

The Prevalence Degree of the Negative Behavior among Students in the Islamic University of Gaza from the Viewpoints of their Teachers

Pro. Mahmoud K. Abu Daff, Dr. Somaya M. Sayma

Professor in the Faculty of Education The Islamic University of Gaza –IUG

Assistant Professor in the Educational Administration The Islamic University of Gaza –IUG

Abstract: The study aimed at identifying the aspects of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University in Gaza-Palestine. The researchers used the analytical descriptive method. The study's tool was a questionnaire applied on (151) university's teachers. The results of the study were as the following: The prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers had a relative weight (%65.4), and the highest statements in the negative behavior came as the following: students focus on achieving degrees more than acquiring beneficial experiences, students base on abstracts without referring to references, students crowd around elevators, and students waste university free time without benefiting. Furthermore, there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the averages of the sample ratings on the prevalence degree of the negative behavior due to the variable of the major in relation to the field of public morals, while there are statistically significant differences in the study and achievement field for the teachers of Science. Also, there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the averages of the sample ratings on the prevalence degree of the negative behavior due to the (years of service) variable in the fields of the study and achievement and public morals.

Keywords: prevalence, negative behavior, Islamic University.

Date of Submission: 13-01-2020

Date of Acceptance: 29-01-2020

I. Introduction

A university stage is one of the most important and fundamental stages in preparing and qualifying young people to future and joining the society. So, this requires preparing the student's personality in an integrated and positive way, and the university as one of the educational institutions bears a responsibility for evaluating and modifying the student's behavior.

A human behavior expresses all visible and invisible actions reacted by an individual. Thus, the behavior is defined as an activity reacted by human being, whether it is an observable and measurable practice, or action that is not noticeable such as thinking and remembering. As well as, the behavior is not fixed, but it changes and occurs because of human interaction with the environment and various circumstances (Attia, 2001, p. 19).

It is worth mentioning that a human behavior is divided into normal and abnormal behavior. The positive behavior appears as a normal behavior among most people, while the negative behavior expresses unfamiliar behavior as a result of inconsistency inside the individual (Barakat, 2008). Many researchers and scholars emphasize the difficulty of identifying a specific definition for the positive and negative behavior, and this refers to the relativity of this issue and its dependency to the society, culture and religion. So, some behaviors might be negative at the present time, but they were positive in the previous years, as well as some behaviors may be negative in one society and positive in another (Al-Thahir, 2004, p. 18).

The negative behaviors are defined as individual behavioral patterns that are contrary to the accepted social norms, and people can observe them. These behaviors affect the individual's psychological efficacy and interaction with others (Al-Kashif, 2004, p. 74).

The negative behavior of student is one of the most prominent obstacles facing teachers and students alike. (Al-Athamna, 2003) study indicated that one of the most difficult challenges facing teachers is the dissemination of behavioral problems inside the educational institutions because it is considered a blatant challenge to the educational system and the values of society. Despite the most students have a high academic and social behavior, there are many students behaving unacceptably which affect negatively on the school climate and disrupt the order inside the educational institution. Patron's study (2008) adds that the negative behaviors affect adversely on the vocational satisfaction of teachers, as well as the enjoyment and harmony of

the students in the lecture. Furthermore, the behavioral problems of the students affect negatively on their peers and exhaust the time and effort of teachers to find solutions of these problems instead of focusing on the educational process. Thus, this reflects in a negative way on the level of achievement and learning outcomes.

The negative behaviors occur as a result of various and joint factors, such as genetic, domestic, or societal factors. So, attracting attention is considered one of the reasons of the negative behaviors through doing practices that impede activities. These practices may occur because of the increased motor activity represented by performing unbalanced movements, or the negativity that expresses the lack of interest and desire to carry out any activity leading to avoid community interaction and participation (Mustafa, 2011, p. 55). Moreover, the negative behaviors may appear as a result of the rebellion where the individual rejects the laws, social standards and the authority of people who are around him (Abu Mandeel, 2016, p. 74).

On the other hand, some scholars attribute the causes of the negative behaviors to the genetic and neurological factors, in addition to domestic and social factors happened as a result of wrong methods in socialization (Yahya, 2002, p. 57). Hong's study (2016) adds another factor called transmitting of the negative behavior which focuses on the effects of students' behaviors on each other.

Abdul-Ghani's study (2015) attributed the negative behaviors of students in Iraqi universities to the events and wars in Iraq, as well as the negative socialization methods that contribute to enhancement of the contrary behaviors, such as an excessive coquetry, tolerance and leniency towards mistakes committed by children with others without having a proper guiding.

While the American lecturers emphasized in Yustnell and Oglo study (2013) that the source of the negative behavior is caused by the lecturers themselves because they are not able to attract the attention of students, and they refrain from using technology as an enjoyable method in teaching.

Yan's study (2012) considered that the basic step is to reveal the causes of students misconduct, as well as the negative behaviors of students in the classrooms cannot be considered isolated from the influence of society and the educational institutions. Therefore, the study classified the source of misconduct of students to:

- Resources related to the students: the lack of interest and motivation of students to learn.
- Resources related to the teachers: the lack of teachers proficiency in their subjects, using boring methods in presenting the subject, and they do not have the ability to control the class.
- Resources related to community: the negative behaviors can be acquired by imitating what others do. Moreover, the family bears a responsibility due to the great impact of family problems on behaviors, such as the lack of parental control, the low level of interaction and positive relationships among family members, in addition to a low educational and social level.

In order to continue the previous efforts in this subject, the researchers detect that there is a necessity to study the prevalence of a negative behavior among students of the Islamic University in Gaza and addressing them.

1.1. Previous studies:

The researchers conducted a survey of the available studies according to the subject matter, and these studies were classified from the newest to the oldest, as follows: **Al-Khalaf & others study (2016)** aimed at identifying the aspects of the negative behavior of students in the Faculty of Physical Education at Yarmouk University in Jordan from the viewpoint of their teachers in the verbal, motor, and social fields. The results showed that the average the total degree of the negative behavior aspects had a low degree with a relative weight (57.4%). Thus, the study suggested some procedures to address the negative behaviors including: utilizing the lecture time completely to preoccupy students with its content, neglecting the negative behaviors of students, using the praise method during the lecture, discussing the violent student in a humane manner, in addition to providing students with values framework at the beginning of the semester. **Abdul-Ghani's study (2015)** aimed at detecting the degree of the behavior aspects of university students which had a low degree with a relative weight (51%). The most prominent negative behaviors were the collective absence and postponing the exams without excuses. Thus, the study attributed the causes of misconduct to the students themselves because of neglecting their studying. Moreover, the weak role of families in monitoring and supporting students. **Deligic and Baihan study (2014)** showed the published studies and theses in the Turkish journals on the negative behaviors of students through reviewed the opinions of teachers from the year 2000 to 2012. The study sample consisted of (3648) teachers. Data were collected from 16 studies. The results showed that the most prominent negative behaviors were: avoiding tasks, the continuing talks with colleagues, the verbal assaults toward teachers and colleagues, neglecting the study and delaying lectures. **Yustnell and Oglo's study (2013)** revealed the negative behavior aspects of university students in the Turkish and American universities from the viewpoint of university lecturers. The study's tools were observation and interview to determine these behaviors which were using the cell phone, inappropriate talks, the lack of interest and attention to the lesson, delaying the study and the weak participation. Furthermore, the treatment strategies differed due to the cultural conditions of the both countries where the Turkish lecturers were more stringent, and they used verbal warnings and expelled students outside the lecture, while the American lecturers used the encouragement, giving opportunities

for interaction with peers in lectures and using technology, such as Moodle and blogs applications. **Ali and Jeraisy study (2013)** indicated that the negative behaviors are common in the classes of higher education institutions. If these behaviors continue, it will be preferable to request the help from the academic assistant. Thus, the cooperation created a comfortable situation for all participants, and the irregular behaviors have been addressed, as well as improving the level and performance of students. **Yan's study (2012)** showed that the most important strategies for addressing negative behaviors of students are to improve the educational activities, support and motivate students to learn, as well as establish clear classroom rules since the beginning of the semester and avoid the direct punishment that cause severe problems between the teacher and students. **Garrett's study (2011)** revealed the aspects of misconduct in the lecture which showed the neglecting of students to the educational process, such as the absenteeism from lectures, sleeping in the classroom, the uncontrolled speech in the classroom, useless reading such as reading newspapers, magazines, textbooks of other courses, the frequent delays and non-delivery of assignments. **Sun & Chek study (2011)** showed many negative behaviors of students in Hong Kong. The study used individual interviews with (18) teachers about the negative behaviors. The study showed that the most prominent negative behaviors were speaking without permission and the lack of respect to the teachers. So, the study considers that these behaviors are unacceptable because they disturb the teacher and violate the values of respect and positivity in the relationship between the teacher and students. **Ozben's study (2010)** showed that the variables of gender and years of service affect on the teachers' evaluation about the most important negative behaviors of students and the means of addressing them. The study showed that females mentioned that students' conversations in classrooms are the most common negative behaviors, while males mentioned that neglecting the lessons and lack of responsibility are the most common negative behaviors. The study also showed that junior teachers face difficulties in dealing with the negative behaviors of students compared with the teachers who have a larger number of years of service. The study reached that discussing students about their behaviors is the best way to address their negative behaviors.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The success of the educational process depends on the availability of an appropriate academic climate based on the rules of discipline in order to allow teachers and students to exchange ideas, opinions and experiences, while the prevalence of any negative practices and behaviors of some students, even if they are few, would disturb the discipline and hinder the achievement of the planned goals. The researchers noticed through their work as teachers at the university and the results of the exploratory study that there is increasing in the negative behaviors among university students compared with the previous periods. So, the researchers conducted this study to reach results concerning to the study's questions. Hence the problem of the study involved the questions of the study as follows:

-What is the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers?

- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the averages of the sample ratings on the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers due to the major and years of service variables?

1.3. Hypotheses of the Study:

1. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample for the prevalence degree of the negative behaviors among Islamic University students due to the variable of years of service (from a year to less than 10 years, from 10 years to less than 20 years, 20 years and more).

2. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample for the prevalence degree of the negative behaviors among Islamic University students due to the variable of major (Sharia, Science, Education).

1.4. The purpose of the Study

1. Identify the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers.

2. Find out the statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the averages of the sample ratings on the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers due to the major and the years of service variables.

1.5. The limitations of the study

The subject limit: identifying the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University.

The humane limit: the teachers of Sharia, Science and Education majors at Islamic University.

The institutional limit: the Islamic University.

The spatial limit: Gaza Governorate - Palestine.

The temporal limit: The study was applied in the first semester of 2018/2019.

1.6. The significance of the study:

1. The importance of behavior as an essential element to build an integrated personality of the university's student.
2. This study can benefit the teachers concerned with forming the personalities of their students and modifying their behaviors, and the university's students through identifying the common patterns of negative behaviors to modify them by themselves.
3. A paucity of studies that addressed the study's subject - according to the acknowledge of the researchers - in the Palestinian environment.

II. Methodology

2.1 Research design:

The researchers used the analytical descriptive method to describe the phenomenon of the study, analyze its data, detect the relationship among its components, show the opinions expressed about it, highlight the processes it contains, and indicate the effects that it causes.

2.2 Instrumentation:

After reviewing the previous studies, the researchers constructed a questionnaire consisting of (34) statements that are divided into (2) fields: the first field is the study and achievement, and the second field is the public morals. Each field of the questionnaire consists of (17) statements. Then Likert's scale (very few, few, medium, large, very large) was used to measure the respondents' answers on the questionnaire statements to equal the following degrees (5, 4, 3, 2, 1). All statements of the questionnaire were positive.

The questionnaire's validity:

1. The virtual validity "arbitrators validity":

The questionnaire was presented in its initial form to a group of arbitrators and experts that are specialized in education in the Palestinian universities to get a feedback.

2. The internal validity:

The internal validity of the questionnaire statements: The internal validity of the questionnaire statements has done on the exploratory sample by calculating the correlation coefficients between each statement of the questionnaire and the total degree of its related field.

Table (1): the correlation coefficients between each statement and the total degree of its related field

No.	The statement	The correlation coefficient	The significance level (Sig.)
The field of study and achievement			
1.	Students attend the lecture lately.	0.711	0.000*
2.	Students are absent from the lectures without excuses.	0.705	0.000*
3.	Students refrain from participating and interacting during the lecture.	0.646	0.000*
4.	Students delay the delivery of duties on time	0.754	0.000*
5.	Students express boredom from the academic duties in front of teachers	0.650	0.000*
6.	Students cheat on exams.	0.731	0.000*
7.	Students refrain from providing scientific assistance to their colleagues.	0.705	0.000*
8.	Students don't evaluate their teachers' performances with credibility.	0.711	0.000*
9.	Students base on abstracts without referring to the main references.	0.450	0.000*
10.	Students criticize the dissenting ideas without objectivity.	0.722	0.000*
11.	Students focus on achieving degrees more than beneficial experiences.	0.567	0.000*
12.	Students evade midterm exams using flimsy excuses.	0.759	0.000*
13.	Students delay entering the exam classin the specified time.	0.720	0.000*
14.	Students don't care for competition to get high marks.	0.578	0.000*
15.	Students rely on the efforts of superior students	0.661	0.000*
16.	Students plagiarize prepared researches and reports via websites.	0.674	0.000*
17.	Students discuss some issues without acknowledge.	0.730	0.000*
The field of public morals			
1.	Students speak up during talks with others.	0.772	0.000*
2.	Students throw papers and waste in the university square.	0.767	0.000*
3.	Students crowd around elevators.	0.641	0.000*
4.	Students laugh out loud.	0.726	0.000*
5.	Students make fun of some teachers and bully them.	0.804	0.000*
6.	Students waste their university leisure timewithout a benefit.	0.628	0.000*
7.	Students smoke on the university'ssquares.	0.711	0.000*
8.	Students enterthe teachers'offices without permission.	0.755	0.000*
9.	Students sit on stairs and roads of the university.	0.699	0.000*
10.	Students don't care of the general appearance.	0.644	0.000*

11.	Students leave the lecture without permission.	0.694	0.000*
12.	Students use the phones during the lecture.	0.767	0.000*
13.	Students deal with teacher rudely.	0.786	0.000*
14.	Students knock on the doors of rooms violently.	0.777	0.000*
15.	Female students neglect to adhere to the Islamic dress.	0.726	0.000*
16.	Students insult each other.	0.772	0.000*
17.	Students write on the seats of the classrooms.	0.580	0.000*

*The correlation is statistically significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table (1): shows the correlation coefficients between each statement and the total degree of its related field, and all correlation coefficients are statistically significant at a significance level of ($0.05 \leq \alpha$). Thus, the statements of questionnaire are valid for what they are intended to measure.

In order to confirm the stability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated at (0.963), and the Split Half Method was calculated at (0.893). This indicates that the questionnaire is consistent.

2.3 The population of the study

The study's population consists of all university's teachers in the majors (Sharia, Science, Education) at the Islamic University in (2018-2019) according to the formal statistics and information in the records of the university.

2.4 The sample of the study

A random sample of (151) teachers from the Islamic University was selected to fill the questionnaire, while (134) questionnaires have been recovered, as shown in table (2):

Table (2): the distribution of the study sample according to study variables

The variable	The variable classification	The number	%
The major	Sharia	25	18.7
	Science	67	50.0
	Education	42	31.3
The years of service	From a year to less than 10 years	34	25.4
	From 10 years to less than 20 years	49	36.6
	From 20 years and more	51	38.1
The total		134	100.0

The Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 25), the used statistical tests as the following:

1. Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.
2. Cronbach's Alpha test and Split Half Method.
3. The arithmetic mean, relative weight, standard deviation and ranking.
4. One-Sample "T" Test.
5. One Way ANOVA.
6. LSD Test.

In order to interpret the results, the following arithmetic averages were adopted as follows:

Table (3): The adopted criterion in this study

The cell length	The weighted average	The degree
From 1 to 1.80	From 20% to 36%	Very Few
More than 1.80 to 2.60	More than 36% to 52%	Few
More than 2.60 to 3.40	More than 52 to 68%	Medium
More than 3.40 to 4.20	More than 68% to 84%	Large
More than 4.20 to 5	More than 84% to 100%	Very Large

III. The results and discussion of the study

Answering to the questions

The first question is: What is the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers?

In order to answer this question, One-Sample T-Test was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the averages of the sample ratings on the intermediate (neutral) degree which is (3) according to the adopted scale in this study. Moreover, the arithmetic averages, standard deviation, and relative weight and ranking were calculated.

Analyzing the fields of the study (the first field):

Table (4): The arithmetic mean, relative weight, "T" test and ranking of the statements of the questionnaire's fields

#	The statement	Arithmetic mean	Relative weight	Standard deviation	"T" Test	Sig.	Ranking
The field of study and achievement							
1.	Students attend the lecture lately.	3.23	64.51	1.15	2.26	*0.013	14
2.	Students are absent from the lectures without excuses.	3.35	67.01	1.11	3.67	*0.000	6
3.	Students refrain from participating and interacting during the lecture.	3.37	67.33	0.93	4.51	*0.000	5
4.	Students delay the delivery of duties on time	3.31	66.27	0.98	3.69	*0.000	7
5.	Students express boredom from the academic duties in front of teachers	3.27	65.34	1.18	2.59	*0.005	10
6.	Students cheat on exams.	3.17	63.48	1.33	1.50	*0.068	16
7.	Students refrain from providing scientific assistance to their colleagues.	2.90	58.00	0.96	-1.18	*0.119	17
8.	Students don't evaluate their teachers' performances with credibility.	3.31	66.21	1.19	3.01	*0.002	9
9.	Students base on abstracts without referring to the main references.	3.75	75.07	1.02	8.54	*0.000	2
10.	Students criticize the dissenting ideas without objectivity.	3.26	65.26	1.00	3.04	*0.001	11
11.	Students focus on achieving degrees more than beneficial experiences.	3.98	79.70	0.95	11.92	*0.000	1
12.	Students evade midterm exams using flimsy excuses.	3.38	67.61	1.13	3.90	*0.000	4
13.	Students delay entering the exam class in the specified time.	3.19	63.73	1.10	1.95	*0.026	15
14.	Students don't care for competition to get high marks.	3.24	64.81	0.95	2.93	*0.002	12
15.	Students rely on the efforts of superior students	3.31	66.27	1.07	3.38	*0.000	7
16.	Students plagiarize prepared researches and reports via websites.	3.57	71.34	1.24	5.29	*0.000	3
17.	Students discuss some issues without acknowledge.	3.23	64.70	1.08	2.51	*0.007	13

*"T" value at the significance level (0.05), and a freedom degree "134" equals 1.646±

Table (4) shows the two highest statements according to the relative weight in this field:

1. Statement (11) which is "Students focus on achieving degrees more than beneficial experiences", had the first rank with a relative weight of (79.70%) and a (large) degree. This result is attributed to:

- Getting high degrees simplifies the university student's way to get a good job or continue the high studies.
- The competition among students motivates them to achieve excellence.

2. Statement (9) which is "Students rely on abstracts without referring to the main references", had the second rank with a relative weight of (75.07%) and a (large) degree. This result is attributed to:

- Abstracts are easier in retrieving information, shortening the time and enabling students to do all required assignments.

Table (4) shows also the two lowest statements according to the relative weight in this field:

1. Statement (7) which is "Students refrain from providing scientific assistance to their colleagues", had the last rank with a relative weight of (58.00%) and a (medium) degree. This result is attributed to:

- Refraining students from providing scientific assistance to colleagues will destroy the relationships among them.
- On the other hand, university study requires a scientific cooperation among colleagues. So, the scientific assistance will be exchangeable among students.

2. Statement (6) which is "Students cheat on exams", had the rank which is before the last one with a relative weight of (63.48%) and a (medium) degree. This result is attributed to:

- Cheating in exams exposes student to a severe punishment that harm his scientific future and reputation in society. Thus, the student seeks to be in a good image in the society.

Analyzing the fields of the study (the second field):

Table (5): The arithmetic mean, relative weight, "T" test and ranking of the statements of the questionnaire's fields

#	The statement	Arithmetic mean	Relative weight	Standard deviation	"T" Test	Sig.	Ranking
The field of public morals							
1.	Students speak up during talks with others.	3.20	63.91	1.15	1.96	*0.026	7
2.	Students throw papers and waste in the university square.	3.16	63.16	1.17	1.55	*0.062	8
3.	Students crowd around elevators.	3.61	72.24	1.06	6.67	*0.000	1
4.	Students laugh out loud.	3.51	70.15	1.14	5.17	*0.000	5
5.	Students make fun of some teachers and bully them.	3.11	62.11	1.16	1.04	*0.149	9
6.	Students waste their university leisure time without a benefit.	3.61	72.18	0.97	7.26	*0.000	2
7.	Students smoke on the university's squares.	2.63	52.62	1.25	-3.36	*0.001	17
8.	Students enter the teachers' offices without permission.	3.06	61.19	1.19	0.58	*0.282	11
9.	Students sit on stairs and roads of the university.	3.55	70.98	1.06	5.96	*0.000	4
10.	Students don't care of the general appearance.	2.92	58.48	1.07	-0.82	*0.208	12
11.	Students leave the lecture without permission.	2.90	58.05	1.21	-0.94	*0.176	13
12.	Students use the phones during the lecture.	3.47	69.47	1.20	4.54	*0.000	6
13.	Students deal with teacher rudely.	2.72	54.39	1.23	-2.63	*0.005	16
14.	Students knock on the doors of rooms violently.	2.81	56.24	1.27	-1.70	*0.046	14
15.	Female students neglect to adhere to the Islamic dress.	3.08	61.52	1.15	0.76	*0.225	10
16.	Students insult each other.	2.81	56.12	1.24	-1.82	*0.036	15
17.	Students write on the seats of the classrooms.	3.58	71.64	1.25	5.38	*0.000	3

*"T" value at the significance level (0.05), and a freedom degree "134" equals 1.646±

Table (5) shows the two highest statements according to the relative weight in this field:

1. Statement (3) which is " Students crowd around elevators", had the first rank with a relative weight of (72.24%) and a (large) degree. This result is attributed to:

- The small number of elevators in the building is not suitable with the large number of students.
- The students' keenness to join their lectures on time.

2. Statement (6) which is "**Students waste their university leisure time without a benefit**", had the second rank with a relative weight of (72.18%) and a (large) degree. This result is attributed to:

- The lack the students' skills in managing and investing the time in the beneficial works.

Table (5) shows the two lowest statements according to the relative weight in this field:

1. Statement (7) which is " Students smoke on the university's squares", had the last rank with a relative weight of (52.62%) and a (medium) degree. This result has attributed to:

- Smoking on university squares is prohibited according to university laws, and therefore the student who smokes in the university will be accountable and punished.

2. Statement (13) which is "**Students deal with teacher rudely**", had the rank which is before the last one with a relative weight of (54.39%) and a (medium) degree. This result is attributed to:

- The university students are concerned with establishing good relationships with their teachers to simplify the learning process.
- The rude behaviors of students in dealing with teachers will spoil their relationships and expose them to reprimand or expulsion from the lecture.

The answer to the second question, which is:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the averages of the sample ratings on the prevalence degree of the negative behavior among students of the Islamic University from the viewpoint of their teachers due to the major and years of service variables?

Thus, There are two hypotheses to answer this question, as follows:

1. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample for the prevalence degree of the negative behaviors among Islamic University students due to the variable of years of service (from a year to less than 10 years, from 10 years to less than 20 years, 20 years and more).

Table (6): the results of using One Way ANOVA for the major variable

The field	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Average squares	"F" Test	Level of significance
The study and achievement	Among groups	5.647	2	2.824	5.618	*0.005
	Within groups	65.838	131	0.503		
	Total	71.485	133			
The public morals	Among groups	0.775	2	0.387	0.545	*0.581
	Within groups	93.083	131	0.711		
	Total	93.857	133			
The total degree of the questionnaire	Among groups	2.501	2	1.250	2.290	*0.105
	Within groups	71.524	131	0.546		
	Total	74.025	133			

*"F" value at the significance level (0.05), and a freedom degree "132,2" equals 3.07

Table (6) shows that the significant value of the total degree of the questionnaire equals (0.105) which is higher than the significance level (0.05), and the calculated "F" value is (2.290). This shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample due to the major variable for the field of the public morals, and this is attributed to the importance of the public morals as a basic requirement in the university life and essential factor emphasized by the family socialization. While, the significant value of the total degree is lower than the significance level (0.05) in the field of achievement and study. This shows that there are statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample. Thus, the researchers used **LSD Test** to know the differences, as in the table (7):

Table (7): the results of using LSD Test for the various comparisons

The field	Major	Religion	Education
The study and achievement	Sharia		
	Science	*0.52066	*-0.29858
	Education	*0.22208	

- statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Through the results of the LSD test, it was found that there are differences in estimating the prevalence degree of the negative behaviors among university students from the viewpoint of their teachers between Science teachers and Sharia teachers for the Science teachers. This result is attributed to focusing the science teachers on stringency during the learning process because of the difficult nature of the Science subject more than the Sharia subject. Furthermore, there are differences between the Science teachers and Education teachers for the Education teachers, and this can be attributed to the emphasis of education teachers on the necessity of positive behavior in the learning process, while there are no differences between Sharia teachers and Education teachers. The researchers attribute this result to the interest of the Sharia teachers and Education teachers in the academic achievement of students and avoiding the obstacles.

2. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample for the prevalence degree of the negative behaviors among Islamic University students due to the variable of major (Sharia, Science, Education).

Table (8): the results of using One Way ANOVA for the variable of years of service

The field	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Average squares	"F" Test	Level of significance
The study and achievement	Among groups	0.490	2	0.245	0.452	*0.637
	Within groups	70.995	131	0.542		
	Total	71.485	133			
The public morals	Among groups	0.367	2	0.183	0.257	*0.774
	Within groups	93.491	131	0.714		
	Total	93.857	133			
The total degree of the	Among groups	0.414	2	0.207	0.368	*0.693

questionnaire	Within groups	73.611	131	0.562		
	Total	74.025	133			

*"F" value at the significance level (0.05), and a freedom degree "132,2" equals 3.07

Table (8) shows that the significant value of the total degree of the questionnaire equals (0.693) which is higher than the significance level (0.05), and the calculated "F" value is (0.368). This shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) among the ratings averages of the study's sample due to the years of service variable, and this is attributed to: the negative behavior is known, understood and unanimous by all teachers, therefore it does not need more years of service to establish or reinforce the negative trend towards it.

III. Recommendations:

- The teachers should use the active learning methods and engage students in attractive activities during the lecture.
- Holding specialized courses for the teachers on the processes of forming and modifying the students' behaviors, especially the new students.
- Conducting more studies in this topic on larger categories and groups to identify the causes of negative behaviors and prepare plans to address them.

References

- [1]. Al-Athamna, Abdul Lateef (2003). The Behavioral Problems and Difficulties of High School Students in Governmental Schools from the Point of View of the Educational Supervisors in the Northern Governorates of Palestine. (**Master Thesis**). Al-Najah University. Nablus
- [2]. Abdul Ghani, Huda (2015). The Undesirable Behaviors of University Students from the Viewpoint of their Teachers. **The Journal of Educational and Psychological Research**. No. (44).
- [3]. Ali, A., Gracey, D., (2013) Dealing with Student Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom. A case Example of the Coordination between Faculty and Assistant Dean for Academics. **Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology**. Vol. 10.
- [4]. Attia, Nawal (2001). **Psychology and Social and Psychosocial Adaptation**. Cairo House for Book, Cairo.
- [5]. Abu Mandeel, Wissam (2016). The Behavioral Problems of Teenagers Using Smartphones and their Relationship with a Domestic Communication from the Parent's Point of View. (**Master Thesis**). Islamic University of Gaza.
- [6]. Barakat, Ziad (2008). The Aspects of the Negative Behavior of Students in the Basic Stage from the Viewpoint of Teachers and the Methods of Dealing with them. **The Journal of Al-Najah University for Research (Humanities)**, Vol. 22 (4).
- [7]. Dalgic, G. & Bayhan, G. (2014). A Meta-Analysis: Student Misbehavior that Affect Classroom Management. **Journal of Education science**.
- [8]. Garrett, C., (2011). Defining, Detecting and Promoting Student Engagement in College Environment. **Teaching & Learning Journal**. Vol.5 issue 2.
- [9]. Al-Kashif, Iman. (2004). The Behavioral Problems and Self-esteem. **Journal of the Psychological Studies**, 14 (1), p.p. 69-221.
- [10]. Al-Khalaf, Moeen, Obaidat, Eid, Amarin, Salam (2016). The Aspects of Common Negative Behavior among the Students of the Faculty of Physical Education at Yarmouk University from the Viewpoint of their Teachers and the Methods of Dealing with them. **The 11th Faculty of Physical Education Conference**, University of Jordan, Jordan.
- [11]. Mustafa, Osama (2011). **Introduction to the Behavioral and Emotional Disorders**. Amman: Dar Al-Masirah for Publishing and Distribution.
- [12]. Ozben, S. (2010). Teachers' Strategies to Cope with Student Misbehavior. **Social and Behavior Science**.
- [13]. Patron, H., Bisping, T. (2008). Why Student's Misbehavior in Class: An Empirical Analysis of Classroom Incivilities. **Mountain Plains Journal of Business and Economics**, Vol.(9)2.
- [14]. Sun, R, Shek, D. (2012). Classroom Misbehavior in the Eyes of Students: A Qualitative Study. **Pediatrics Faculty Publication**. Vol. (19).
- [15]. Thahir, Qahtan (2004). **The Behavior Modification**. Amman. Wael Publishing and Distribution House.
- [16]. Ustunluoglu, E. (2013). Understanding Misbehavior at University Level: Lecturer Perceptions from the US and Turkey. **Education and Science Journal**, Vol.38, No 169.
- [17]. Yahya, Khawla (2003). **Emotional and Behavioral Disorders**. Ed (3). Amman: Dar Al-Fikr for Printing, Publishing and Distribution.
- [18]. Yuan, X. (2012). How to Deal with Student Misbehavior in Classroom? **Journal of Education and Development Psychology**. Vol.(2), No.1.

Pro. Mahmoud K. Abu Daff, and Dr. Somaya M. Sayma. "The Prevalence Degree of the Negative Behavior among Students in the Islamic University of Gaza from the Viewpoints of their Teachers." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 10(1), 2020, pp. 45-53.