NDRUMI: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Humaniora P-ISSN 2615-0832
Vol. 9 No. 1 Edisi Maret 2026 E-ISSN: 2828-4097

WHEN ENGAGING LEARNING IS NOT ENOUGH: EXPLORING THE ROLE OF RULE AND COMPLIANCE BASED CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN DISRUPTIVE CLASSROOMS

Christabell Hasibuan[1], Ni Luh Sekar Astuti[2]
[1-2]Cendekia Harapan School, Bali, Indonesia
(christabell@cendekiaharapan.sch.id[1], sekar@cendekiaharapan.sch.id[2])

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji keterbatasan pembelajaran berbasis pengalaman yang menarik dalam mengelola kelas yang disruptif serta mengeksplorasi respons guru melalui manajemen kelas berbasis aturan dan kepatuhan. Penelitian ini menggunakan tinjauan pustaka kualitatif dengan mensintesis sumber konseptual dan empiris tentang perilaku disruptif, pembelajaran bermakna, keamanan emosional, dan manajemen kelas terstruktur. Teori pembelajaran berbasis pengalaman dari John Dewey digunakan sebagai landasan teoretis utama. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pembelajaran yang menarik dapat mengurangi gangguan apabila aktivitas bermakna, dirancang dengan baik, dan didukung oleh lingkungan yang aman secara psikologis. Namun, keterlibatan saja sering tidak efektif ketika siswa belum memiliki disiplin diri, kesadaran belajar, dan regulasi emosi. Dalam konteks tersebut, aturan yang jelas, rutinitas, supervisi, serta konsekuensi yang konsisten memberikan stabilitas untuk mendorong partisipasi yang bertanggung jawab. Penelitian ini menegaskan pentingnya integrasi antara pembelajaran bermakna, keamanan emosional, dan struktur yang jelas.

***Kata Kunci**: Kelas disruptif; Pembelajaran berbasis pengalaman; Manajemen kelas; Disiplin diri; Modal internal siswa*

Abstract

This study examines the limitations of engaging, experience-based learning in managing disruptive classrooms and explores how teachers respond through rule- and compliance-based classroom management. Using a qualitative literature review, the study synthesizes conceptual and empirical sources on disruptive behavior, meaningful learning, emotional safety, and structured classroom management. John Dewey's experiential learning theory serves as the primary theoretical lens, particularly his emphasis on meaningful experience, continuity, and responsibility. The findings indicate that engaging learning can reduce disruption when activities are meaningful, well designed, and supported by a psychologically safe environment. However, engagement alone often fails when students lack self-discipline, learning awareness, and emotional regulation. In such contexts, clear rules, routines, supervision, and consistent consequences provide the stability necessary for responsible participation. The study refines Dewey's framework through the concept

of internal student capital and argues that effective classrooms require meaningful learning, emotional safety, and clear structure operating together.

***Keywords**: Disruptive classroom; Experiential learning; Classroom management; Self-discipline; Internal student capital*

A. Introduction

Disruptive classroom behavior remains one of the most persistent barriers to effective teaching and learning. In many classrooms, disruption does not appear only through extreme misconduct, but through repeated low-level behaviors such as talking during instruction, ignoring routines, interrupting peers, moving without permission, and losing focus during learning activities. Although each behavior may appear minor in isolation, their cumulative effect is substantial. Disruption interrupts lesson flow, reduces instructional time, weakens teacher-student communication, and compromises the concentration of other learners. It is therefore both a behavioral and a pedagogical problem because it affects the basic conditions under which meaningful learning can occur.

Recent research confirms the seriousness of this issue. Rahmani et al. (2025) found that classroom noise in an Indonesian elementary school reached an average of 67 decibels, exceeding the recommended threshold of 55 decibels. At that level, students were more than five times more likely to experience difficulty hearing and understanding their teacher's explanation. This finding is important because it shows that disruption is not merely an issue of discipline or classroom irritation. It directly interferes with instructional communication and academic performance. In other words, noisy classrooms do not simply feel disorganized. They materially weaken learning.

The roots of disruptive behavior are usually multidimensional. One source is the absence of clear and consistent routines. When students do not know when to listen, when to speak, how to transition, or what follows a rule violation, uncertainty increases and off-task behavior becomes more likely. A second source is the quality of the learning experience itself. Students may disengage when lessons feel repetitive, passive, or disconnected from their interests and purposes. A third source concerns classroom culture. If respect, safety, and shared responsibility are weak, students may interrupt one another, avoid participation, or treat classroom expectations casually. Disruption thus tends to emerge not from a single cause, but from the interaction of weak routines, low instructional engagement, and fragile classroom culture.

One influential response to disruption has been to make learning more engaging. This approach assumes that students often become noisy or inattentive because classroom tasks do not offer sufficiently meaningful opportunities for participation. When lessons are active, relevant, and connected to experience, students may be less likely to seek stimulation elsewhere. Research gives considerable support to this view. Metzger and Langley (2020) found that students are more focused when tasks feel meaningful and relevant. Odum et al.

(2021) similarly suggested that active learning can increase responsibility and lower misbehavior when instructional design supports participation. Whitney et al. (2017) also showed that increasing opportunities to respond can improve engagement and reduce off-task behavior. Together, these studies suggest that behavior is partly shaped by the quality of the learning experience itself.

This pedagogical perspective is strongly aligned with John Dewey's experiential learning theory. Dewey (1938) argued that education should not be reduced to passive reception, memorization, or obedience detached from understanding. For him, genuine education occurs through meaningful experience. Such experience must be connected, purposeful, and growth-producing. Dewey also warned that not all activity is educative. Some experiences are mis-educative because they fail to support reflection, continuity, or responsibility. His work is therefore especially relevant to disruptive classrooms. If students are meaningfully engaged in purposeful activity, they should become less dependent on external control and more capable of responsible participation.

However, the literature also shows that engaging learning does not always solve classroom disruption. Teachers often find that group work, project-based tasks, movement activities, or student-centered discussion do not automatically reduce noise, distraction, or off-task behavior. In some cases, these activities may even intensify disorder if students lack self-control, clear expectations, or understanding of the task's purpose. This recurring tension points to a significant theoretical and practical problem. The question is not whether meaningful learning matters. It clearly does. The deeper question is why it sometimes fails to reduce disruption, especially in classrooms where problematic habits are already established.

To address this issue, it is useful to place Dewey alongside other perspectives on classroom behavior. Skinner (1965), from a behaviorist perspective, argued that behavior is shaped by rewards and consequences. This view highlights the importance of reinforcement, clear contingencies, and predictable sanctions. Rogers (1969), in contrast, emphasized emotional safety, acceptance, and the learner's subjective experience. More recent work by Tu (2021) similarly shows that classroom culture and psychological safety influence how students engage in learning. Guil et al. (2024) add another dimension by showing that disruptive behavior may be related to stress, coping difficulties, trauma, and home conditions. These perspectives suggest that classroom behavior is shaped not only by instructional design, but also by emotional, relational, and regulatory conditions.

Research on structured classroom management further complicates the picture. Guinness et al. (2020) reported that active supervision and explicit routines help reduce disruptive behavior by preventing problems before they escalate. The Australian Education Research Organisation (2023) similarly emphasizes that predictable routines and clear expectations reduce disengaged and disruptive behavior. The Good Behavior Game, as summarized by the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of

Education Sciences, and What Works Clearinghouse (2023), also demonstrates that team-based compliance systems can reduce disruption and improve on-task behavior. These strategies are effective even though they do not rely primarily on engaging pedagogy. This raises a key question: if structured management works so consistently, how should it be understood in relation to meaningful learning? Is it an alternative to engaging pedagogy, or a condition that allows engaging pedagogy to succeed?

This question reveals an important research gap. Much of the literature identifies techniques teachers can use to manage classrooms, but fewer studies explain the relationship between external control and internal responsibility. In many classrooms, students behave appropriately only while being watched, yet return to disruptive behavior when supervision is reduced. This suggests that short-term compliance and long-term self-discipline are not the same. Existing studies tend to emphasize teacher actions more than the development of student ownership, self-control, and behavioral responsibility in the absence of immediate authority. The problem is especially important in classrooms where engagement appears pedagogically desirable but does not reliably produce responsible conduct.

Accordingly, this study addresses the following research question: To what extent does engaging learning fail to reduce disruptive behavior, and how do teachers address this challenge through rule- and compliance-based classroom management? The objective of the study is to examine the limitations of experience-based and engaging learning in disruptive classrooms when students do not yet demonstrate sufficient learning awareness and self-discipline, and to analyze how structured classroom management is used as a response to low internal readiness.

This study makes two contributions. First, it clarifies that rule- and compliance-based classroom management should not be interpreted simply as the opposite of meaningful learning. In disruptive classrooms, structure may function as the condition that makes meaningful participation possible. Second, it refines Dewey's experiential learning theory through the concept of internal student capital, defined here as the combination of motivation, self-discipline, learning awareness, and emotional regulation that enables students to benefit from engaging learning. The central argument of this article is therefore that engaging learning is necessary but not sufficient. Meaningful learning reduces disruption only when it is supported by both internal readiness and external classroom structure.

B. Research Method

This study employed a qualitative literature review to examine the limitations of engaging, experience-based learning in managing disruptive classrooms and to analyze how rule- and compliance-based classroom management functions when students do not yet demonstrate sufficient self-discipline and learning awareness. A qualitative review design was appropriate because the purpose of the study was interpretive and conceptual rather than statistical. The study did not seek to calculate effect sizes or measure intervention outcomes quantitatively. Instead, it aimed to synthesize selected conceptual and

empirical literature in order to explain when engaging learning reduces disruption, when it fails, and why structured classroom management remains necessary.

The review was conducted between August 2025 and February 2026. Literature was identified through Google Scholar, publisher journal platforms, school-library-accessible academic materials, and trusted educational organization websites. The search was guided by keywords derived directly from the research question and conceptual focus of the study, including "disruptive classroom behavior," "classroom noise," "engaging learning and behaviour," "active learning and student engagement," "John Dewey experience and education," "rules and routines classroom management," "psychological safety in the classroom," and "student self-discipline." Searches were conducted primarily in English because most of the conceptual and empirical literature relevant to the topic was available in that language.

Sources were included when they addressed one or more of the following areas: (1) the causes or characteristics of disruptive classroom behavior; (2) the role of engaging, active, or experience-based learning in reducing or failing to reduce disruption; (3) emotional, relational, or environmental influences on classroom behavior; and (4) teacher responses through rules, routines, supervision, consequences, or compliance-based systems. Foundational theoretical works were also included when they were directly relevant to the article's conceptual argument. Sources were excluded when authorship was unclear, when the content was primarily opinion-based rather than scholarly or research-informed, or when the source did not clearly contribute to the study's analytical focus.

After title and abstract screening, relevant texts were read in full. From the broader set of reviewed materials, eight core sources were selected for the main analytical synthesis because they most directly represented the central themes of the study and were used to construct the summary presented in Table 1. These sources consist of key theoretical, empirical, and practice-oriented references that most clearly explain the relationship between meaningful engagement, emotional conditions, and structured classroom management in disruptive classrooms. Other supporting references were retained to strengthen the conceptual background and discussion, but the main synthesis was centered on these eight core sources.

Data extraction was conducted through structured note-taking. For each core source, the author, year, publication type, main finding, and relevance to the research question were recorded. Each source was then examined in relation to three guiding questions: why classrooms become disruptive, whether engaging learning reduces or fails to reduce disruption, and how teachers respond when students do not yet demonstrate sufficient self-discipline. Particular attention was also given to whether each source supported, extended, or complicated Dewey's argument that educational experiences must be meaningful, guided, and connected to responsibility and growth.

The data were analyzed using thematic synthesis. In the first stage, the

selected sources were read repeatedly to identify recurring patterns and conceptual relationships. In the second stage, the findings were coded using descriptive labels such as meaningful engagement, limits of engagement, emotional safety, rules and routines, supervision, compliance systems, and self-discipline. In the third stage, related codes were grouped into broader themes corresponding to the objective of the study. Four final themes emerged: (1) engaging learning as a means of reducing disruption, (2) the limits of engagement when students lack internal readiness, (3) the role of emotional safety and wider influences on classroom behavior, and (4) the stabilizing role of rule- and compliance-based classroom management. These themes were then interpreted through Dewey's experiential learning framework and read alongside complementary behaviorist and humanistic perspectives.

To strengthen trustworthiness, the review compared ideas across theoretical, empirical, and practice-oriented sources. Interpretations were treated as stronger when similar patterns appeared across more than one source type. Nevertheless, this study has limitations. It relies on secondary literature and does not include classroom observation, interviews, or intervention data. In addition, the review is a focused qualitative synthesis rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. Therefore, its conclusions should be understood as interpretive and theory-informed rather than exhaustive.

From an ethical standpoint, the study sought to represent the reviewed literature accurately and fairly. The purpose of the analysis was not to assign blame to teachers or students, but to clarify how pedagogy, emotional conditions, and classroom structure interact in disruptive classroom settings.

C. Result and Discussion

Result

The literature review revealed a coherent set of themes that explain both the strengths and the limits of engaging learning in disruptive classrooms. Across the reviewed sources, meaningful engagement emerged as an important but conditional mechanism for reducing disruption. At the same time, clear rules, routines, and compliance-oriented structures appeared as the strongest stabilizing response when students lacked readiness for self-regulated participation.

Engaging learning can reduce disruption when activities are meaningful and well designed

A major pattern in the reviewed literature supports Dewey's claim that meaningful educational experience can improve both learning and behavior. Dewey (1938) argued that responsibility develops not through passive obedience but through participation in purposeful activity. Contemporary studies support this position. Metzger and Langley (2020) found that students demonstrate stronger focus when learning tasks feel relevant and meaningful. Odum et al. (2021) likewise suggested that active learning environments can increase responsibility and reduce misbehavior when they are intentionally designed. Whitney et al. (2017) further showed that increasing opportunities to respond improves student attentiveness and decreases the

idle space in which disruption often develops.

These findings suggest that classroom behavior is partly shaped by the design quality of the lesson itself. When instruction is passive, repetitive, or disconnected from student experience, learners may seek stimulation elsewhere through talking, joking, or disengagement. In contrast, when students are actively involved in relevant tasks, disruption may decline because the lesson provides cognitive and social direction.

Engagement fails when students lack internal readiness

A second major theme is that engaging learning does not automatically regulate behavior. The literature repeatedly indicates that active and meaningful learning may fail when students lack self-discipline, learning awareness, emotional regulation, or willingness to participate constructively. Dewey (1938) warned that not all activity is educative. A lesson may appear active without actually guiding students toward growth. This warning becomes especially important in disruptive classrooms, where collaboration may become distraction and movement may become disorder if students do not yet possess the habits necessary for self-regulation.

Biesta (2015) reinforces this point by arguing that education must balance freedom and responsibility. Freedom without guidance does not necessarily lead to growth. In practical classroom terms, this means that engaging learning works only when students are able to use autonomy responsibly. The review therefore indicates that engagement is not self-sufficient. Its behavioral benefits depend on internal readiness.

Emotional safety and external influences shape classroom behavior

A third theme concerns the emotional and environmental conditions surrounding classroom conduct. Tu (2021) shows that classroom culture and psychological safety influence whether students participate productively. When learners feel respected, emotionally secure, and supported, they are more likely to engage constructively. Rogers (1969) provides a compatible humanistic perspective, emphasizing the importance of acceptance and emotional support in education.

At the same time, Guil et al. (2024) demonstrate that disruptive behavior may also be related to stress, trauma, and coping difficulties. This means that no teaching method, however engaging, can fully explain or solve classroom disruption on its own. Emotional instability and external pressures can interrupt the transition from activity to responsibility. Behavior must therefore be understood within a broader emotional and social ecology.

Clear rules and routines create stability

The strongest theme in the review concerns the stabilizing role of clear rules, predictable routines, and structured expectations. The Australian Education Research Organisation (2023) emphasizes that explicit expectations and routines reduce disruptive behavior by making

classroom conduct predictable. Guinness et al. (2020) likewise show that active supervision allows teachers to intervene early before disruption escalates.

The significance of this finding lies in its consistency. Rules and routines do not only restrict behavior. They also organize time, attention, transitions, and interaction in ways that create order and reduce ambiguity. In disruptive classrooms, this organizational function becomes foundational. Students cannot participate responsibly if they do not know when to listen, when to move, or what is expected of them during learning activities.

Compliance-based systems are effective, but often mainly in the short term

A final theme concerns the use of compliance-oriented systems such as the Good Behavior Game and similar rule-based interventions. The U.S. Department of Education et al. (2023) indicate that such systems can reduce disruptive behavior and improve on-task participation, particularly in the short term. Their effectiveness is consistent with behaviorist explanations that emphasize reinforcement and consequence (Skinner, 1965).

However, the review also shows that short-term order is not identical to long-term responsibility. Compliance systems can establish stability, but they do not automatically produce internalized discipline. Their educational value is greatest when they function as stabilizing mechanisms that create the conditions for meaningful participation, rather than when they serve as the only basis for classroom order. Based on the synthesis of the eight core sources selected for the main analysis, the key findings related to the limitations of engaging learning and the role of structured classroom management in addressing disruptive behavior are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Key Findings from Literature

No	Author(s) & Year	Main Finding	Relation to Research Question
1	Dewey (1938)	Learning must be meaningful and connected to growth. Mis-educative experiences can fail.	Engagement alone is not enough without structure.
2	Metzger and Langley (2020)	Students are more focused when tasks feel meaningful and relevant.	Supports Dewey's idea that engagement reduces disruption.
3	Odum et al. (2021)	Active learning increases responsibility and lowers misbehavior.	Engagement helps, but depends on design.
4	Biesta (2015)	Education must balance freedom and responsibility.	Structure is needed alongside engagement.
5	Tu (2021)	Students behave better when	Emotional care affects classroom

No	Author(s) & Year	Main Finding	Relation to Research Question
		they feel safe and emotionally supported.	behavior.
6	Guil et al. (2024)	External factors such as stress, trauma, and home conditions shape student behavior.	Engagement cannot solve all disruption.
7	Australian Education Research Organisation (2023)	Clear rules and routines reduce disruptive behavior.	Rule-based management supports stability.
8	U.S. Department of Education et al. (2023)	Structured compliance systems reduce short-term disruption.	External control works, but mainly short-term.

Discussion

The findings of this review both support and refine Dewey's experiential learning theory. Dewey (1938) was fundamentally correct in arguing that behavior and learning quality are closely connected. When students experience learning as meaningful, connected, and purposeful, they are more likely to participate responsibly because conduct becomes part of an educational process rather than a mere response to authority. This proposition is supported by the reviewed literature. Metzger and Langley (2020), Odum et al. (2021), and Whitney et al. (2017) all suggest that meaningful engagement can improve attentiveness and reduce misbehavior.

However, the review also shows that Dewey's framework requires refinement when applied to highly disruptive classrooms. The problem is not that Dewey ignored the importance of guidance. He did not. He rejected both rigid traditionalism and unstructured permissiveness, insisting that educative experience must be purposeful and guided. The practical difficulty lies elsewhere. Dewey's theory does not fully specify what teachers should do when the internal conditions necessary for meaningful participation are not yet present. In classrooms marked by persistent noise, weak self-regulation, and fragile learning habits, meaningful activity may not produce responsibility directly. Instead, it may reveal the absence of the dispositions needed to sustain responsible participation.

This is where the concept of internal student capital becomes analytically useful. Internal student capital refers to the set of learner capacities that enable students to benefit from engaging pedagogy: motivation, self-discipline, learning awareness, and emotional regulation. These capacities are not guaranteed merely because a lesson is active or student-centered. If students do not yet understand the purpose of learning, cannot regulate their impulses, or are emotionally dysregulated, even carefully designed experiential learning may fail to reduce disruption. In this sense, the present study does not reject Dewey's theory. Rather, it identifies a boundary condition in its classroom application. Meaningful experience requires not only sound pedagogy but also learner readiness.

This refinement also helps explain why rules and routines emerged so strongly in the findings. If internal student capital is weak, external structure becomes necessary not simply to suppress behavior, but to stabilize the environment in which those internal capacities can gradually develop. The literature on classroom management strongly supports this interpretation. Clear expectations, active supervision, and consistent routines reduce ambiguity and prevent escalation (Australian Education Research Organisation, 2023; Guinness et al., 2020). Structure therefore serves a dual function. It manages immediate behavior and simultaneously creates the predictability needed for habit formation.

The findings also suggest a developmental sequence that is especially relevant for disruptive classrooms. First, clear rules create stability. Second, stability builds habits and predictability. Third, predictable habits support responsible participation. Fourth, meaningful engagement becomes more

likely to produce deeper learning and growth. This sequence is important because it reframes the relationship between discipline and pedagogy. Structure is not the opposite of meaningful learning. In difficult classrooms, it may be the condition that allows meaningful learning to become genuinely educative.

This interpretation also helps reconcile Dewey with other perspectives. From a behaviorist viewpoint, the effectiveness of compliance systems is unsurprising because consequences shape observable conduct (Skinner, 1965). The review confirms that compliance-based systems can reduce disruption, particularly in the short term. Yet a behaviorist explanation by itself does not answer the deeper educational question of whether students internalize responsibility or merely comply while external controls are active. Dewey's contribution remains crucial because he draws attention to the educational purpose of behavior: responsible participation in meaningful communal learning.

At the same time, humanistic insights strengthen the argument rather than oppose it. Tu (2021) and Rogers (1969) suggest that students are more likely to engage constructively when they feel emotionally safe and respected. This means that classroom order is not sustained by structure alone. Rules become educationally productive when they are embedded in a classroom climate that students perceive as fair, supportive, and psychologically secure. A classroom without structure may become chaotic. A classroom without safety may produce fear-based compliance. Meaningful learning becomes most viable when structure and emotional safety operate together.

The findings of Guil et al. (2024) add another layer by showing that disruptive behavior may reflect external stress, coping difficulties, and wider psychosocial pressures. This discourages simplistic interpretations of misbehavior as either mere disobedience or solely a failure of instructional design. In some cases, disruption may express emotional strain rather than simple defiance. This reinforces the need for a balanced approach that combines predictable structure, emotional support, and meaningful participation.

The main theoretical contribution of this study, therefore, is not the rejection of Dewey's experiential learning theory, but its refinement. Dewey remains highly relevant because he correctly links responsibility to the quality of educational experience. Yet the review shows that meaningful experience does not automatically generate disciplined participation. The mediating layer is internal student capital. When internal student capital is weak, external structure becomes necessary to scaffold classroom order and make meaningful participation more feasible.

This Study has several practical implications. First, teachers should not assume that active learning strategies will regulate behavior by themselves. Student-centered learning needs to be accompanied by explicit norms for speaking, moving, collaborating, and transitioning. Second, classroom management should be integrated into lesson design rather than treated as a separate disciplinary concern. Third, schools should pay closer attention to

emotional safety and student self-regulation if they want engaging pedagogy to succeed. Fourth, researchers should investigate more directly how self-discipline, emotional regulation, and learning awareness are built over time, and how these capacities shape the effectiveness of classroom interventions.

The study also has limitations. As a literature review, it does not provide direct observational or interview-based evidence from classrooms. Its conclusions are therefore conceptual and interpretive rather than experimental. In addition, the study draws on a relatively focused set of sources rather than a full systematic review protocol. Future research should test the present argument empirically by examining whether classrooms that combine structured stabilization with meaningful engagement produce stronger long-term responsibility than classrooms relying on either approach alone.

Even with these limitations, the discussion leads to a clear conclusion. Dewey's theory remains highly valuable for understanding the educational purpose of classroom order, but disruptive classrooms expose the need for a more explicit account of readiness. Engagement is powerful, yet conditional. Structure is effective, yet incomplete. Emotional safety is essential, yet insufficient without clarity and guidance. The most defensible position is therefore an integrated one: responsible classroom behavior develops most plausibly when meaningful learning, emotional safety, and structured management operate together.

D. Conclusion

This study examined the extent to which engaging learning fails to reduce disruptive behavior and analyzed how teachers respond through rule- and compliance-based classroom management. The review shows that engaging and meaningful learning can improve focus, participation, and responsibility when classroom activities are purposeful, well designed, and emotionally supportive. In this respect, Dewey's experiential learning theory remains a strong foundation for understanding the relationship between learning quality and student behavior.

At the same time, the study demonstrates that engaging learning is not sufficient by itself. Its effectiveness is limited when students lack self-discipline, learning awareness, motivation, and emotional regulation. The strongest pattern in the reviewed literature is the stabilizing role of clear rules, predictable routines, active supervision, and consistent consequences. These forms of structured classroom management are particularly important in disruptive classrooms because they create the order necessary for responsible participation.

The central contribution of the study is the refinement of Dewey's theory through the concept of internal student capital. This concept helps explain why meaningful learning sometimes fails to reduce disruption even when teachers attempt to make lessons active and relevant. Meaningful engagement depends on a level of internal readiness

that must often be supported by external structure. The study therefore argues that effective classrooms are built not on a choice between engagement and discipline, but on the integration of meaningful learning, emotional safety, and clear structure.

This study is limited by its reliance on secondary literature and by the absence of direct classroom observation or interview data. Future research should examine how internal student capital can be developed systematically, how hybrid models of experiential learning and structured classroom management function in actual classrooms, and how short-term compliance can be transformed into long-term self-discipline. Even with these limitations, the central conclusion remains clear: engaging learning is necessary, but not sufficient. In disruptive classrooms, meaningful participation becomes sustainable only when supported by internal readiness and stable classroom structure.

E. References

Australian Education Research Organisation. (2023). *Classroom management practice guide: Responding to disengaged and disruptive behaviours*. https://www.edresearch.edu.au/sites/default/files/2023-12/disengaged-and-disruptive-behaviours-aa.pdf

Biesta, G. J. (2015). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge. https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/books/mono/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9781315634319&type=googlepdf

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. Kappa Delta Pi.

Guil, R., Holgado-Herrero, M., Gil-Olarte, P., González-Fernández, S., Costalat-Founeau, A.-M., & Gómez-Molinero, R. (2024). Disruptive behaviors in the classroom, a question of gender or of inadequate forms of coping? *Current Psychology*, *43*(27), 22897–22907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06190-3

Guinness, K., Detrich, R., Keyworth, R., & States, J. (2020). *Active Supervision*. The Wing Institute. https://www.winginstitute.org/classroom-active-supervision

Metzger, K. J., & Langley, D. (2020). The Room Itself is Not Enough: Student Engagement in Active Learning Classrooms. *College Teaching*, *68*(3), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2020.1768357

Odum, M., Meaney, K. S., & Knudson, D. V. (2021). Active Learning Classroom Design and Student Engagement: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, *10*(1), 27–42.

Rahmani, N. M. D., Rachmaniyah, Sulistio, I., Khambali, & Sherawali. (2025). Classroom Noise and Its Impact on Communication Disruptions and Students' Academic Performance. *Public Health Research Development*, *2*(2),

44–51. https://doi.org/10.36568/phrd.v2i2.34

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to Learn: A View of what Education Might Become*. C.E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Skinner, B. F. (1965). *Science And Human Behavior*. Simon and Schuster.

Tu, X. (2021). The Role of Classroom Culture and Psychological Safety in EFL Students' Engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.760903

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, & What Works Clearinghouse. (2023). *Good Behavior Game Intervention Brief (WWC 2023-004)*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED628138.pdf

Whitney, T., Cooper, J., & Lingo, A. (2017). Increasing Student Engagement Through Opportunities to Respond. *Kentucky Teacher Education Journal: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children*, *3*(2). https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ktej/vol3/iss2/3