r of 0.71 for the scale.

Procedure

Four research assistants assisted in the administration of the instrument which lasted forfour weeks. They were specially trained on the procedures of the exercise whichincludes behaviour problems of students and the technical nature of some aspects of the instrument.

Data Analysis

The statistical technique used in the study is the two tailed t-test to test for significance. Confidence level is set at 0.05.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1: Lecturers will not differ significantly in their opinion on the pattern ofstudents' classroom conduct disorders.

Results of the test are presented in a pooled summary in Table 1:

Table 1:   t – test Summary on Pattern of Students' Classroom Conduct Disorders.

Variables	Df	t	P	t-Crit.	Sig.
Students' late class attendance.	388	1.42	0.158	1.96	NS
Students' attention at lecture is low.	388	2.20	.028	1.96	S
Side talk among students during lectures.	388	2.71	0.11	1.96	S
Students' movement during lectures.	388	.48	.630	1.96	NS
Students' distraction during lectures.	388	2.33	0.41	1.96	S
Students' exhibition of poor writing material possession during lectures.	388	3.01	0.22	1.96	S
Students' excuses for lack of requirement in class during lectures.	388	2.66	0.61	1.96	S
Students' noise making during lectures.	388	2.99	.70	1.96	S
Students' incompatibility during lectures.	388	0.18	0.28	1.96	NS
Students' absent mindedness during lectures.	388	3.48	0.66	1.96	S
Students' inability in putting down note during lectures.	388	2.01	.28	1.96	S
Students' unpreparedness for lectures.	388	2.22	.42	1.96	S
Low grasping level of students' during lectures.	388	2.55	0.24	1.96	S
Students' obstruction during lectures.	388	2.01	0.26	1.96	S

N = 390   **p** <0.05

Results in Table 1 indicate significant difference in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 11 (P – CCDI) subscales measured as in students' attention at lectures is low (t = 2.20, df = 388, p <0.05), side talk during lectures (t = 2.71, df = 388, p <0.05), students distraction during lectures (t = 2.33, df = 388, p <0.05), students' exhibition of poor writing material possession during lectures (t = 3.01, df = 388, p <0.05), students' excuses for lack of requirement in class during lectures (t =2.66 , df = 388, p <0.05), students' noise making during lectures (t = 2.99, df = 388, p <0.05), students' absent mindedness during lectures (t = 3.48, df = 388, p <0.05), students' inability in putting down note during lectures (t = 2.01, df = 388, p <0.05), students' unpreparedness for lectures (t = 2.22, df = 388, p <0.05), low grasping level of student during lectures (t = 2.55, df = 388, p <0.05) and students' obstruction during lectures (t = 2.01, df = 388, p <0.05).

However, there was no significant difference in the mean of male and female lecturers in 3 (P – CCDI) subscales measuring students' late class attendance (t = 1.42, df = 388, p <0.05), students' movement during lectures (t = .48, df = 388, p <0.05) and students' incompatibility during lectures (t = 0.18, df = 388, p <0.05).

Hypothesis 2:
> There is no significant difference among lecturers in their opinion on thepredictors of students' classroom conduct disorders.

Results of the test are presented in a pooled summary in Table 2:

Table 2:t – test summary on Predictors of Students Classroom Conduct Disorders

Variables	Df	t	P	t-Crit.	Sig.
Conflict with school system.	388	0.81	0.11	1.96	NS
Non conformity with school rules and regulation.	388	1.24	0.22	1.96	NS
Family background.	388	0.26	0.31	1.96	NS
Peer group pressure.	388	1.01	0.64	1.96	NS
Rebellious disposition.	388	0.82	0.12	1.96	NS
Gender.	388	0.17	0.41	1.96	NS
Personality profile.	388	2.01	0.10	1.96	S
Lecturer subject incompetence.	388	3.04	0.20	1.96	S
Lecturer conduct.	388	2.84	0.06	1.96	S

N = 390   **p** <0.05

Results in Table 2 indicate significant difference in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 3 (P – CCDS) subscales measuring personality profile (t = 2.01, df = 388, p<0.05), lecturer subject incompetence (t = 3.04, df = 388, p<0.05) and lecturer conduct (t = 2.84, df = 388, p<0.05). However, results also indicate no significantdifference in 6 (P – CCDS) subscales measuring conflict with school system (t = 0.81, df = 388, p<0.05), non conformity with school rules and regulations (t = 1.24, df = 388, p<0.05), family background (t = 0.26, df =388, p<0.05), peer group pressure (t = 1.01, df = 388, p<0.05), rebellious disposition (t = 0.82, df = 388, p<0.05) and gender (t = 0.17, df = 388, p<0.05).

Hypothesis 3:
> There is no significant main impact of lecturers' strategies on themanagement of students' classroom conduct disorders.

Results of the test are presented in a pooled summary in Table 3:

EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 9 | Issue: 4 | April 2024   - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 3:   t – test Summary on Impact of Lecturers' Management Strategies ofStudents' Classroom Conduct Disorders.

Variables	Df	T	P	t-Crit.	Sig.
Send students awayfromclassroom fordisturbance.	388	2.01	0.10	1.96	S
Prevent students from entering classroom for late coming.	388	2.11	0.09	1.96	S
Warning against late coming.	388	0.78	0.63	1.96	NS
Report students to school authority.	388	2.55	0.33	1.96	S
Counsel students.	388	1.22	0.41	1.96	NS
Rebuke students.	388	1.31	0.22	1.96	NS
Ignore students.	388	0.58	0.28	1.96	NS
Seize handsets in use during lectures.	388	2.17	0.14	1.96	S
Arrange test when some students are not in class.	388	2.02	0.16	1.96	S
Change their sitting positions.	388	.67	0.52	1.96	NS
Walk out of class in protest.	388	.17	0.23	1.96	NS
Reduction in test scores as punishment.	388	2.18	0.19	1.96	S
Give students more assignment.	388	2.14	0.21	1.96	S
Threat of failing students.	388	2.16	.101	1.96	S
Strict on disciplinary rules.	388	3.34	0.06	1.96	S
Praise for good conduct.	388	0.24	.610	1.96	NS

N = 390   **p** <0.05

Results in T able 3 indicate significant difference in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 9 (M – CCDC) subscales measuring send students away from classroom for disturbance (t = 2.01, df = 388, p<0.05), prevent students from entering classroom for late coming (t = 2.11, df = 388, p<0.05), report students to school authority(t =2.55, df = 388, p<0.05), seize handsets in use during lectures (t = 2.17, df = 388, p<0.05), arrange test when deviant students are not in class (t = 2.02, df = 388, p<0.05), reduction in test scores(t = 2.18, df = 388, p<0.05), give students more assignments (t = 2.14, df = 388, p<0.05), threat of failing students (t = 2.16, df = 388, p<0.05) and strict ondisciplinary rules (t = 3.34, df = 388, p<0.05).

However, results also indicate no significant difference in 7 (M – CCDC) subscales measuring counsel students (t = 1.22, df = 388, p<0.05), rebuke students (t = 1.31, df = 388, p<0.05), ignore students (t = 0.58, df = 388, p<0.05), change sitting position due to side talk (t = .67, df = 388, p<0.05), walk out of class in protest (t = .17, df = 388, p<0.05) and praise for good conduct (t = 0.24, df = 388, p<0.05).

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The following major findings were generated in the study:

1. Significant difference exist in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 11 (P – CCDI) subscales measuring the pattern of students' classroom conduct disorders asfollows:
   a. Students' attention at lectures is low.
   b. Side talk during lectures.
   c. Students' distraction during lectures.
   d. Students' exhibition of poor writing material possession during lectures.
   e. Students' excuses for lack of requirement during lectures.
   f. Students' noise making during lectures.
   g. Students' absent mindedness during lectures.
   h. Students' inability in putting down note during lectures.
   i. Students' unpreparedness for lectures.
   j. Low grasping level of students during lectures.
   k. Students' obstruction during lectures.

2. Significant difference exist in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 3 (P – CCDS) subscales measuring the predictors of students classroom conduct disordersduring lectures as follows:
   a. Personality profile.
   b. Lecturer subject incompetence.
   c. Lecturer conduct.

3. Significant difference exist in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 9 (M – CCDC) subscales measuring the impact of lecturers management strategies ofstudents' classroom conduct disorders as follows:
   a. Send students away from classroom for disturbance.
   b. Prevent students from entering classroom for late coming.
   c. Report students to school authority.
   d. Seize handsets in use during lectures.
   e. Arrange test when deviant students are not in class.
   f. Reduction in test scores as punishment.
   g. Threat of failing students.
   h. Strict on disciplinary rules.
   i. Give students more assignments.

DISCUSSION

The main objective of the study was to determine the pattern, predictors and the impact ofstudents' classroom disorders in polytechnic in Nigeria. The discussion is presented inthe following:

Pattern of Students' Classroom Conduct Disorders

From the results and analysis, the study found significant differences in the mean response of male and female lecturers in 11 (P – CCDI) subscales measuring students' attention at lectures is low, side talk during lectures, students' distraction during lectures, students' exhibition of poor writing material possession during lectures, students' excusesfor lack of requirement during lectures, students' noise making during lectures andstudents absentmindedness during lectures. Others are students' inability in putting down notes during lectures, students' unpreparedness for lectures, low grasping level of students during lectures and students' obstruction during lectures. These findings are consistent with those of Chukuma (2022) that students of polytechnics display lateattendance, low attention, side talk, movement, distraction, hunger, poor writing material possession, watching video films from phones while lectures are on and so on. These findings can be justified in the following:

a. The poor economic situation in Nigeria has rendered the people poor. Most aspects of the finding have to do with poverty among students – a situation where they lack writing materials, sleep in class and low grasping due to hunger, move up and downin search of one thing or the other, obstruct classes because they want to go and look for money and come late to school or even be absent due to lack of transport fare.

b. The perception of students about education is what is manifesting in this pattern of classroom conduct disorders – where students see education as not contributing to their well-being. When students graduate, they cannot find jobs and make comparisonbetween themselves with those who did not attend higher institutions; but are well to do, make students to exhibit this kind of behaviours in the classroom.

c. Curriculum irrelevance may make students to exhibit patterns of classroom conduct disorders. Alhassan (1992) reports that;

There are three main ways in which pupils, (likewise polytechnic students) experience of the curriculum could be adverse: if they found it irrelevant if theywould not meet the demand it made; and if it left them with a sense of failure.
The findings are further consistent with that of Turner (1975) in Chukuma (2011) thatidentified teacher (this applies to lecturers also) weakness in skill areas.

Predictors of Students' Classroom Conduct Disorders
From the results and analysis, the study found significant differences in the mean responses of male and female lecturers in 3 (P – CCDS) subscales measuring personality profile, lecturer subject incompetence and lecturer conduct. These findings are consistent with that of Chandler in Chukuma (2011), "that delinquent boys were less able than non- delinquent boys to take the perspective of another person". That is, the cognitive capacityto appreciate other peoples' views was severely lacking. This is the case with somepolytechnic students as a result of personality abnormalities resulting in strong argumentsin classrooms that are unnecessary and disturbing. The findings are also consistent with those of Alhassan (1992) on teacher conduct that, "ten teachers (25%) highlighted abuse of office – in the staff-room or irregular attendance by their colleagues as developments that may likely influence pupils into playing truancy". This conduct of teachers in primary/secondary schools are also found among lecturers. Sometimes, students react to it. According to Alhassan (1992), "it has also been observed that truanting teachers do nothave respect in school". Sometimes too, students copy truancy from lecturers. For instance, Alhassan (1992) remarks that, "negative models are likely to be provided by teachers starting lesson late and ending them early".

Management of Classroom Conduct Disorders
From the results and analysis, the study found significant differences in the mean responses of male and female teachers in 9 (M – CCDC) subscales measuring send students away from classroom for disturbance, prevent students from entering classroom for late coming, report students to school authority, seize handsets in use during lectures and arrange test when deviant students are not in class. Others are give students more assignment, reduction in test scores as punishment, threat of failing students and strict on disciplinary rules. These findings are consistent with the observation of Chukuma (2022),that these strategies have proved effective in managing polytechnic students' conduct disorders – that is, the stricter the lecturers on managing classroom disorders, the morethe students comply with the treatment. However, the findings are inconsistent with thoseof Biddle (1964) in Chukuma (2011) that, "a warm, firm, democratic or emphatic teacher is the most competent". The findings are also inconsistent with that of Adzenga (1986) in Chukuma (2011) that, "authoritarian approaches to human relationship are ineffective". Incidentally, the findings represent authoritarian approaches. Notwithstanding, the findings can be justified:
   a. It has been observed that lecturers who apply these management strategies on behaviour compliance have been more successful (Chukuma, 2022).
   b. There are students who will want to test the will of lecturers of which only these approaches in the findings will be effective.
   c. Some students may outsmart lecturers in their management of classroom conduct disorders. For instance, Flaherty (1976) reports that, "where the disruptive student is intelligent, such a student will outsmart the teachers and parents in their treatmentplan and may not comply with it".
   d. The findings do not relate to corporal punishment; but one of adjustment initiatives bylecturers for compliance.

CONCLUSION
Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that:
   1. The pattern of students' classroom conduct disorders are:
   a. Students' attention at lectures is low.
   b. Side talk during lectures.

c. Students' distraction during lectures.
d. Students' exhibition of poor writing material possession during lectures.
e. Students' excuses for lack of requirement during lectures.
f. Students' noise making during lectures.
g. Students' absent mindedness during lectures.
h. Students' inability in putting down note during lectures.
i. Students' unpreparedness for lectures.
j. Low grasping level of students during lectures.
k. Students' obstruction during lectures.

2. The predictors of students classroom conduct disorders are:
a. Personality profile.
b. Lecturer subject incompetence.
c. Lecturer conduct.

3. The management of students' classroom conduct disorders for impact are:
   a. Send students away from classroom for disturbance.
   b. Prevent students from entering classroom for late coming.
   c. Report students to school authority.
   d. Seize handsets in use during lectures.
   e. Arrange test when deviant students are not in class.
   f. Reduction in test scores as punishment.
   g. Threat of failing students.
   h. Strict on disciplinary rules.
   i. Give students more assignments.

Recommendations
Based on the results and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations aremade:
   a. Government should resuscitate bursary and scholarship awards provided by the Federal Government and state governments to students due to chronic poverty among students.
   b. School authorities should organize orientation for students on the need for education.
   c. Government, the National Board for Technical Education and polytechnic managements should review the curricular of polytechnics to meet current needs of students.
   d. Polytechnic management should develop strategies in dealing with students withpersonality abnormalities in order to reduce conflict with lecturers.
   e. Polytechnic managements should ensure that competent lecturers are employed.
   f. Polytechnic management should ensure that lecturers abide by the terms of their employment in order to maintain acceptable conduct.
   g. Lecturers should be strict on disciplinary rules in order to ensure compliance by students.

REFERENCES
1. Adzenga, J. A. (1986). The Perceived Causes of Behaviour Problems of Children inHomes. Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University.
2. Bukar, R. M. (2021). Teacher-Parent Bipartite Approach to Behavioural Problems in Schools; Kaduna: Solomon Print Ville.
3. Chukuma, G. (2000). Teachers' Effectiveness in the Selection of Strategies for TreatingBehaviour Problems. Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
4. Chukuma, G. (2003). Teacher Effectiveness in the use of Communication for Treating Behavioural Problems, Journal of Administrative and Business Forum, vol.1, PP:1 – 8.
5. Chukuma, G. (2011). Treatment of Behaviour Problems in Schools: The Teacher – Parent Cooperation Approach. Kaduna: Raph Printing Productions.
6. Chukuma, G. (2022). Survey of Classes for Identifying Conduct Disorders in Classrooms. The Class Teacher, Vol 3, (2) 8, PP: 21

– 25.

7. *Flaherty, B. T. (1976). Disruptive Children in a Community Home. In Jones, D & R. G.Cave (Eds.). The Disruptive Pupils in the Secondary School. London: Ward Lock Educational.*
8. *Nicholls, J & Hazard, S. P. (1993). Education as Adventure: Lessons from the Second Grades. New York: Teachers College Press.*
9. *Owusu, K. A. & Manger, T. (1996). Strategies for Dealing with Behavioural Problems in Junior Second Schools in Ghana. Ife Psychologia, Vol. 4, No. 1, PP: 26 – 43.*
10. *Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Studying Human Values. In A. M. Bouvy, P. Bosk, P. Schmitz & F. V. D. Vijer (Eds.), Proceeding of the Eleventh Cultural Psychology. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swerts and Zeitlinger.*
11. *Valsiner, J. (1994). Personal Culture and Anti Social Conduct. Paper presented at the XII Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Pamplona, Navarra, Spain, July 24 – 28.*