# RAISING BEHAVIOUR

## 3.

## A SCHOOL VIEW

BY
KAY KINDER
ANNE WILKIN
HELEN MOOR
CHRIS DERRINGTON
SYLVIA HOGARTH

# RAISING BEHAVIOUR

# 3.

# A SCHOOL VIEW

by

KAY KINDER
ANNE WILKIN
HELEN MOOR
CHRIS DERRINGTON
SYLVIA HOGARTH

Published in July 1999
by the National Foundation for Educational Research,
The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berkshire SL1 2DQ


Registered Charity No. 313392
ISBN 0 7005 1549 6

# CONTENTS

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would first of all like to thank very much the staff, adults and pupils from the case-study schools who gave their time and support to the research and also all of the senior managers and school staff who completed and returned our questionnaire.

We are also extremely grateful to Avril Howarth, Charlie Stevens and Phil Hamerton for their valuable comments on drafts of this report, and to our colleagues in Slough: Ian Schagen of the Statistics Department, Enver Carim, David Upton and Judy Bradley (Project Director). The contribution of Sue Medd and Sally Wilson, at NFER's Northern Office, has also been much appreciated throughout the report production. In addition we would like to give our thanks to Hugo Berger for all his initial work on the quantitative analysis and Paul Stephens, who undertook some of the fieldwork in the case-study schools.

# ABOUT THIS REPORT

There are many authors and associations who have written texts on how to manage behaviour in the classroom. This report does not attempt such a brief, but instead looks at the organisational procedures, imperatives and principles which currently form the basic components of effective behaviour management in schools.

In over 20 case-study primary and secondary schools, four off-site units and from a survey of 120 secondary schools, the study gathered evidence on behaviour policies, pastoral systems, and rewards and sanctions, because these all feature as the general apparatus which schools currently have at their disposal to monitor and maintain acceptable behaviour. Other available specialist strategies and systems for addressing behavioural difficulties, such as the Code of Practice, also were covered. A final area of investigation looked at how practitioners described their school's general principles or philosophies regarding managing behaviour.

The report presents survey and case-study data by the themes outlined above and includes examples of practice, as well as summaries and 'vignettes' of key findings from the research.

A full account of the methodologies, details of the case-study and survey samples and copies of the survey instruments employed are available in the appendices.

# EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS: A SCHOOL VIEW

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***School behaviour policies: key findings***

- While the vast majority of senior managers in the survey sample acknowledged the existence of a written behaviour policy, one in 20 secondary teachers did not know whether their school had one or not.

- One in six secondary teachers did not believe the written behaviour policy was backed/subscribed to by all the staff, and one in five felt there were no clear guidelines and procedures on behaviour management to follow.

- The written policies of the case-study secondary schools were much less likely to contain examples of actual strategies for managing behaviour than were their primary counterparts.

- The written policies of the PRUs and special school were particularly explicit about their philosophy and their strategies for helping pupils manage their behaviour successfully.

- Overall, in the case-study sample, written behaviour policies varied in length between one and 50 pages.

- Less than three-quarters of the secondary school teacher sample felt staff were involved in the development of their school's behaviour policy.

- Only a quarter of senior managers in the survey indicated the involvement of parents.

- Pupils' contribution was acknowledged by 40 per cent of the SMT subsample but only by one in five (19 per cent) of teachers.

- Non-teaching staff had greater involvement in the policy development in the case-study primary schools than was the case in the secondary case-study sample.

- The teacher sample in the secondary school survey was consistently less aware of any reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues than were their senior management colleagues. This was particularly striking at whole-school level.

- In all, a quarter of the secondary teacher sample did not feel that their school's behaviour policy made a significant contribution to the management of behaviour.

- Only about half the teachers agreed they were informed how to be consistent in their dealing with behaviour, compared with nine out of ten senior managers.

***Rewards and sanctions: key findings***

- One in five secondary teachers did not feel their school emphasised rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour. Half the teacher sample held the view that there were insufficient sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour.

- A large and diverse array of rewards was operating within the schools in the case-study sample. The majority of these offered 'symbolic' outcomes (certificates, merits, points) which often had less currency with particularly older pupils.

- Finding rewards with some credibility/currency value, especially for older pupils, was not easy.

- The value of including parents in their child's receipt of any reward for behaviour was raised in a number of instances.

***Pastoral systems: key findings***

- A range of pastoral systems was in evidence in the case-study schools, including house systems and vertical grouping. From the survey, the most common pastoral organisation involved head of year and form tutors following through with the school careers of their charges.

- Contact time between form tutors and pupils varied: about a quarter of the survey schools nominated between two and two-and-a-half hours a week. However, instances of schools providing less than one hour and up to five hours a week were also recorded.

- The amount of non-contact time for pastoral managers also showed much variation: the variable of size of school seemed to play a part here. It was evident that large schools (rather than those with, say, high free school meals numbers or inner-city settings) consistently provided more non-contact time for pastoral managers.

- Fifty-nine per cent of senior managers but 72 per cent of teachers felt there was insufficient time for carrying out pastoral responsibilities.

- Training in pastoral work, developing the role of the form tutor and better communication between pastoral and curriculum managers were cited as areas for development in the case-study schools.

***Strategies for behavioural difficulties*: *key findings***

- Schools did not readily utilise their own staff in providing alternative relationships or additional PSE opportunities for youngsters with behaviour difficulties.

- Support from external agencies was felt to be affected by funding and time constraints: sometimes lack of feedback to school staff or awareness of the demands of whole-class teaching were noted.

- Assemblies emerged as the most frequently mentioned pastoral opportunity to raise behaviour issues.

***Behaviour management and special educational needs: key findings***

- The case-study primary schools and off-site provision were far more likely to acknowledge the need for alternative approaches to the mainstream system of sanctions and rewards for youngsters with behaviour difficulties than was evident in the case-study secondary schools.

- SENCOs in the case-study primaries maintained an overview of behaviour difficulties more often than was the case in most of the case-study secondary sample. More than one in four (27 per cent) senior managers in the survey secondary schools did not think their SENCO/SEN department had any considerable involvement with children experiencing behaviour difficulties.

- The Code of Practice was sometimes felt to better suit a primary model of classroom relationships. IEPs/IBPs could be more difficult to implement in a secondary system, given the likely number of teachers involved.

- A need for more frequent reviewing of behaviour targets was suggested by some SENCOs.

- Over half of respondents in the secondary teacher survey and a quarter of senior managers recorded they were '*unsure*' whether IBPs and target setting were effective.

***Professional development in behaviour management: key findings***

- Interviewees in the case-study primary schools noted the opportunities to share ideas, concerns and strategies regarding pupil behaviour, including observation of colleagues; this was less apparent among their secondary counterparts.

- Secondary schools and off-site provision often expressed concern about the quality, relevance and availability of appropriate INSET providers in the area of behaviour management.

- In a number of the case-study secondary schools, senior managers and SENCOs wanted to see further training in the area of teaching and learning styles as a corollary to improving behaviour management.

***Factors in effective behaviour management at classroom level: key findings***

- 'Behaviour specialists' (e.g. PRU staff, SENCOs, residential care staff) gave more emphasis to curriculum differentiation and praise and reward as key factors than did their mainstream colleagues. Indeed, some two-thirds of the survey teacher sample did not rate differentiation as among their top six factors for effective management of behaviour.

- The importance of good teacher–pupil relations, with profoundly simple concepts such as respecting, caring for, and just 'liking' young people, was cited as a key factor by a number of interviewees in the case-study schools. However, '*respect for pupils*' was rejected by one in three of secondary teachers as a key factor in behaviour management.

***Philosophies underpinning behaviour management: key findings***

- Different emphases emerged in the accounts of the general philosophies or principles underpinning schools' approaches to behaviour management. A number of the case-study primary schools tended to stress the importance of developing interpersonal relations (treatment of others), while, in the case-study secondary schools, responses focused more on linking behaviour management to ensuring pupils' academic achievement.

- Lack of consensus about the school philosophy underpinning behaviour management (and also an acknowledgement that not all staff concurred with certain approaches) was noted in the secondary case-study sample but not in the primary case studies.

- Mainstream practitioners did not apply technical/theoretical terms when describing their approaches to managing behaviour. This may indicate it is not just the provision of 'ready-made' techniques but a better conceptualisation of the meaning of behaviour which is required in professional development.

- For a number of interviewees with a reputation for good practice in this area, the origins of personal principles underpinning behaviour management came from first-hand experience of youngsters who did not readily fit social/academic norms or encounters with other practitioners who related successfully to this pupil group. In sum, these principles were 'caught' from role models and/or life experiences, and this may have implications for professional development and initial training.

In the conclusion of the report, three central aspects were raised:

First, it was suggested that consistent and coherent whole-school approaches to managing behaviour were not so much achieved by written documents: rather, they were 'living doctrines', derived from ongoing discussion among staff. Such discussion was usually instigated by senior managers, who were personally committed to certain behaviour management principles and also to ensuring that their staff's approach to young people was in keeping with these.

Second, the role of the pastoral system in managing behaviour was discussed and the conclusion queried whether such systems currently ensure administrative efficiency rather more than enhancing positive pupil behaviour through affective support. It similarly questioned whether pastoral roles could be better utilised as a key supportive adult relationship for youngsters in school.

Finally, on the issue of what makes an individual teacher an effective manager of behaviour, the conclusion introduced the notion of 'kid whispering'. Like the concept of 'joining up' used in the humane approach to working with horses known as 'horse-whispering', one group of interviewees appeared to have techniques and attitudes which enabled them to recognise, and relate successfully to, troubled youngsters. Recognising the causes and appreciating the affective experiences underpinning youngsters' behavioural difficulties seem fundamental components of successful practice. Hence, the conclusion suggests that effective management of behaviour may really require ways of improving teachers' understanding of behaviour theory rather than just off-the-shelf techniques for managing classroom incidents and, beyond that, queries whether the inclusive school might actually correlate with having 'kid whisperers' in its most senior positions.

# PART ONE
# MANAGING BEHAVIOUR: WHOLE-SCHOOL FEATURES

## CHAPTER 1
## BEHAVIOUR POLICIES IN PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter draws on quantitative data arising from questionnaires completed by senior managers and teachers in the secondary school survey, and on qualitative data from the interviews with staff in the case-study schools. These interviews comprised: senior managers, pastoral staff, Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs), subject teachers and non-teaching staff, including governors, in 11 primary schools (including one middle school), 12 secondary schools, three pupil referral units (PRUs) and a residential special school (EBD).

The chapter will cover:

- the existence, or otherwise, of written behaviour policies in schools;
- who was involved in their development (including who, or what, provided the impetus for that development);
- reviewing behaviour policies; and
- the survey sample's views on the efficacy of behaviour policies in practice.

It is useful at this stage to recall the recommendations of the Education Act 1997 regarding discipline, which stated that headteachers should determine measures to be taken with a view to:

> *... promoting, among pupils, self-discipline and proper regard for authority; encouraging good behaviour and respect for others on the part of pupils; securing that the standard of behaviour of pupils is acceptable; and otherwise regulating the conduct of pupils* (GB. Statutes, 1997, Part II: Section 154).

The Act further stipulated that the measures determined by headteachers should be publicised in the form of a written document. It is also interesting to note the emphasis it placed on the involvement of the governing body in the development of policies '... *designed to promote good behaviour and discipline on the part of its pupils*'. The latter point is referred to in more detail in the course of this chapter.

## 1.2 THE EXISTENCE OF A WRITTEN BEHAVIOUR POLICY

### Survey sample

In the questionnaire sent out to secondary schools, senior managers and teaching staff were asked to indicate whether or not their school had a written behaviour policy, or whether one was in preparation. The responses from both senior management and from teachers are set out in Table 1.1:

**Table 1.1 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of responses indicating existence or absence of a written behaviour policy**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 117 | % | N = 359 | % |
| Yes | 107 | 92 | 317 | 88 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| In preparation | 9 | 8 | 25 | 7 |
| Don't know | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Thus, a very high proportion of senior managers and teachers (about nine out of ten) indicated that their schools did have a written behaviour policy. Of the remaining ten per cent, the majority of respondents reported that their school was in the process of preparing one. All the senior management respondents were aware of the current status of the behaviour policy in their schools, but a very small minority of teachers, almost one in 20, indicated that they did not know whether the school had such a policy or not.

In the next section of the questionnaire, both sets of respondents were asked to respond to the statement '*All staff subscribe to/back this policy*'. Respondents were

offered a four-point scale: '*strongly agree*', '*agree*', '*disagree*' and '*strongly disagree*', with the additional option of responding '*not sure*'. The responses of both senior managers and teachers to this statement are set out in Table 1.2 below.

**Table 1.2 Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to statement '*All staff subscribe to/back the behaviour policy*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 112 | % | N = 336 | % |
| Strongly agree | 20 | 18 | 55 | 16 |
| Agree | 84 | 75 | 197 | 59 |
| Disagree | 6 | 5 | 50 | 15 |
| Strongly disagree | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| Not sure | 2 | 2 | 26 | 8 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Of the senior managers who completed this question, only one in 20 (five per cent) disagreed that all staff supported the policy and none marked the '*strongly disagree*' option. A high majority, 93 per cent, believed that all staff supported the policy, although the greater proportion of these were in the '*agree*' rather than the '*strongly agree*' category.

In contrast, teachers were less convinced that all school staff supported the policy, as an overall total of just 75 per cent of responses fell into the two categories of agreement. This represents a difference of nearly 20 per cent between the two types of staff. At the same time, nearly three times as many teachers disagreed with the statement than did senior managers. Thus, about one in six teachers felt that their school's policy was not backed by all staff. Once again, teachers were more inclined than senior managers to voice uncertainty, with one in 12 (eight per cent) responding '*not sure*'.

In a subsequent section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate whether particular statements reflected their school's current practice for managing pupil behaviour. One of these statements was '*There are clear behaviour guidelines/discipline procedures to follow of which all staff and pupils are made*

*aware*', and three options of response ('*yes*', '*no*', '*not sure*') were offered. The responses of both senior managers and teachers are set out in Table 1.3 below.

**Table 1.3 Effective behaviour management in schools: response to the statement '*There are clear behaviour guidelines/discipline procedures to follow of which all staff and pupils are made aware*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 118 | % | N = 358 | % |
| Yes | 114 | 96 | 282 | 79 |
| No | 1 | 1 | 53 | 15 |
| Not sure | 3 | 3 | 23 | 6 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

More than 95 per cent of senior managers indicated that there were clear behaviour guidelines or procedures to follow of which all staff and pupils were aware, but once again, the teacher subsample was less convinced. Overall, one in five secondary teachers were not aware of or sure about the existence of clear procedures regarding behaviour.

**Case-study schools**

In the case-study schools, a range of staff (including senior managers, pastoral staff, SENCOs, subject teachers and non-teaching staff, including governors) was also asked whether or not their school had a written behaviour policy, or whether one was in preparation.

***Primary***

Of the 11 primary schools, there was consensus amongst staff in nine that their school did have a written behaviour policy, although, in one, a deputy head thought it might be part of their SEN policy. Of the other two primary schools, there was consensus in one that the Code of Conduct followed by staff and pupils was viewed as the equivalent of a written behaviour policy. In the other school, a set of guidelines on managing behaviour was included in the Personal and Social Education (PSE) policy and all the interviewees referred to this as a behaviour policy.

Copies of written behaviour policies were collected from seven of the primary schools and ranged in size from a one-page set of guidelines on behaviour, to one policy of 50 pages. Most policies were typically eight pages long and contained expectations of behaviour, school rules, the school's reward system and its system of sanctions. One school referred to the latter as '*consequences*'. In one instance, the policy made no mention of rewards, although it did advocate the use of positive comments. This was borne out in the staff interviews, where all the interviewees highlighted the need for some consensus on the reward system.

In the primary school where the behaviour policy was 50 pages long, like the others, it covered expectations *re* behaviour, reward systems and sanctions, the latter again referred to in the policy as '*consequences*'. It also included many ideas for games and activities, together with worksheets for children who might need to be made aware of the consequences of their behaviour.

At the other extreme, in the school where staff referred to their behaviour policy being '*within the PSE Policy*', the issue of behaviour was discussed on one of the four pages of this document. It covered strategies for coping with problems, such as providing opportunities for making choices, discussing or '*talking out*' difficulties, and proposing the use of corporate, non-punitive solutions to unacceptable behaviour.

***Secondary***

In eight of the 12 case-study secondary schools, there was consensus amongst senior managers and other school staff interviewed that their school did have a written behaviour policy, although the head in one referred to the behaviour policy in his school as '*a written rewards and punishment*' policy. In one of the schools, the behaviour policy was currently under review.

In three schools, there appeared to be some lack of consensus about terminology. In all three schools, senior managers reported that there was no written policy for behaviour, rather what appeared to be an understood set of expectations which, in effect, operated as a policy. However, in two of these schools, other members of staff interviewed were under the impression that there was a written behaviour policy.

In one secondary school, there was consensus amongst senior managers and other school staff that their school did not have a written behaviour policy as such. What they had was a set of recognised and well-understood expectations which were reflected in various written formats (e.g. in the staff handbook, the prospectus, curriculum documents, etc.).

Documentation was collected from five secondary schools where all interviewees agreed that there was a written behaviour policy in existence. The documentation collected ranged in size from a one-page set of school and class expectations, to a behaviour policy of 16 pages. Documentation typically included information on school rules, expectations of behaviour, reward systems and sanctions. The latter were variously referred to as '*behaviour checks*', '*reinforcements*' and as '*consequences*'.

In two of the four secondary schools in which interviewees reported that there was no written behaviour policy as such, similar information regarding expectations, rules, reward systems and sanctions was included in the staff handbook. In the other two schools, the documentation collected consisted of two pages covering the school's system of rewards and sanctions, referred to in one as '*recognition and consequences*'.

***Off-site provision***

In the residential special school and two of the three PRUs, staff were in agreement that a written behaviour policy did exist, although in one of the latter it was only in draft form. The remaining PRU did not have an actual written policy, but, before starting at the PRU, pupils were given a contract based on a set of expectations and asked to sign to say they had read, understood and agreed with the conditions of the contract.

These policies were between five and eight pages long, and covered the institutions' principles or philosophies, expectations or codes of conduct, strategies for managing behaviour, reward systems and sanctions.

However, it is noteworthy that, in special schools and PRUs where behavioural problems might be anticipated, these policies were much more explicit about their philosophy and their strategies, or approaches, for helping the pupils in their care manage their behaviour more successfully.

***The existence of a written behaviour policy: key findings***

- Compared with their senior manager colleagues, the teacher sample was consistently less sure of the existence and clarity of the school's behaviour policy.
- While the vast majority of SMTs acknowledged the existence of a written behaviour policy, one in 20 teachers did not know whether their school had one or not.
- One in six teachers did not believe the written policy was backed/subscribed to by all the staff, and one in five felt there were no clear guidelines and procedures on behaviour management to follow.
- Written behaviour policies varied in length between one and 50 pages.
- The policies of the case-study secondary schools were much less likely to contain examples of actual strategies for managing behaviour than were their primary counterparts.
- The written policies of the PRUs and special school were particularly explicit about their philosophy and their strategies for helping pupils manage their behaviour successfully.

## 1.3 WHO WAS INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A WRITTEN BEHAVIOUR POLICY?

Staff in schools in both the survey sample and the case-study sample were asked to indicate whether staff, pupils and parents had been involved in the formulation of written behaviour policies (or their equivalent). In addition, respondents in the survey sample schools were invited to identify any other individuals who might have been involved. As part of the interviews with staff in the case-study schools, a range of staff including senior managers, subject teachers, pastoral staff, SENCOs and non-teaching staff, including governors, was asked to elaborate on the nature of that involvement.

**Survey sample**

For the survey sample, senior managers and teachers were presented with pre-set options (including parents and pupils) together with the opportunity for staff to offer additional categories of individuals under an open-ended '*other (please specify)*' section. Respondents were allowed to tick as many boxes as appropriate. Their responses are set out in Table 1.4 below.

**Table 1.4 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of respondents indicating involvement of various individuals in the development of the behaviour policy**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 116 | % | N = 340 | % |
| SMT | 108 | 93 | 278 | 81 |
| Staff | 107 | 92 | 246 | 72 |
| Pupils | 46 | 40 | 64 | 19 |
| Parents | 27 | 23 | 29 | 9 |
| Don't know | 0 | 0 | 38 | 11 |

*As the school representatives were allowed multiple responses, the total of percentage cases comes to more than 100. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

The majority of senior managers and teachers reported that their SMT **and** their staff were involved in the production of the written policy. Eleven per cent (about one in ten) of teachers indicated they did not know who was involved. Most striking is the fact that there was a 20 per cent difference between senior managers and teachers in their opinion about teacher involvement: less than three-quarters of teachers (72 per cent) indicated teacher involvement, compared with over nine out of ten senior managers (92 per cent). Only two-fifths (40 per cent) of the senior management respondents identified pupils as being involved in the production of the written policy, while less than a quarter (23 per cent) confirmed any parental participation. Teachers were even less convinced of pupil or parental involvement, with only one in five (19 per cent) suggesting any pupil contribution and less than one in ten (nine per cent) noting a parental role.

Analysis of the '*others*' category showed four main categories of additional contributors: governors, heads of year team, school council, and advisers. It is

important to note that only 39 senior management respondents and 40 teachers completed this question and, of these, only 29 senior managers and 24 teachers highlighted the involvement of governors. This is perhaps particularly noteworthy given the recommendation on school discipline in the Education Act 1997 that governors '*... shall make, and from time to time review, a written statement of general principles to which the headteacher is to have regard*' in determining measures designed to promote an acceptable standard of behaviour in school.

It is perhaps interesting, given the fact that, in order to be effective, any written behaviour policy would need to be consistently interpreted and administered both within, and between, departments, that no respondent identified heads of department teams in this context.

**Case-study schools**

Staff in the case-study schools were also asked to comment on whether, and in what way, staff, pupils and parents were involved in the development of their school's written behaviour policy or its equivalent.

***Primary***

Interviewees in all 11 case-study primary schools commented that, in their school, *staff* had been involved to varying degrees in the development of a behaviour policy, or its equivalent. In four of the schools, working parties had put together the initial drafts and presented these to the rest of the staff for discussion. One of these working parties was made up solely of senior managers. Two working parties involved senior managers, but also representatives from other areas of the school. In one, these representatives included governors and non-teaching staff, and in the other, they were representatives from the different keystage areas, '*... so many people's voices are heard within small group settings*' (headteacher). In four of the case-study primary schools, interviewees specifically mentioned the inclusion of non-teaching staff in the developmental process, and one other headteacher signalled her intention to do so as part of the review currently in progress.

*Pupils* were identified as being involved in nine of the 11 case-study primary schools. This involvement typically took the form of discussion, usually in PSE or RE lessons, and led to pupil input into school rules and expectations. In one of these, school council representatives presented the ideas arising from such discussions at staff meetings. In another, representatives from each class in the school were working with the PSHE coordinator to review playtimes and devise appropriate playground rules. In a third, pupils were involved in a whole day of activities and discussion focused on reviewing behaviour within the school. Two case-study primary schools reported no pupil involvement in the development of a behaviour policy, or its equivalent. In one, the headteacher commented: '*I have a very teacher-orientated view of schools, I believe ... teachers create the school, ... the ethos ... within that the head then creates the tone from the staff.*'

Within the majority of the 11 case-study primary schools, *parents* were not involved in the formulation of the behaviour policy, merely receiving information on the finished product. However, in one school, parents' comments on a draft had been requested. In another, the headteacher commented that parents were very supportive and the school would certainly listen if any parent did come forward with a suggestion. Three schools stated that parental involvement was through parent governors who were part of the consultation process. Parents were reported as having a greater involvement in the formulation of the behaviour policy in two of the case-study schools. One noted that interviews had been conducted with parents and the data collated to inform the formulation of the policy; while in the other, a special parents' committee had been set up to provide input into the developmental process. Interestingly, in two of the schools where staff reported no parental involvement other than the receiving of information, a teacher in one and the headteacher in the other both felt that it would be valuable to involve them more in the future. One had in fact begun to follow up on this intention by inviting parents to join the day of whole-school activities which formed part of their annual review: '*I don't know why it didn't occur to me then. I think I saw them more in a support capacity rather than being developmentally involved in it* (headteacher).'

***Secondary***

As with the primary case-study sample, interviewees reported that *staff* in each of the 12 case-study secondary schools were involved to varying degrees in the development of a behaviour policy, or its equivalent. In seven of these, working parties made up of representatives from different departments, faculties, houses, etc. put together drafts which were then fed back to the rest of the staff for consideration and discussion. No interviewee mentioned the involvement of non-teaching staff in these working parties. In two other secondary schools, working parties again put together drafts to be fed back for discussion, but this time the working parties were made up solely of members of SMT. In three of the case-study secondary schools, the whole staff was involved in the development of the behaviour policy – in two through all its stages, and in one through surveys undertaken with staff (and also pupils) – the information from which was then fed back to senior management.

*Pupils* were involved in 11 of the case-study secondary schools, although in three of these, there was not always consensus about the extent of their involvement. Pupil involvement generally took the form of discussion, to provide input into guidelines for appropriate behaviour, rules, rewards and sanctions. In four of the schools, this was done through the school or student council, so pupil views were heard through their elected representatives. In the others, pupils were involved in discussions as part of form time or PSE lessons. In one of the secondary schools, the pupils took part in a survey, the results of which were then presented to senior management. However, one member of staff in this school commented that he did not think this had provided the pupils with enough opportunity to put forward their views. In the remaining school, pupils were not involved in any of the developmental stages and merely received information on the system in place on starting school.

Interviewees in three of the 12 secondary case-study schools reported that *parents* had been involved in either the formulation of a behaviour policy, or at draft stage. In one of these schools, parents had been sent a draft on which to comment and had been invited into workshops in school involving role play situations, in order to show them how it might work in practice. In the other nine secondary schools, staff commented that parents had had no involvement in the behaviour policy's formulation, receiving only information on the finished product:

*You tell the parents that you welcome ideas ... but you don't get a lot through; you basically tell them what you are doing just to keep them informed of what's happening* (head of year).

*I think that was a weakness. I think historically the school has had close contacts with parents when the school wanted them ... There has not been a tradition really of even, say, the Parent–Teacher Association having that sort of involvement* (headteacher).

*I must admit that we didn't discuss things with parents. Maybe we should have, I don't know* (pastoral deputy).

In a few instances, there was some lack of consensus about how much parents were involved. For example, in one school, although the staff interviewed believed parental involvement only took the form of receiving information about the policy, the actual documentation referred to their involvement in the formative process, along with staff and pupils, thus giving shared ownership.

***Off-site provision***

In the residential special school and the PRUs in the case-study sample, all *staff* were involved in developing documentation, and had input into how the institution should run and what its ethos should be.

In the special school and the PRUs in the sample, *pupils* were not involved in the development and/or review of a behaviour policy or its equivalent.

*Parents* were not involved in any developmental work in either the special school or the PRUs, usually only receiving information, although one of the PRUs had a policy about working with parents and pupils, and both parents and pupils had been invited to comment on this.

**Research vignette: Behaviour policies – What's the impetus?**

In the 23 case-study schools, questions were asked about what triggered the development or reworking of written behaviour policies. Accounts in these schools (chosen because of their reputation for good behaviour management) invariably included one or more of the following factors:

- the arrival of a new headteacher
- general concern about increasing behavioural problems
- recognition of the inadequacy of existing structures (e.g. lack of consistency, consensus or insufficient focus on rewards)
- overload on pastoral middle management
- the presence of pupils with statemented behaviour problems.

The commonality in this list is perhaps that each represents an internally driven impetus, rather than an externally imposed imperative. Equally, it was noteworthy that only one of the 12 secondary schools referred to 'new headteacher' as a stimulus, compared with six of the 11 primaries.

Subsequent contributions by LEA services and agencies, such as Education Psychology, Behaviour Support or Advisers, were also cited by four primary schools as a component in developing their policy, while four secondary schools mentioned an initial external input on Assertive Discipline (albeit subsequently adapted). Instituting subcommittees on Behaviour Management was mentioned in a number of instances as a key process in policy development. Thus, the ongoing ownership of policy development by school staff, as well as the conviction of the headteacher, seems a key issue.

***Involvement in developing a behaviour policy: key findings***

- Less than three-quarters of the secondary school teacher sample felt staff were involved in the development of their school's behaviour policy.
- Only a quarter of senior managers indicated the involvement of parents.
- Pupils' contribution was acknowledged by 40 per cent of the SMT subsample but only by one in five (19 per cent) of teachers.
- Non-teaching staff had greater involvement in the policy development in the case-study primary schools than was the case in the secondary case-study sample.
- Pupils' involvement was evident in almost all primary and secondary case-study schools, including class discussion in PSE/RE on school and classroom rules and expectations; school councils; contributions from surveys of pupil opinions.
- A small minority of the case-study schools involved parents in the formulation of their behaviour policy.

## 1.4 REVIEWS OF BEHAVIOUR POLICIES

This section looks at how often written behaviour policies were reviewed, using both survey and case-study data.

### Survey sample

Survey respondents were asked about reviews in one section of the questionnaire, where they were invited to respond to the statement '*There are regular reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues ... at department level* [and] *at whole-school level*'. Senior managers' and teachers' views are shown in the following two tables.

**Table 1.5 Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to statement '*There are regular reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues at department level*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 108 | % | N = 338 | % |
| Yes | 60 | 56 | 156 | 46 |
| No | 25 | 23 | 143 | 42 |
| Not sure | 23 | 21 | 39 | 12 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Just over half (56 per cent) of the senior managers but under half (46 per cent) of the teachers in the survey sample responded that there were regular reviews at department level. However, more than two-fifths of the teacher sample (42 per cent) felt that there was no regular review of behaviour at department level, compared with about a quarter (23 per cent) of senior managers. Two-fifths (21 per cent) of the senior manager respondents were not sure if regular reviews took place at department level, compared with about one in ten teachers. Given the likelihood of departments taking a role in managing behaviour, this low level of response is noteworthy. Equally, the acknowledged lack of awareness of senior managers about departmental review on behaviour stands in contrast to their certainty and positive responses at whole-school level.

**Table 1.6** **Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to statement '*There are regular reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues at whole-school level*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 113 | % | N = 337 | % |
| Yes | 93 | 82 | 183 | 54 |
| No | 17 | 15 | 105 | 31 |
| Not sure | 3 | 3 | 49 | 15 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

There was a significant difference between the responses of the two types of staff to the statement about reviews at whole-school level. More than four-fifths (82 per cent) of the senior managers in the survey sample indicated that there were regular reviews at whole-school level, compared with just over half (54 per cent) of the teachers. It may well be that teachers had much less involvement than their senior management colleagues in any review process at a whole-school level, and so were less aware of it taking place, although the real status of a '*whole-school level review*' must be questioned if this is the case.

## Case-study schools

### *Primary*

In four of the primary schools, reviews of the behaviour policy were carried out annually, while in three, a review had either just taken place, or was due in the following year. In one, the behaviour policy had been reviewed 18 months previously and, in the remaining primary school, no details were given.

In the school where staff considered the Code of Conduct to be the equivalent of a behaviour policy, this had been reviewed some 18 months ago. In the school where behaviour guidelines were included in the PSE policy, no timescale for review was given, which may suggest discrete policies on behaviour are more likely to be revised and revisited.

***Secondary***

When asked when the behaviour policy was last reviewed, of the eight secondary schools where staff were in agreement that a written policy did exist, in two, no details about reviews were given, although the policies had themselves only been in existence for one and two years respectively. Of the other six schools, staff in three said reviews had taken place within the last two years, staff in one said reviews took place annually, while staff in another indicated that reviews took place '*regularly*' as part of '*an ongoing process*'. In the remaining secondary school where staff indicated that a behaviour policy was in existence, it was currently under review.

Of the four secondary schools where staff perceived the equivalent of a written behaviour policy to exist, in two, this had been reviewed within the last two years, in one, review was '*an ongoing process*' and in the other, staff indicated that a review had taken place but were not specific about the timescale.

***Off-site provision***

In the residential special school, the behaviour policy was a longstanding one which was constantly being reviewed and updated. In the PRU which had a behaviour policy in existence, this was due to be reviewed within the next year. Staff in the other two PRUs made no comments about the timescale for review, although in one the policy was in draft form.

***Reviewing behaviour policies: key findings***

- The teacher sample in the secondary school survey was consistently less aware of reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues than were their senior management colleagues. This was particularly striking at whole-school level.
- On being asked about reviewing behaviour policies, four of the 11 case-study primary schools referred to an '*annual*' appraisal of their policy, while only one of the 12 secondaries stated this frequency. Seven of the 23 case-study schools stated that a whole-school review had taken place in the last two years.
- The ongoing high status given to reviewing behaviour policies by the 'good-practice' primary schools stands in some considerable contrast to the secondary case-study schools.

## 1.5 SURVEY VIEWS ON THE EFFICACY OF BEHAVIOUR POLICIES IN PRACTICE

Summative views on the efficacy of behaviour policies in practice were sought from the survey sample. In one section of the questionnaires, both sets of respondents were asked to respond to the statement '*The behaviour policy makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour*'. Table 1.7 sets out the responses of senior managers and teachers to this statement:

**Table 1.7 Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to the statement '*The behaviour policy makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 111 | % | N = 335 | % |
| Strongly agree | 33 | 30 | 53 | 16 |
| Agree | 74 | 67 | 168 | 50 |
| Disagree | 0 | 0 | 67 | 20 |
| Strongly disagree | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 |
| Not sure | 4 | 4 | 35 | 10 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Responses from senior managers were very positive, as 97 per cent in all agreed with the statement, with nearly one-third of the subsample strongly agreeing. None disagreed, although four per cent were not sure.

In contrast, teachers were considerably less convinced that the policy made a significant, positive contribution, as almost a quarter disagreed with the statement and one teacher in 20 felt strongly it did not.

As the above table shows, overall 30 per cent fewer secondary teachers than senior managers believed that the behaviour policy made a significant, positive contribution to the management of behaviour. It would thus appear that about one in four of those who are meant to interpret and operate the policy on a day-to-day basis, believed that it made no positive contribution to managing behaviour.

In another section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate whether particular statements accurately reflected their school's current practice for managing

pupil behaviour. Four of the statements offered to respondents related to the efficacy of the behaviour policy in practice. These statements were:

- *Teachers have autonomy in dealing with behaviour as they see fit.*
- *Staff are informed how to be consistent in their dealing with discipline/ behaviour.*
- *There is a particular emphasis on rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour.*
- *There are insufficient sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour.*

The following tables show the distribution of responses from senior managers and teachers to these statements.

**Table 1.8** **Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to the statement '*Teachers have autonomy in dealing with behaviour as they see fit*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 112 | % | N = 346 | % |
| Yes | 32 | 29 | 139 | 40 |
| No | 72 | 64 | 161 | 47 |
| Not sure | 8 | 7 | 46 | 13 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

This statement was meant to show how far school policy might offer a clear directive influence on individual teachers' management of behaviour, '*autonomy*' implying that staff were not adhering to any overarching whole-school procedures and/or principles when dealing with behaviour incidents. It is noteworthy that two-thirds of the senior managers in the survey sample disagreed with this statement, suggesting that there was, by implication, a policy to be adhered to. However, less than half the teacher subsample took this view. Again, it is interesting to note that two in five secondary teachers felt they had freedom to manage behaviour rather than adhere to any overarching policy or procedures.

**Table 1.9** **Effective behaviour management in schools: response to the statement '*Staff are informed how to be consistent in their dealing with discipline/behaviour*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 118 | % | N = 357 | % |
| Yes | 106 | 89 | 201 | 56 |
| No | 2 | 2 | 99 | 28 |
| Not sure | 10 | 9 | 57 | 16 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

This statement intended to survey whether the key terminology of '*consistency*' in behaviour management prevailed within the viewpoints of staff, and again, the evidence suggested considerable disparity between the perceptions of senior staff and teachers on this issue. Nine out of ten senior managers were confident that information on how to be consistent in dealing with behavioural issues was passed on to staff. However, only just over half of teachers supported that view. This disparity of opinion is clearly seen within the '*No*' responses, which were more than ten times greater for teachers (28 per cent) than for senior managers (two per cent). Teachers were far less convinced that information on consistency with regard to behaviour management was conveyed to all staff. This is again interesting, considering the recommendations of the Education Act 1997, which states that headteachers should take steps to bring the measures designed to promote an acceptable standard of behaviour '... *to the attention of all such pupils and parents* ***and all persons employed at the school***'.

**Table 1.10** **Effective behaviour management in schools: response to the statement '*There is a particular emphasis on rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 115 | % | N = 357 | % |
| Yes | 97 | 84 | 251 | 70 |
| No | 8 | 7 | 71 | 20 |
| Not sure | 10 | 9 | 35 | 10 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

This statement attempted to garner evidence on how far the much vaunted principle of '*focusing on the positive*' prevailed within the representative sample of secondary schools. As Table 1.10 shows, while both categories of respondents were largely in accord with this statement, a noticeably higher proportion of senior managers (four-fifths) indicated their agreement than did teacher staff (less than three-quarters). At the same time, one in five teachers did not feel there was a particular emphasis on rewards and the positive reinforcement of good behaviour. Further, there was some difference between men and women teachers' views on the emphasis on rewards. Over three-quarters (76 per cent) of women respondents agreed with the statement, compared with less than two-thirds (61 per cent) of male teachers. Subject differences also were in evidence: teachers of maths, science and practical subjects (e.g. PE, technology) were less likely to agree than their colleagues within humanities and communications specialisms.

**Table 1.11 Effective behaviour management in schools: response to the statement '*There are insufficient sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour*'**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 116 | % | N = 358 | % |
| Yes | 33 | 28 | 168 | 47 |
| No | 75 | 65 | 156 | 44 |
| Not sure | 8 | 7 | 34 | 9 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

This statement sought to detect how far current systems for controlling behaviour were felt to be adequate. As Table 1.11 shows, there was again a marked difference in the responses of senior managers and teachers. Nearly half of the teachers agreed that there were insufficient sanctions in place for dealing with challenging behaviour, whereas only just over a quarter of senior managers assented. This difference in opinion would appear to indicate that senior managers had more confidence in their behaviour policy, than did the teachers who were dealing with behaviour in the classroom. However, there were no notable differences in views between age, gender or subject specialism of teachers.

The lack of congruence in the understanding of the content of policies and the approaches they embody, including reward and sanction systems, is very evident from these four tables. The question thus arises: what is the precise function of a behaviour policy if there is such a lack of consensus about both its content and efficacy?

***The effectiveness of behaviour policies: key findings***

- In all, a quarter of the teacher sample did not feel that their school's behaviour policy made a significant contribution to the management of behaviour.
- Two in every five secondary teachers felt they had freedom to manage behaviour rather than adhere to any overarching policy or procedure.
- Only about half the teachers agreed they were informed how to be consistent in their dealing with behaviour, compared with nine out of ten senior managers.
- One in five teachers did not feel their school emphasised rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour.
- Half the teacher sample held the view that there were insufficient sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour.

# CHAPTER 2
# REWARDS AND SANCTIONS

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

As well as recommending the introduction of whole-school behaviour policies which should be clearly understood by everyone working in the school, by pupils and parents, the Elton Report, *Discipline in Schools* (1989), stated that schools should achieve '*... a healthy balance between rewards and punishments*' (Recommendation 23). In addition, the report suggested schools should provide a range of rewards which would prove accessible to pupils of all abilities. As has already been shown in Chapter 1, while the majority of staff in both survey and case-study schools were in agreement that there was a written behaviour policy in place, the efficacy of such policies was clearly questioned by a sizeable minority of the survey's teacher sample, especially in connection with sanctions. Given the centrality of this aspect of behaviour management, detailed information on the rewards and sanctions systems which underpinned those policies or expectations was also sought from staff in the case-study schools, and this chapter focuses on their practices.

A range of staff was asked if their school operated a system of rewards and sanctions for behaviour and, if so, to elaborate on the type of rewards and sanctions available, and on their perceived effectiveness. At the same time, building on previous studies investigating pupils' opinions of rewards and sanctions systems – in primary schools (Harrop and Williams, 1992; Merrett and Tang, 1994; Miller *et al.*, 1998) and in secondary schools (Sharpe *et al.*, 1987; Merrett *et al.*, 1988; Caffyn, 1989; Kinder *et al.*, 1996) – 44 pupils from selected schools (primary, secondary and off-site provision) in the case-study sample were asked to consider the same questions.

## 2.2 REWARDS

Rewards for behaviour were evident in each of the case-study schools. A number of variations emerged as to what these rewards comprised, and who received them. The following differences were noted:

**Target:** Differences were noted in that some schools gave rewards only to individuals, while others also proffered them to a whole class or tutor group.

**Eligibility:** In some instances, all rewards for behaviour could be acquired by any pupil/group; other systems, in addition, singled out or spotlighted exceptional achievement in behaviour with special rewards (e.g. 'student of the week', 'class of the week').

**Presentation style:** Rewards could be presented in a highly public way (e.g. in ceremonies/assembly, reports in school newsletter). In other instances, they were dispensed privately (e.g. letters/postcards home, complimentary comments in a pupil's planner).

**Format:** Rewards could remain essentially as 'symbols' (merits, certificates, reward cards, plaques, badges), while in other systems, they were transferable into artefacts of pupil currency/ credibility (e.g. pens, vouchers for books, meals, stationery, special trips and activities).

**Paradigm/ general approach:** Finally, differences in the basic approach to rewards were evident. Reward systems could be 'accumulative' or 'hierarchical' (i.e. stickers, credits, merits, tokens which built towards higher 'prizes'). Others were, in effect, a 'credit detraction' model (i.e. instituting special regular treats or 'privileges' which were an entitlement, but were 'lost' if behaviour was inadequate).

The most common systems operated individual, generally available rewards, the format of which was essentially to proffer 'accumulative symbolic' outcomes like certificates. Eighteen of the 23 schools offered certificates (11 of the 12 secondary schools and six primary schools and one PRU for primary pupils). Fifteen utilised stickers (ten of the 11 primary schools and five of the secondary). Eight secondary schools operated a merit system. Certificates rewarding behaviour could be of quite glamorous design (bronze, silver, gold); stickers could reflect current youth interest. However, it was only a small number of primary schools and the special school which worked on the credit detraction model. For instance, one primary school operated the general privilege of 'golden time', which allowed all children a period of free choice activity every Friday, except those who failed to conform to behavioural expectations.

The majority of staff interviewed in the case-study schools were in agreement that rewards for behaviour were effective, although the degree of effectiveness could be variable. Many saw them as a vital component in encouraging pupils to be more positive about their work and behaviour in school. Staff commented that, generally, pupils liked receiving rewards, especially the younger ones, seeing it as a form of '*recognition*' which it was important to acknowledge: '*The majority of children, they love the rewards, even the verbal praise, any kind of reward at all*' (head of lower school: secondary). Pupils themselves spoke of being pleased that their behaviour had been noticed: '*... it's good if they notice that you have tried*' (female pupil: lower school). One boy in Year 10, who had experienced behaviour problems earlier in his school career, remarked: '[being rewarded] ... *makes you feel happy for the rest of the day really. It makes you feel if you can do it in one lesson, you can do it in the rest of the lessons.*'

However, several common issues emerged during discussions about the principle and procedures of giving rewards for behaviour. These related to the **appropriateness** of rewarding behaviour; the problem of **consistency** in giving rewards; and how reward systems could achieve **credibility**, particularly with older pupils.

### Appropriateness

*Sometimes the reward* [of points] *becomes a smoke screen to hide behind the problem. Children would want to achieve the points at all cost, without actually thinking about the problem. The points become the thing, and they would want to discuss 'Why didn't I get my point on such and such?', but the actual difficulty is getting them to think about the behaviour which underlies that* (headteacher: PRU).

There was some difference of opinion amongst the case-study sample as to whether it was actually justified to reward behaviour at all, some interviewees seeing it as something pupils should learn, rather than be rewarded for. It was felt that extrinsic rewards might result in children becoming 'reward-dependent' instead of taking responsibility for their own behaviour. Other interviewees stressed that it was the ethos of the school, and the relationships created between staff and pupils, which should play the most important part in any approach to behavioural problems. A rewards system was then best seen as only one part of a whole approach, a confirmation of that ethos:

> *... it's much better if a reward system can be something where you are actually building up a child's confidence in themselves, rather than thinking they are doing this because they are going to get that. I prefer to see someone able to behave because of the general ethos of the school and they feel that they then fit in* (SENCO: secondary).

### Consistency

*You can't get everybody working towards the same way of dealing with behaviour, never mind rewarding. It's very difficult* (SENCO: secondary).

A key issue, raised by both staff and pupils, was the need for some consistency of application in any reward system. It was recognised that this was necessary, though not particularly easy to achieve. Approaches to behaviour could vary between departments in secondary schools, and between classes within primary schools. While some of the case-study primary schools felt they could effect whole-school consistency, the difficulty was particularly noted in the secondary sample.

Pupil interviewees were also aware of inconsistencies in the way rewards were given out, observing that some teachers did not hand them out at all, or did not give out promised rewards when targets for behaviour had been achieved. Equally, several pupils commented that it often appeared to be the poorly behaved pupils who received rewards for behaviour:

> *... the people who do behave well, they don't get rewarded so much as the naughty ones that behave well for the lesson. They get rewarded, but the people who just sort of like go in and* [behave] *all the time, I don't think they get rewarded that much. I think it's pretty unfair, because we are just taken for granted ... there's nothing really else for the good people* (female pupil: lower school).

> *... mostly when you earn a treat, the teachers don't give you it. They make an agreement with you, but they don't stick to it. Then I fly off the handle, I complain. Most of the time, they just say it has to be the right time for us. I say, 'Well I stuck to my part of the bargain' ... but you don't get anywhere* (female pupil: Year 6).

This was echoed by some staff who observed that the brighter, more motivated pupils sometimes had to work even harder to achieve a reward, because of the expectations staff had of them. Other staff interviewees felt that, after explaining the reward system in place for pupils with behavioural difficulties, their peers '*came to ... accept it; they see that's a way forward for certain pupils*' (headteacher: primary).

## Pupil credibility

*I want to create a system whereby ... they are going to get rewards and they are going to be important to them ... I know for a fact that if there was a Year 10 end of year disco that you could only get tickets to that disco if you had 150 merits, people would die for 150 merits. They would make sure that they got their 150 merits* (deputy head: secondary).

Previous research (Kinder *et al.*, 1996; Kinder and Wilkin, 1998; Miller *et al.*, 1998) has identified the need for schools to ensure that reward systems include items which will provide an incentive for pupils – ones which will '... *command credibility and acceptance among their pupils*' (Miller *et al.*, 1998, p. 56). Respondents in the case-study schools were also aware of this fact. There were accounts in a number of schools that their reward systems were being adapted in order to keep, or increase, their 'currency' value (e.g. one school had recently instituted a system allowing merits to be exchanged for book tokens).

Throughout the sample of case-study schools, staff and youngsters noted how older pupils outgrew rewards, particularly when they remained of the type described as 'symbolic' in nature (e.g. certificates, merits and stickers). Examples of some of these typical comments of staff and pupils are given on page 29.

As these comments also show, a number of respondents noted that parent involvement with these reward systems could be a considerable factor in credibility with pupils. Positive accounts by pupils often did include reference to the affective experience of being praised and appreciated.

Another credibility issue raised by both staff and pupils was the possible 'embarrassment' factor associated with receiving rewards publicly. This factor was also identified in an earlier study by Harrop and Holmes (1993), who found that pupils rated public teacher praise much lower than did teachers. A previous NFER project (Kinder and Wilkin, 1998) identified the need for schools to be sensitive to this factor when considering reward-giving scenarios. There was some recognition of this in the case-study schools in the present study. It was noted that it was younger children who were more likely to feel comfortable about receiving rewards in a public forum. A Year 10 boy in one of the case-study schools affirmed that such sensitivity was, in fact, already a feature of his school's award ceremonies: '... *they normally*

*ask you because some people might get embarrassed; they normally ask you if you want it in assembly or do you want it in the class.*'

Some secondary staff also mentioned that, by Year 9, there was '*street cred in keeping your head down and not standing out too much*'; '*... after Year 8, they don't like standing up in assembly and being told they've done well*'. It was noteworthy that older pupils in the study tended to refer more to being '*a bit embarrassed*' about being singled out, whereas younger pupils spoke of feeling '*proud*' or '*excited*' about it: '*It just feels really good, because everyone is like looking and ... they clap you and that. When I stood up in assembly ... it made me feel really happy. Yeah, I don't usually smile, but like I was smiling then*' (male pupil: Year 5).

In sum, student and teacher views on giving rewards (see also page 36) did clearly indicate some caution about their perceived effectiveness as a way of managing behaviour, particularly so in the case of older pupils. Two examples of rewards that did seem to have more generally positive consensus from pupils and teachers are given overleaf.

**Tokens**

In the special school in the case-study sample, a system of tokens which could be exchanged for special treats or activities was in operation. At the end of each week, a 'token-pyramid' gave the pupils access to certain rewards ranging from minor treats to the ultimate prize (a motorbike ride under staff supervision). This was felt by staff to be an effective reward system, supported by rules and expectations:

> *There are very few who don't achieve the lowest layer on the pyramid. And, of course, it doesn't take them long to realise that, you know, if their behaviour is appropriate, then they will progress up the pyramid and consequently get the greater rewards at the top end of the pyramid* (deputy head).

Pupils also considered the system to be effective: being able to access the treats and activities was 'a bit of a buzz': '*... the first time I ever reached top ten I just cried, I could do everything – motorbikes, horse riding and all that*' (male: lower school).

Whilst appreciating that not reaching the required level of tokens could be hard for pupils, staff believed that they soon began to appreciate the fact that changing their behaviour brought more rewards:

> *... it seems cruel that you get the children to work towards* [the rewards], *if they haven't got enough. There's one boy who's 15 tokens short for his horses next week. He wants to ride horses, and he can't understand why he hasn't enough. We go through the book and we explain, and they're allowed to see all the records and talk it through. That boy has* [the tokens] *on the educational side but he's lost some on the care side. So he's quite upset, which is good 'cos now he knows; he's aware of trying to change his behaviour* (headteacher).

This view was endorsed by an upper school boy who realised as he moved up the school that, by not working towards the tokens, he was actually losing out: '*I didn't care at first ... as I got older I realised I was missing out on a lot of things.*'

**Letters/postcards home**

In six of the case-study secondary schools and one of the primary schools, amongst the rewards spotlighting individual achievement, staff commented on the use of letters or postcards home to parents. This was recognised as effective by both staff and pupils and seen to have a '*higher tariff*' within the reward system than, for example, merits or certificates. Letters or postcards home were believed to be appreciated by parents and pupils alike. A deputy head in one secondary school referred to them as '*a real powerful thing*'. A Year 11 girl in the same school believed that postcards home were effective because they seemed more special, '*... just because you feel like they've bothered to send it to your house*'. That pupils considered information sent home to be an effective reward is a finding which has already been recorded in a number of recent studies (Sharpe *et al.*, 1987; Merrett *et al.*, 1988; Caffyn, 1989; Harrop and Williams, 1992; Merrett and Tang, 1994; Miller *et al.*, 1998).

## Views on reward systems

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***CERTIFICATES*** | |
| ... [certificates] *look very nice in your record of achievement, but once you have got the full set in the first year, there is no incentive to get them in the second year, and by Year 9 it has tailed off quite dramatically ... I am a Year 10 form tutor and I think I have had three children who have got a bronze certificate* (SENCO: secondary). | *Because it's not only the teachers that praise you, but the children would praise you, and then you would take* [the certificates] *home to your mum and show them ... and your mums and dads ... whoever you live with, they would praise you as well* (male pupil: Year 6).<br><br>*I started getting certificates when I was seven ... I felt very nice, and tears was dropping down. Well, they were very proud of me and they took me out* (male pupil: Year 3).<br><br>*I really did feel happy when I first kept getting them, but now it's a normal thing, it's just like going out to play. I am still pleased, I still get praised a lot by my mum and that ... but now it's just a normal thing* (male pupil: Year 6).<br><br>*... at the end of the day they are just pieces of card, you have got nothing to remember from it, but like if you get rewarded by a trip out somewhere, you get to remember the trip out* (male pupil: lower school). |
| ***STICKERS*** | |
| *... these kids will do anything for stickers! It doesn't matter how old they are* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*It's no good giving them gold stars if that's not the currency that gets the achieved result. If it's a sticker with a smiley frog on it, then it's a sticker with a smiley frog. If it's a book whereby they collect the stickers and take it home to show their parents and then get a little certificate, if that works, we use those* (SENCO: primary). | *Mostly you get them until you're in about Year 9. Then you really think you don't want to bother with them any more. I've got a friend in Year 10 and she doesn't bother with them any more* (female pupil: lower school).<br><br>*In the first year I loved getting them, just taking them home, showing my mum, tell her that I have been good ...* [but now] *it's quite boring just getting them* (male pupil: lower school). |
| ***MERITS/POINTS*** | |
| *In lower school I think some of the reward system is much more ... they want to get the commendations and the merit awards. We have a merit award system that works well there but by the time you get to upper school that is a bit immature really* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*As we go through to Year 9 and upwards, the value of* [merits] *becomes less and less, the children see them as being less important* (SENCO: secondary). | *... when you get into the fourth and fifth year people start thinking what's a merit worth? ... When we were all second years, it was like 'How many merits have you got?' I think it does work with the younger pupil* (female pupil: upper school).<br><br>*At first I felt proud but then I just didn't care afterwards* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>I knew one teacher in Year 7 and she gave rewards for the tiniest little thing and so what people would do is they would do these tiniest little things so you get a point off her, and then be naughty for the rest of the lesson *(female pupil: lower school).* |

## 2.3 SANCTIONS

Inevitably some form of sanctions system for behaviour was in operation in each of the case-study schools. However, the terminology employed to describe sanctions differed between schools, interviewees referring to them variously as '*sanctions*', '*consequences*', '*behaviour checks*', '*reinforcements*' or '*withdrawal of privileges*'.

In more than half (seven) of the 11 primary schools and nearly all (ten) of the 12 secondary schools in the case-study sample, staff referred to a hierarchical system of sanctions:

> *Our sanctions range from a little 'That will do thank you, I don't want any more of that', right through to, if need be, 'I will permanently exclude', and I have done. I think since I have been here I have probably only permanently excluded two pupils, but there's a 1,001 stages in between that* (headteacher: primary school).

> *I mean in terms of having come through the hierarchy, students would be referred on from a classroom teacher to a head of year, to a senior teacher, through to deputy head, and then perhaps on to the headteacher herself ... there would be a series of pathways that they would go through, and obviously as well, we would use a temporary exclusion in some instances, but each case is looked very much at individually on its own merits* (deputy headteacher: secondary).

Generally, within the case-study schools, pupils – especially older ones – did seem to be aware of a hierarchy of sanctions operating. Several pupil interviewees referred to things '*building up*' or going in '*stages*' as behaviour worsened.

Staff in the case-study schools were in agreement that sanctions were necessary where inappropriate behaviour was concerned. However, they were also of the opinion that sanctions should not be seen in isolation, but had to function as part of a whole-school approach to behaviour management. Equally, as one secondary school SENCO pointed out, it was all about ensuring a balance between sanctions and rewards, something highlighted in the Elton Report, *Discipline in Schools* (1989):

> *I think sanctions, you know, it's getting a balance, and using sanctions where appropriate and recognition of achievement where appropriate, and it's no good saying that one is better than the other. You need both, because, obviously, if it's wholly negative, you create an unpleasant atmosphere in the school. I don't think a punitive atmosphere is healthy. If you only used*

> *sanctions, you end up driving kids out. The only way you are going to get a real change is if you bring them back in and make them feel included and valued. That is the only way you will change their behaviour significantly for the future* (SENCO: secondary).

Assessing each case on its individual merits was also considered important by a number of interviewees. In several schools, the system was felt to be flexible enough to allow for other factors to be taken into consideration before a sanction was applied:

> *Well, obviously there are sanctions when behaviour is unacceptable, but each case is looked at very much individually because where you have students with particularly special needs, or perhaps even a student who has a crisis at home, who is going through a particularly difficult period, all these factors are taken into consideration before sanctions are actually served on any individual student* (deputy headteacher: secondary).

As with reward systems, several staff interviewees raised the issue of consistency of application. In secondary schools, this could vary both between, and within, departments, something which it was believed could seriously weaken any system of sanctions. Equally, it was felt to be important for the member of staff concerned in the incident to deal with the inappropriate behaviour. Sometimes, as the deputy headteacher in one case-study secondary school pointed out, staff could undermine the system by trying to refer incidents to a higher authority, when they could be dealt with by the teacher concerned, or at least within their department.

A wide range of sanctions was mentioned by interviewees, and some noteworthy variations between the different phases and institutions. Equally, the depiction of lower-, middle- and higher-order sanctions, as usefully identified by Merrett *et al.* (1988), was in evidence. In this study, the authors defined 'lower-order' sanctions as those '*at the direct disposal of the class teacher*', 'middle-order' sanctions as involving '*some other management staff*' and 'higher-order' sanctions as '*actions involving higher management*' (pp. 144-5).

In all, eight major types of sanction were referenced by the sample, with the following hierarchy noted:

- reprimand, e.g. verbal warning, name on board
- registering inappropriate behaviour, e.g. behaviour slips, incident sheets

- loss of personal time, e.g. detention, missing breaktime/lunchtime
- loss of privilege, e.g. points, tokens, special activity/treats
- parental contact/involvement
- ongoing surveillance, e.g. on report, behaviour contracts
- removal (internal), e.g. time out, moving to another class, withdrawal unit
- removal (external), e.g. fixed-term exclusion, permanent exclusion, lunchtime exclusion, temporarily sending home.

**Reprimand**, e.g. verbal warning, name on board

This lower-order sanction involved some usually public declaration of a pupil's inappropriate behaviour, and no doubt could be seen as the basic tool in any teacher's sanction repertoire. It was notable that some of the practitioners identified as effective managers of behaviour recounted how they often avoided making this sanction public (e.g. by using eye contact instead, speaking to the offender in private later, publicly acknowledging only good behaviour). Alternatively, they ensured a reprimand was delivered in a way that conveyed no personal animosity towards the recipient, and sometimes Assertive Discipline (AD) was seen as an effective system for depersonalising the reprimand.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***REPRIMAND: verbal warning/name on board*** | |
| *I think our system is very good because they know exactly what's going to happen to them. If they step out of line once, they know they will get a warning, and when they go on ... it does prevent a lot of them going any further* (English teacher: secondary). | *If you are naughty, you get warned and if you don't stop, you get a punishment and you stop doing it then* (male pupil: lower school). |
| *I can say 'I am sorry, but I am putting your name down'. It does not need to be a confrontation, I do not need to get angry ... it takes the heat out of the situation for that child but they know that they have been sanctioned and that is why it is acceptable, I think* (class teacher: primary). | *Some kids don't really care or listen. They always get their names put up. But it works for most pupils* (male pupil: lower school). |
| *The name on the blackboard really upsets some children, but the ones that are really hard-faced, it doesn't upset them at all. They like to see their name on the blackboard. I think this system is brilliant as long as you have not got someone who is a real problem* (class teacher: primary). | *... it's just because the kids don't really think getting your name on the board is that serious* (male pupil: Year 6). |

**Registering inappropriate behaviour**, e.g. behaviour slips, incident sheets

Essentially, this sanction type formalised an occasion of inappropriate behaviour by recording all information about the incident, including action to be taken. These could then be filed so that either further action could be taken, or parents could be informed, if the same pupils featured too often. The effectiveness of this system was thought by staff to depend on the consistency with which it was applied, and whether the staff to whom the slips were meant to be sent actually received the copies. Pupil interviewees seemed to think the system would be more effective if parents were also informed.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***REGISTERING INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOUR: incident sheets*** | |
| *I wouldn't say that always worked brilliantly, but it is there, and you can make yourself known as a form tutor who wants those pieces of paper* (form tutor: secondary). | *... if you don't tell your parents then they won't know because they don't go home. All it is is they go to your house group, your form tutor and your teacher keeps one, you get three* (male pupil: lower school). |

**Loss of personal time**, e.g. detention, missing breaktime/lunchtime

This sanction type, essentially involving deprivation of pupils' social and/or leisure opportunities, was again usually within the remit of class teachers. It was noticeably less evident in off-site provision. Equally, among the case-study secondary schools, there were a number of staff and pupils who questioned the value and effectiveness of detention.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***LOSS OF PERSONAL TIME (e.g. breaktime, end of lesson)*** | |
| *The children enjoy going out at playtime. They enjoy having the choice. They don't find it a very pleasant experience being on their own and not talking to other children ... what we're doing is encouraging them to think about what they've done ... to actually decide what they are going to do about their behaviour* (class teacher: primary).<br><br>*... if I am to be honest, the one that hits the kids the worst is if I don't let them mix with their peers breaktimes and lunchtimes. That is the one that really hurts them. In other words, 'You go to all your lessons, petal, but your free time is spent with me'. That one they do not like* (head of year: secondary). | *... he don't like staying in* [at playtime] *'cos all his mates are out playing and he gets a bit bored* (female pupil: Year 6).<br><br>*I don't think they like it 'cos it is taking some of your playtime away* (male pupil: Year 5). |
| ***detention*** | |
| *It is always the same children ... but those children are never going to change* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*Detentions are a joke ... hopeless ... although some staff want to bring them back on a Friday night. There is no point but if they want to they can, if they want to waste their time, that is up to them. They still get kids copying out, you know. What a good idea ... so extra work is a punishment is it?* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*I don't think any student relishes the prospect of detentions* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*I don't think* [detention] *does work for children who have particularly challenging behaviour because you find them going into detention again and again, if you don't actually look at what's happening to them and why* (acting head of year: middle school). | *I don't like them much because they are boring, you have to sit there, but they don't bother me that much* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>*The first few detentions I had I didn't like 'em and then I just started getting used to them ... and not really bothered about them ... my mum and that lot never even bothered about punishing me, the first few times they did and then my mum just says 'Oh, if you get done it's your fault not mine; it's your time that you are losing not mine'* (male pupil: off-site, Year 8).<br><br>*It's like 30 minutes ... you just sit there, you do a bit of work and then you just have to sit there and do it all again. It just gets quite tiring after a while* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>*... people don't like getting after-school detentions because it's wasting an hour of your time then, so they try and behave as much as they can* (male: upper school). |

**Loss of privilege**, e.g. points, tokens, special activity/treats

This lower-order sanction type was much more evident in off-site units and primary schools, perhaps due to the system requiring sustained, ongoing contact with the young person, in order that opportunities for regaining such credits could also be offered. A system of losing team or class points, which then involved peer pressure, was also mentioned as a successful strategy in one primary school.

**Parental contact/involvement**

This sanction type, effectively a middle-order sanction by virtue of involving significant others, was again particularly mentioned by primary schools, though clearly parental involvement was also an aspect of higher-order 'removal' sanctions such as exclusion. The important distinction seemed to be whether the parent was invited to share in the process of improving their child's behaviour (including celebrating any subsequent achievement or success), or whether parental contact was merely one component of a reprisal: their involvement, in effect, only symbolising the seriousness of the child's behavioural difficulty.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| *PARENTAL CONTACT* | |
| *... it's a very effective thing with children if their parents are involved in it, and often it will stop them before it happens, and they also know that she really will – it's not just a threat; it's something that has happened. But it's kind of once or twice a term. It's not a regular thing at all* (class teacher: primary). | *... if we're really, really bad, I think they should get in contact with the parents a bit more; they do do that ... I think it would be a good thing* (male pupil: Year 6). |

**Ongoing surveillance**, e.g. on report, behaviour contracts

Particularly evident in the case-study secondary schools, this sanction essentially involved some formal monitoring of the youngster's behaviour over a period of time by numbers of staff. It was noticeable that very few schools mentioned behaviour contracts or Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs) in this context, which may indicate how a directly remediating role was not always the intent. How far any such formal monitoring was meant to supportively alter – rather than merely arrest – behavioural problems may be questioned in some instances. Some staff indeed noted that effectiveness of this type of sanction depended on the youngster seeing the surveillance '*as a positive step, not a punishment*'.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***ONGOING SURVEILLANCE: on report/monitoring card*** | |
| *It's a very cumbersome procedure because it takes time in a lesson and it relies on a student remembering it* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*A lot of youngsters, actually putting them on report has quite a positive effect, because if they haven't got much self-confidence, something like actually having a report where they can actually see that they are achieving. I actually have youngsters come to me asking me to put them on report* (head of middle school: secondary).<br><br>*The monitoring card will only work if the child also sees the effectiveness of it and sees the monitoring card as a positive step, not as a punishment. It is in the form of a timetable. If they get a whole day with no negatives, they get an extra* [reward point] (head of year: secondary). | *You are just your normal self or whatever you normally do and you just get it signed and that's all it is really, just to show your teachers how you are, it don't really make any difference* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>*... we've got all our mates and we call it a gang, and we're like cool, sort of like cool and all that, and they think it's cool to be on, but I don't. ... if someone else gets on report, we think it's cool and they don't* (male pupil: Year 5). |

**Removal (internal)**, e.g. time out, moving to another class, withdrawal unit

This type of sanction, which could be applied as a lower-, middle- or higher-order reprisal, essentially involved removing the youngster from the milieu in which their inappropriate behaviour was surfacing. 'Time out' perhaps differed from other removal strategies in that it allowed the youngster some self-determination in instigating or ending their time away from that usual location, and, again such an approach was little spoken about in the secondary sample. (Examples in primary schools included a seat in the secretary's room where a child could cuddle a teddy bear until his anger/anxiety subsided, or a designated 'quiet' corner within the classroom. One secondary school had instigated 'time out' cards for pupils to give to their teacher if they felt they could not cope with the classroom setting.)

Another removal sanction often mentioned by interviewees typically involved placing the youngster in a different classroom. Apart from the '*immediacy*' and curtailing the 'oxygen of publicity' factor, teachers noted this as essentially having a chastening effect, largely due to the youngster's proximity with older or younger pupils. One SENCO noted: '*It's very effective; they don't like being in with other kids, especially if they're older than them.*'

Internal removal could also be a higher-order sanction when it involved containment within special units, quiet rooms and so on, often under the supervision of senior staff. As previous research (Kinder and Wilkin, 1998; Kinder *et al.*, 1996) has indicated, there were many permutations of this approach – short-stay (pupils contained until the end of the lesson or the day) as well as longer-term occupancy, involving several days or weeks. From the pupils' perspective, this sanction was essentially experienced as a social or stimulus deprivation. In only a few instances, behaviour modification or management programmes accompanied this internal removal and it was rare to find any reference to pupils having self-referral opportunities.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***REMOVAL: INTERNAL*** | |
| *The reason the kids hate the quiet room is that they know that a letter gets sent home to their parents. They also hate the quiet room itself ... I mean at the moment it is an awful place and it looks awful and it's tatty and it's dismal* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>[It works] *because there are children who like to get externally excluded because they like to have a good old doss. Well I'm sorry, that doesn't happen here. You're internally excluded. I mean, we do it upstairs wherever we can, but usually you go up to learning support ... They don't like being away from their peers and it seems to have a positive effect* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*I think it's got its place in school. The way it's handled and the way it's set up, we think, it's very negative* (behaviour support teacher: secondary). | *The quiet room is just somewhere where they just sit there and there's a teacher on duty, and they just sit there and do nothing, or they write lines or something ... I don't think it really does* [work] *because most of the people that go to the quiet room go about once or twice a week* (female pupil: lower school).<br><br>*I have done much better like that, I have done loads of work, because there's not the other kids like, you know* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>*I have done loads more work ... because you are on your own. All day I have been on my own, sitting at the back of a room, getting on with your own, nobody to talk to. If you just sit there, you just get bored, so all you can do is work to amuse yourself. I did 12 sheets of all French writing. I was really proud of myself for doing that* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>[They work] *because they keep you away from your friends and you don't see your friends and you don't know if you are going to see them all day or whether you are going to be able to find them to go with them at lunch* (female pupil: lower school). |

**Removal (external)**, e.g. lunchtime exclusion, temporarily sending home, fixed-term exclusion, permanent exclusion

The higher-order sanction of exclusion perhaps needs little additional comment. In this sample of case-study schools, three secondaries, one primary and one off-site unit referred to their recent use of permanent exclusion. Five of the secondary sample

noted recent fixed-term exclusions. The usual tensions emerged between whether the purpose of the exclusion was as an effective reprisal or remedy for inappropriate behaviour, or whether its main function was the safeguarding of other pupils and staff. Again, as in previous NFER studies, the efficacy of exclusion as an effective sanction was regularly challenged by teacher and pupil interviewees. Where exclusion was used as a defusion technique, followed by planned and supportive reintegration programmes, its value seemed less in doubt. Involvement of parents was often highlighted as a key factor, and lunchtime exclusion in primary school or sending home until parents came into school were noted as successful strategies to engage parents in the management of their child's behaviour.

| TEACHER COMMENT | PUPIL COMMENT |
|---|---|
| ***REMOVAL: EXTERNAL*** | |
| ***exclusion*** | |
| *I don't see it as a negative thing, and I always talk to the parents in terms of the positive side of it, the time to be away and to calm down and reflect, and the positive act of putting it back together again through the contract, and making a fresh start* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*I don't see exclusion as a very effective form of discipline ... I think that in some cases, exclusions are now used ... it's like we have tried keeping them in at playtime, the next situation on is exclusion. And I think that is an inappropriate form of exclusion* (headteacher: primary). | *... they're sort of getting what they want then. It's like a weekend* (female pupil: Year 6).<br><br>*... they just think it's a holiday, don't they? Because I used to for the first, second time, but then I have had plenty more and I am like on my last chance, so I know how bad it is, because people just take it like a holiday, they keep on doing it and doing it* (male pupil: lower school).<br><br>*... making them go home, that's what they want, isn't it? Not many children like school and if you send them home, then that's what they want basically* (female pupil: lower school). |
| ***sending home until parents come into school*** | |
| *... probably our most successful sanction ... they want them back in school for whatever reason, so we get them hotfoot back up and then once we have got the parents with us in the room, and they look at what's happening with things we have done, then 99 per cent of times we are successful* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*... in terms of punishments, we have very few. Our main sanction would be to send children home to cool down and to get parents in. We use that to bring parents in to talk through issues a lot, because really, a lot of the problems tend to be home-based as well, and if we can work with a united front, we make progress, with parents and home* (headteacher: off-site). | |
| ***lunchtime exclusion*** | |
| *Parents hate lunchtime exclusion – it puts pressure on them to encourage their child to behave* (headteacher: primary). | |

Put together, sanctions within school seemed to be applying two main discomforting stimuli – social and/or leisure deprivation and public exposure. Their intent seemed to be that, having experienced this discomfort, the youngster would not want it to recur. It may be noteworthy that the repertoire of lower-order sanctions (e.g. reprimand, loss of personal time) within the remit of classroom practitioners particularly seemed to have these deprivation principles as their basis. Any regenerative function of a sanction, or efforts to guide behaviour and enrol the support of significant others (like parents), was usually only within the remit of more senior teachers or even external agencies. Perhaps when opportunities for regeneration are dislocated from reprisal in this way, ineffectiveness is the inevitable outcome.

Indeed, the views of staff and pupils on a range of sanctions illustrated above does clearly demonstrate the caution with which many respondents viewed components of their school's sanctions system.

Finally, it might be noteworthy that there seemed generally to be a lack of symmetry between rewards and sanctions. The deprivation of some aspect of young people's real enjoyment (contact with peers/friends and personal leisure time) was not in many instances matched by giving such pleasurable experience directly as a reward. Indeed, successful reward systems, particularly for older pupils, seemed to incorporate this equivalence.

**Research vignette: Responsibility for behaviour across the school**

Senior managers and teachers were requested to indicate who was the first person responsible for dealing with incidents of problematic or challenging behaviour and then what was a typical chain of responsibility. The question was posed for '*typical*' and '*serious*' behaviour problems and also for those occurring '*within the classroom*' and '*generally around school*'.

Typical and serious behaviour problems within class were felt unanimously to be dealt with first by individual teachers, with the head of department the second to be involved in both kinds of incidents. Form tutors were not readily nominated for any involvement in serious problem behaviour in class. Typical behaviour problems around school most commonly involved pastoral staff (form tutors and then head of year), while serious problems again did not often include form tutors.

The high profile of head of department in managing classroom behaviour was very apparent: could this tier management be a key to the elusive 'consistency' of approaches to behaviour noted so often in secondary schools? Equally noteworthy was the low involvement of form tutors in any behaviour incidents in class or any serious incidents around school. If a supportive and ongoing relationship with their charges is a key feature of the form tutor role, this omission may be a reflection of current limitations of the pastoral system.

Respondents were asked to nominate examples of what might constitute typical and serious behaviour incidents, in class and around school. More than one example could be given.

Tables A–D give the results of these nominations, from both the senior manager and teacher subsamples.

| **Table A: Examples of typical behaviour problems in class** | **Senior Managers** n=153 cases **% of cases** | **Teachers** n = 481 cases **% of cases** |
|---|---|---|
| Refusal to do work/uncooperative | 18 | 34 |
| Talking/not on task | 40 | 31 |
| Disrupting/distracting | 35 | 21 |
| Self-management: (e.g. failure to complete homework/bring correct books/ turn up on time) | 9 | 10 |
| Disrespect/rude to teacher | 4 | 8 |
| Confrontational approach to teacher | 2 | 4 |

| **Table B: Examples of typical behaviour problems around the school** | **Senior Managers** n = 155 cases **% of cases** | **Teachers** n = 436 cases **% of cases** |
|---|---|---|
| Boisterous/rowdy/swearing | 25 | 26 |
| Verbal abuse/bullying (of pupils) | 34 | 21 |
| Hitting/fighting | 13 | 19 |
| Disregarding instructions | 6 | 9 |
| Damage to property | 7 | 9 |
| Rudeness to staff | 5 | 6 |

| **Table C: Examples of serious behaviour problems in the class** | **Senior Managers** n = 133 cases **% of cases** | **Teachers** n = 427 cases **% of cases** |
|---|---|---|
| Defiant/verbal abuse of teacher | 44 | 40 |
| Fighting/threatening another pupil | 13 | 31 |
| Clear refusal to do work | 25 | 19 |
| Disrespect to staff | 5 | 6 |
| Damage to classroom | 2 | 5 |
| Assault on teacher | 5 | 4 |

| **Table D: Examples of serious behaviour problems around the school** | **Senior Managers** n = 148 cases **% of cases** | **Teachers** n = 430 cases **% of cases** |
|---|---|---|
| Fighting/hitting another pupil | 45 | 48 |
| Bullying/racial abuse | 22 | 28 |
| Damage to property | 16 | 14 |
| Physical assault/violence (unspecified) | 13 | 8 |
| Verbal abuse of staff | 7 | 7 |
| Theft | 4 | 4 |
| Drug/substance abuse | 1 | 2 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

The noteworthy aspects of these rankings is the high incidence of pupil-to-pupil problems around school noted by both samples. Compared with senior managers, teachers were much more likely to nominate pupil/pupil problem behaviour in class as a serious incident and to recognise non-cooperation and refusal to work as typical behaviour problems.

***Rewards and sanctions: key findings***

- A large and diverse array of rewards was operating within the schools in the case-study sample. The majority of these offered 'symbolic' outcomes (certificates, merits, points) which often had less currency with particularly older pupils.
- The importance of embedding any rewards system within a whole-school approach to behaviour was stressed.
- There was a need for consistency and fairness in the application of any rewards system, including ensuring rewards were accessible to both lower- and higher-achieving pupils.
- Finding rewards with some credibility/currency value, especially for older pupils, was not easy.
- The value of including parents in their child's receipt of any reward for behaviour was raised in a number of instances.
- It was noted that pupils needed to learn to take responsibility for their behaviour, rather than simply becoming 'reward-dependent'.
- Many sanctions within the remit of mainstream classroom practitioners appeared to focus on deprivation and public display of disapproval: regenerative and supportive strategies were often available only to more senior staff.

# CHAPTER 3
# PASTORAL SYSTEMS IN SCHOOL

## 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The survey phase of the project asked secondary school teachers and senior managers a number of closed and open questions about the pastoral system currently operating in their institution. The research wished to elicit:

- the range of pastoral systems in place;
- the amount of time spent on pastoral work; and
- views on the contribution of pastoral activity to effective behaviour management in school.

Prior to the survey, interviews in all the 12 case-study secondary schools had also collected accounts of each institution's particular type of pastoral system, and staff opinion about its role in managing behaviour. Issues raised in these enquiries, including the amount of time available for pastoral work, were explored further in the questionnaire. Within the case-study sample, the most common form of pastoral system (operating in three-quarters of the sample) was that of form tutors and heads of year. In three of these schools, form tutors and heads of year followed through from Year 7 to Year 11 with their pupils. Half the schools in the sample had a head of lower and a head of upper school. One school operated a vertical pastoral system and this is described in Figure 3.1 below.

## 3.2 TYPES OF PASTORAL SYSTEM

In the survey, senior management representatives, but not teachers, were asked to indicate what type of pastoral system currently applied in their school. The respondents were asked to tick one of five possible suggested systems in evidence in the case studies and were also offered the opportunity to specify their particular system if the pre-set options did not apply to their school. The number and percentage of responses are set out in Table 3.1 (in all, 26 respondents did not supply details from the pre-set options).

**Figure 3.1**

**VERTICAL PASTORAL SYSTEM**

This case-study school was an 11-18 comprehensive, in an urban location with approximately 1,300 pupils on roll and a fairly stable staff of 75.6 fte. Traditionally seen as serving a working-class area and one with a low academic profile, the school had recently increased its number of pupils from middle-class areas and now catered for pupils from various backgrounds and areas, ranging from owner occupier housing to local authority housing. It had 21 feeder schools, but the majority of pupils came from within a two-mile radius of the school. Senior management commented that the school had always been '*very proactive pastorally*'.

The school operated a vertical pastoral system and this consisted of vertically grouped tutor groups with 27-28 pupils in each (approximately five or six pupils from each year of the school), within six houses. Each house then had a head of house, an assistant head of house and seven tutors. Hence nine pastoral staff were associated with approximately 180 pupils. In addition, there were two assistant headteachers, one with key stage 3 and one with key stage 4 responsibility, including pastoral.

Interviewees in the school were positive about this system. The pastoral deputy headteacher believed it allowed for greater integration of pupils socially, and thus had a calming effect on the whole school. One of its greatest strengths was felt to be the fact that it reduced bullying between year groups. Each form had pupils from all five year groups, so they got to know each other well and it removed much of the fear or worry for younger pupils:

> [We] *haven't got the Year 8's syndrome – 'We're not the bottom year group any more, so as soon as Year 7 arrive fresh, we can take it out on them' – because in the vertical tutor group you're using Year 8s as your guides for the new Year 7s and they get to know each other quite quickly.* [Equally] *you might be sitting next to a Year 11 in the same tutor group and they're not those horrible people who are six foot four and don't wear uniform. You know, they are fairly ordinary kids who've got a lot of pressure for GCSE* (senior manager).

> ... *from day one, the new first year student meets Year 8, 9, 10 and 11 and that idea of 'big kids' in the school disappears to a large extent. The gang warfare – Year 10 versus Year 11 – does not exist, because right from the start they're thrown in at the deep end and they meet basically 40 little families around the school and they become part of one* (head of house).

The system was also believed to have strengths from a parental point of view. Where siblings were in the school, parents had only one point of contact, instead of having to deal with more than one tutor as they would in a year-based system. Having brothers and sisters in the same tutor groups meant that stronger relationships could be forged between home and school. It was recognised that contact with the home had been much improved, especially since discipline had become devolved more to departments, but there was still felt to be some room for improvement. A further advantage of the system, raised by one head of house, was the fact that where issues arose with a particular year group of pupils (e.g. option choices), tutors could be more easily available for the few pupils from that year in their form than they could if they had 30 pupils of the same age to deal with.

Within the vertical pastoral system, differentiated communication was raised as an area which could be developed. In terms of delivering a pastoral curriculum, tutors often found it difficult to find activities which would be suitable for the range of age groups with which they were dealing. Equally, assemblies could be difficult because of the range of ages. As a result of this, the school tended to organise year group assemblies with keystage coordinators. Administratively, the system was felt to be quite complex and, in many ways, resource-intensive. For example, the attendance profile was computerised but programmed to read alphabetical year groups. With the vertical system, it had to read five Year 11 pupils, five Year 10 pupils and so on, in their alphabetical order. Interviewees in the school were all in favour of the vertical pastoral system, though it was recognised that some school staff might find it difficult to come to terms with the varying demands placed on them by such a system, and would prefer a year-based version. It was a case of weighing up the pros and cons of the system and deciding which way was actually the most appropriate:

> *Maybe in a year's time what we'll need to do is to look at that balance and convince ourselves that the communication deficit is really being balanced by positive advantages* (senior manager).

**Table 3.1 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of different pastoral systems**

| System | Number of Schools N = 94 | % |
|---|---|---|
| College/house | 7 | 7 |
| Head of year and form tutors follow through with pupils | 61 | 65 |
| Head of year and form tutors stay within same year while pupils move on | 8 | 9 |
| Form tutors only follow through with pupils | 18 | 19 |
| Vertically grouped forms | 0 | 0 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey, 1997–8.*

By far and away the most common system of pastoral care involved both heads of year and form tutors following through with their pupils; very nearly two-thirds of the schools operated this way. The next most frequent pastoral approach (in nearly one-fifth of the sample) was that in which the form tutors alone followed through with their pupils. Less than one in ten schools had a college or house system, or one where the head of year and form tutor stayed within the same year while pupils moved on.

Other variations did emerge as some respondents made additional and qualifying comments. These included: pastoral staff being able to choose to remain static or move on; and some systems where only certain staff followed through with their form or year, usually within a key stage. Seven of the survey schools noted they did not have heads of year, but heads of lower and upper school or key stage managers/coordinators.

Locale of school emerged as a statistically significant variable associated with type of pastoral system. Self-defined 'suburban' schools were far more likely to have college or house systems than those nominating themselves as in 'small/medium town' or 'inner-city' settings. Rural schools were the subsample most likely to use the system whereby only form tutors (and not pastoral middle managers) followed through with their group. One in three rural schools mentioned this arrangement. No inner-city school or those in the highest band of free school meals had a system whereby pastoral staff remained static within a particular year group while pupils moved on.

Size of school was another statistically significant variable associated with type of pastoral system. Four out of five large schools (over 1,000 pupils) used the system of form tutor and head of year following through with their charges, compared with only half of the small schools (up to 700 pupils). No 'large' school had a system whereby heads of year and form tutors remained static while pupil groups moved on. Half of the 18 schools where only form tutors followed on with their groups were in the category 'small'. No statistically significant association was found between type of pastoral system and achievement at key stage 3, or levels of exclusions and unauthorised absence.

Put together, the findings suggest that form tutors are almost invariably linked to one pupil group for substantial periods of youngsters' school careers. This seems particularly the case in schools where relationships between staff and pupils might be affected by the sheer scale of the institution and socio-economic differences. How far that relationship is fully exploited to effect positive behaviour is a key question and issue to be further examined.

### 3.3 AMOUNT OF TIME ON PASTORAL WORK

Senior managers were asked to indicate the number of contact hours per week between form tutors and their forms. Responses were then quantified using half-an-hour bands of time. From this, it was clear that the most usual amount of weekly contact was in the range two to two-and-a-half hours, and almost one in five schools (19 per cent) had between two-and-a-half hours and three hours of contact time. The precise range of times is given in full in Table 3.2 below and perhaps reflects, in part, the degree to which form tutors deliver PSE programmes.

**Table 3.2 Effective behaviour management in schools: amount of contact time between form tutors and their pupils per week**

| Time spent with pupils by form tutors | Number of Schools N = 118* | % |
|---|---|---|
| Zero | 2 | 2 |
| Less than one hour | 1 | 1 |
| 1 hour to 1 hour 29 minutes | 17 | 14 |
| 1 hour 30 minutes to 2 hours | 23 | 19 |
| 2 hours to 2 hours 29 minutes | 28 | 23 |
| 2 hours 30 minutes to 3 hours | 22 | 19 |
| 3 hours to 3 hours 29 minutes | 16 | 14 |
| 3 hours 30 minutes to 4 hours | 1 | 1 |
| 4 hours to 4 hours 59 minutes | 1 | 1 |
| 5 hours or more | 2 | 2 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey, 1997–8.*
* *Five non-responses*

Above all, the findings suggest that pupils in different schools can have quite startlingly different amounts of pastoral contact with their form tutor. Variation ranged from 'none' to five hours per week.

Small schools were more likely to have lower amounts of contact time between form tutors and students – half of this subsample had less than two hours. No school within the highest English as a Second Language (ESL) numbers had less than two hours' form tutor contact.

The number of hours per week given to those with pastoral management responsibilities was also of interest. In the senior managers' questionnaire, a request to '*indicate the number of non-contact hours per week for those with pastoral responsibilities*' was made. Pastoral roles such as head of year and heads of upper and lower school were offered as pre-set options, as well as an opportunity to itemise any other personnel with a pastoral management role.

As Tables 3.3 and 3.4 show, once again, a considerable variation in time allocation emerged from the sample, with pastoral roles of greater seniority (and hence presumably with responsibility for a higher number of pupils) being consistently

awarded more time for their pastoral duties. This is particularly interesting given their low involvement in minor behaviour incidents (see Research vignette at the end of Chapter 2). Table 3.3 shows the extent of the range of non-contact time, as well as the average for each role.

**Table 3.3 Effective behaviour management in schools: amount of non-contact time for staff with pastoral responsibilities**

| Role | No. of Responses | Average (hours) | Minimum (hours) | Maximum (hours) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Head of year | 90 | 6 | 1 | 18 |
| Head of upper school | 41 | 8 | 1 | 35 |
| Head of lower school | 40 | 8 | 1 | 35 |
| Deputy head | 12 | 12 | 2 | 20 |
| Head of house | 11 | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| Senior teacher | 9 | 10 | 4 | 15 |
| Deputy head of year | 7 | 6 | 1 | 15 |

Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey, 1997–8.*

Looking further at the range of non-contact time by role type (see Table 3.4), the most common time allocation for heads of year was between five and seven hours, while eight-plus hours was the most likely for heads of upper and lower school. More than half the sample's heads of year had five to seven hours of non-contact time; less than one in five had more than eight hours. For year heads, size of school – and hence the number of pupil charges – seemed the only statistically significant variable. For instance, no head of year in a small school (700 or less) had as much as nine-plus hours of non-contact time. In other words, issues like the degree of pupil need did not seem a determinant of non-contact time: variables like free school meals or school location did not register as statistically significant. (However, one notable finding was that five of the seven schools with the highest unauthorised absence rates all had less than two hours of head of year non-contact time.)

**Table 3.4 Effective behaviour management in schools: the range of pastoral non-contact time**

| Role | | Amount of Non-contact Time per Week | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4 or less | | 5-7 hours | | 8+ hours | |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Head of year | (N=90) | 23 | 26 | 50 | 56 | 17 | 18 |
| Head of upper school | (N=41) | 6 | 15 | 15 | 36 | 20 | 49 |
| Head of lower school | (N=40) | 7 | 18 | 15 | 37 | 18 | 45 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey, 1997–8.*

Views on this issue of amount of non-contact time were directly requested in a closed question to senior managers and also the secondary teacher sample. In a subsequent question, both samples were asked whether the statement '*There is **insufficient** time for staff to undertake their pastoral responsibilities*' accurately reflected their school's current practice for managing pupil behaviour. In all, over half (59 per cent) of senior managers agreed there was insufficient time for pastoral work in their school, while more than a third (38 per cent) felt this was not the case. Just less than one in ten (nine per cent) of senior managers responded they were '*not sure*'. In contrast, nearly three-quarters (72 per cent) of teachers concurred that staff currently did not have sufficient time for their pastoral responsibilities, while only one in six (17 per cent) indicated there was sufficient time.

Once again, some variation in teacher subsamples emerged. The groups most strongly in agreement with the statement about lack of time for pastoral work were: teachers over 46 years old (80 per cent); those teaching in the area of communications (e.g. English) (83 per cent); pastoral staff (77 per cent) and female teachers (74 per cent). Curriculum managers (heads of department or deputy heads of department), male teachers, those under 35 and those teaching maths/science and humanities were more likely to reject the statement (20 per cent or more of these subsamples did so) or to state they were '*not sure*'.

## 3.4 THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PASTORAL SYSTEM TO BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

### Survey sample

A further question asked senior management respondents to state whether their pastoral system made '*... a significant distinctive contribution to the effective behaviour of all pupils*'. Overwhelmingly, despite conveying a range of different pastoral approaches and time allocations, the response was positive, with 91 per cent of the senior manager sample answering in the affirmative, only three per cent replying '*no*', and seven per cent indicating they were '*not sure*'.

Reasons for their particular response were also requested and over a third of the respondents supplied these. Most commonly, senior managers pinpointed the stability which their system offered, i.e. the fact that form tutors and heads of year got to know their students well, and that this contributed to '*consistency*' for pupils This kind of comment came from some 25 schools. The positive link between parents and school provided by the form tutor was mentioned in only three cases and three respondents similarly pointed out the benefits of the house system for ensuring sibling/family connection. However, the house system was criticised for being '*divisive as each has isolated methodologies*' by one respondent, and two respondents noted their preference for the year system rather than a house approach. Finally, four senior managers volunteered at this point that there was a need for further non-contact time.

### Case-study schools

A similar set of issues and positive comments emerged from the case-study data. Overall, regardless of the **type** of pastoral system, there was consensus among interviewees that it did make a positive contribution to the management of behaviour in schools.

Each system was generally seen as underpinning the school's approach to behaviour management. It was considered by a deputy headteacher in one case-study secondary school to make '*a huge contribution*'; by a SENCO to be '*brilliant*'; and by one headteacher to be '*... the backbone of the school ... the foundation for everything else that goes on in the school*'. Staff believed that, in order to be effective, a pastoral

system needed to be supportive and strong, though not '*a heavy system*' (headteacher). This was important in terms of supporting pupils experiencing difficulties, but also in terms of providing support for teachers, especially the more inexperienced ones.

The form tutor was felt by several respondents to play the pivotal role within any pastoral system. They were in the best position to be able to build up relationships with the pupils in their form. As a result, they functioned as the first point of contact between home and school. The form tutor would then be involved in any problems the pupil may have in school. Equally, as one SENCO pointed out, for form tutors, the fact that they were going to have the same form for five years, meant that it was worth investing time and effort in those relationships.

The importance of the role of middle manager pastoral staff like heads of year was also recognised. It was felt that they had an overview of what was happening in school with the pupils in their year. Pupils could approach them individually to discuss problems, or alternatively, pupils might be invited in by their head of year to discuss behavioural issues. Equally, heads of year were in the position to be able to refer things on, either to a higher authority within the school, or through working with other agencies, such as the Education Welfare Service (EWS) or the Behaviour Support Service (BSS). The dedication and conscientiousness of such staff, especially when dealing with such large numbers of pupils, was also highlighted. In only one of the secondary schools, staff commented that heads of department also had a key role in behaviour management, which meant they could work with pastoral staff on behavioural issues, thus linking the pastoral with the academic and creating a more cohesive approach.

Several issues emerged when case-study staff were asked to itemise challenges or suggest how the pastoral system might be improved. Some staff interviewees identified better **communication** between pastoral and curriculum staff as an area for development. It was recognised that the pastoral care of students should be the responsibility of everybody in the school and not just the pastoral staff. It was thought to be difficult for one staff member to be responsible for so many, the relationship

often then becoming impersonal. The need for increased quality time with pupils was highlighted:

> *It's impossible to be pastorally in charge of hundreds because you never get to know them, it becomes impersonal, you know. It has to* [be that way]; *you have efficient systems but kids don't always fit systems* (deputy head: off-site).

A second concern commonly expressed was the **role of the form tutor** being in need of development. Some respondents felt that form tutors should have more involvement in what was happening with the pupils in their form. Sometimes, it was possible for behavioural incidents to reach a fairly high level within the school, without the form tutor being aware:

> *Sometimes, the form tutor is never finding out what's happened. He's got this kid. He hears in the staffroom every now and then that this kid's not so good. Suddenly it's up at head of year level and it's gone to the SENCO and out and the kid is* [at the PRU]. *The form tutor actually doesn't know what's going on, and I think they should* (teacher: off-site).

Beyond that, the issue of **training in pastoral work** was raised. There was a recognition that initial teacher training (ITT) did not cover pastoral work, and therefore new teachers might be lacking in confidence in this area. At the same time, longer-serving staff could be quite set in their ways and not always open to different approaches:

> *Sadly, I have to say, in my opinion, a lot of new teachers have never been trained to work pastorally ... as well, some of the best people we've got pastorally are the least qualified. They are the natural sort of teachers. And some of the best qualified teachers are the ones that cause me problems. They see things in black and white. They're here to pass on knowledge and if a kid's going to be devious or awkward, there's a conflict instead of winning them round and getting them to work with you* (head of house: secondary).

In summary, the question might be asked how far, or if, schools currently can fully exploit the potential of pastoral roles to ensure stable, positive and supportive teacher–pupil relationships. Do pastoral systems function for the benefit of administrative efficiency rather more that to improve the affective lives of the young people and adults within the school?

***Pastoral systems: key findings***

- A range of pastoral systems was in evidence in the case-study schools, including house systems and vertical grouping. From the survey, the most common pastoral organisation involved head of year and form tutors following through with the school careers of their charges.

- Contact time between form tutors and pupils varied: about a quarter of the survey schools nominated between two and two-and-a-half hours a week. However, instances of schools providing less than one hour and up to five hours a week were also recorded.

- The amount of non-contact time for pastoral managers also showed much variation: the variable of size of school seemed to play a part here. It was evident that large schools (rather than those with, say, high free school meals numbers or inner-city settings) consistently provided more non-contact time for pastoral managers.

- Fifty-nine per cent of senior managers but 72 per cent of teachers felt there was insufficient time for carrying out pastoral responsibilities.

- Training in pastoral work, developing the role of the form tutor and better communication between pastoral and curriculum managers were cited as areas for development in the case-study schools.

# PART TWO
# MANAGING BEHAVIOUR: SPECIAL APPROACHES

## CHAPTER 4
## STRATEGIES FOR BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on interviews with a range of school staff from the case-study schools, this chapter illustrates a number of initiatives or strategies in place which were nominated as being specifically aimed at behavioural difficulties. The chapter attempts to provide an overview or audit of the range of strategies mentioned, as well as some cameo descriptions of individual schools' initiatives.

### 4.2 AN AUDIT OF STRATEGIES

Interviewees were asked to describe any strategies which were in place to address behavioural difficulties and a wide range of initiatives emerged. Overall, these could be considered as having two different intents.

In some instances, the schools mentioned strategies which had a clear **general preventative** or **diagnostic** focus with regard to behaviour difficulties. These initiatives were essentially aimed at the whole school population, or some general subsample (e.g. a specific year group). Distinct from that, some schools also referred to what were clearly **remediating** strategies, in that the target was specifically those youngsters with identified behavioural difficulties.

The strategies might variously be instituted within existing school resources; require new school-based roles; or utilise part-time support and expertise from external agencies.

**General 'preventative' strategies**

The accounts of this type of initiative included:

- A contribution to the overall ethos of the school regarding behaviour, e.g. staff instituting/reviewing new behaviour policies or whole-school systems like Assertive Discipline (AD).

- A greater involvement of pupils in devising and/or administering rules, rewards and sanctions, including peer mediating roles in potential conflict.

- An investment of resources in addressing perceived 'arenas of vulnerability', such as certain transition periods in youngsters' school careers (between Years 6 and 7). Certain times of the school day which made youngsters' behaviour vulnerable (e.g. lunchtime, break) might also be the focus of preventative work.

- A screening function for large numbers of pupils, e.g. SEN reviews or diagnostic testing for sight or hearing problems which might affect behaviour in class.

- The introduction of counselling and mentoring roles to which there was open access for all pupils.

- Theatre in Education events or drama modules aimed at raising awareness about behavioural issues.

**Remediating strategies**

When the focus was youngsters with acknowledged behavioural problems, the kinds of initiatives which were itemised by schools included:

- Withdrawal from lessons for additional personal and/or social education opportunities, often involving external services or agencies, e.g. group work on self-esteem.

- Additional learning support within the classroom, e.g. extending the use of Learning Support Assistants (LSAs).

- Alternative vocational provision or different accreditation schemes.

- Individualised behaviour modification strategies, e.g. IBPs, special leisure opportunities to be attained by good behaviour.

- The introduction of special 'on-site' facilities, e.g. longer-term withdrawal units for those at risk of exclusion; special lunchtime clubs for youngsters identified with existing or potential behavioural problems.

- The development of specialist behaviour forums, e.g. panels involving parents and staff or inter-agency meetings.
- 'Matched' mentors – e.g. from the youngster's own community.
- The provision of support groups for parents of youngsters with behavioural difficulties.

As an overview, the audit perhaps also reveals that schools did not readily seem to utilise their own staff in providing alternative relationships or additional personal or social education opportunities for youngsters with behaviour difficulties. Indeed, developing peers as support or quasi-authority figures featured rather more than finding mechanisms for existing school staff to relate in different innovative ways with pupils. Equally, it was rare to find mention of comprehensive screening and diagnostic programmes to anticipate likely factors associated with behaviour difficulties (such as physical health, learning difficulties).

The audit of strategies is summarised in table form on page 65.

In addition, the research sought to identify which external agencies provided the case-study schools with support in the management of behaviour. Respondents mentioned the Behaviour Support Service (BSS), the Education Welfare Service (EWS), the Educational Psychology Service (EPS), PRUs and special schools, learning and language support services, LEA advisers, Social Services, Child and Family Guidance Service and the Health Service. Independent consultants and the voluntary sector were also involved with some schools, while some had made use of TEC and industry projects.

The nature of the work undertaken by the same type of agencies operating in different LEAs appeared to vary, and consequently, schools had clearly received different support. The type of support ranged from offering staff advice, support and/or training on developing whole-school policies and initiatives, to working with whole classes, through to counselling and more focused work on behaviour with groups of pupils or with individuals.

Several interviewees commented on the benefits of a multi-disciplinary approach to behaviour management. Such approaches were felt to offer strategic and collective responses to behaviour problems. At the same time, clarity about the roles of each agency involved was identified as a key need.

Generally, the support given to schools was well received. Help from outside agencies in coping with challenging classroom behaviour was often perceived as beneficial by individual teachers:

> *I think it's been wonderful ... at first it was like ... 'Oh, it's just something else to do!' ... but it's given me lots and lots of ideas. It's helped across the whole class as well* (class teacher: primary).

However, the success of the support offered appeared to be dependent on the expertise of the individual external agent that the schools dealt with. Concerns about external support were raised by interviewees, and tended to focus on one or more of the following:

- funding constraints which limited the amount of support available;
- time constraints on the work;
- a lack of feedback to school staff by the external agent on work undertaken with pupils in school; and
- a lack of awareness by external support staff of the demands of whole-class teaching.

# SCHOOL-BASED AUDIT OF STRATEGIES FOR BEHAVIOUR DIFFICULTIES

| | GENERAL/PREVENTATIVE AND DIAGNOSTIC | REMEDIATING/FOCUSED SUPPORT |
|---|---|---|
| **Within-school resources** | • Behaviour policies/whole-school systems, e.g. AD<br>• Rewards and sanctions<br>• Involvement of pupils in:<br>- devising rules<br>- circle time<br>- 'talking out'<br>• Diagnostic screening:<br>- of sight/hearing problems<br>- of learning<br>• Year 6–7 transition programme<br>• Year 7 residential trip<br>• Enhanced use of school facilities, e.g. more innovative use of the library<br>• Drama work | • IBPs<br>• On-site alternative facilities, e.g.<br>- units<br>- rooms<br>• Behaviour panels to assess and advise on programmes of support<br>• Alternative accreditation opportunities |
| **New school-based roles** | • Counselling roles, e.g. school nurse<br>• Mentoring roles<br>- peers<br>- adults<br>• Peer mediators | • Learning Support Assistants<br>• Adult mentors<br>- community<br>- business<br>• EBD specialist |
| **External** ***(e.g. BSS, EWS, EPS, Social Services, LEA advisers, etc.)*** | • Theatre in Education<br>• INSET, e.g. on behavioural issues, classroom management, etc.<br>• Whole-class support<br>• Support *re* the development of behaviour policies/AD | • Support groups for parents<br>• Support for pupils with behaviour difficulties<br>- individuals<br>- groups<br>• Additional personal and/or social opportunities<br>- assertiveness training and self-esteem programmes<br>• Support with IEPs/Code of Practice<br>• Alternative vocational provision (e.g. leavers' package) |

## 4.3 EXAMPLES OF STRATEGIES

This section portrays in more detail examples of some of the strategies in place in the case-study schools to address behavioural difficulties.

### General 'preventative' focus

The following six examples illustrate strategies with a general preventative or diagnostic function. The first four of these could be instituted within the schools' existing resources, while the last two (examples five and six) required the introduction of new school-based roles.

**EXAMPLE ONE**
**General preventative focus (primary)** **Developing new playground rules**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
This primary school aimed to defuse possible behaviour problems at playtime. Representatives from each class in the school worked with the Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) Coordinator in order to try to make playtimes a more positive experience for all pupils. They worked together to develop a set of playground rules which were then presented in assembly. Each class was then given a copy and all pupils signed them to say that they had read and agreed to abide by them. The PSHE Coordinator also liaised closely with lunchtime supervisors over the issue of playground behaviour.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
When the playground rules had become properly embedded in the school system, the PSHE Coordinator planned to work with pupils again to review them and to ask pupils to sign up to them again. The next step planned was to draw up a system of rewards and sanctions for good and inappropriate behaviour in the playground.

**EXAMPLE TWO**
**General preventative focus (primary)** **Pupil involvement ('talking out')**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
Opportunity for discussion was provided in this primary school through '*talking out*', which involved pupils talking to other pupils about behaviour and endeavouring to find solutions to their own, or their classmates', behaviour problems.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Staff felt that this was an effective strategy, encouraging responsibility and fostering relationships, though did cite occasions when pupils had used it as an excuse to get out of doing their work. It was also noted that it could be difficult for younger pupils to differentiate between telling tales and genuinely needing help. Pupil interviewees appeared less enthusiastic, asserting that it only worked '*sometimes*' when they felt happy that they had sorted something out. Criticisms tended to focus on the fact that it could take a long time and might mean them missing playtime; that they sometimes felt it was unfair if they thought the other person had been more at fault; and that they did not like teachers to help with '*talking out*' because they were often critical of the way the pupils were doing it.

**EXAMPLE THREE**
**General preventative focus (secondary) Diagnostic and screening function**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
The SENCO in this secondary school had devised an internal review to identify pupils whose learning and/or behaviour was giving cause for concern. Teachers were asked to provide the information on pupils from Year 7 up to Year 10 and then this was fed into a database. From this, an individual '*education map*' was produced for each pupil. Also included in these 'maps' was other information about the pupil – whether they wore glasses, which groups in school they might be involved in, whether they were registered on the Code of Practice, whether they received any support for their behaviour, etc.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The review had, the SENCO believed, been particularly valuable in identifying areas where pupils were perhaps not doing as well as they were in others. Appropriate support could then be put in place where problems had been identified. At the same time, the review had enabled tutors to monitor and discuss pupils' progress with them.

**EXAMPLE FOUR**
**General preventative focus (secondary) Year 6–7 transition programme**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
In this secondary school, Year 6 pupils attended the school for a full week in their last term of primary school as part of a transition programme. Prior to their visit, the head of lower school saw the Year 6 class teachers in order to obtain information about the pupils. The week in school gave staff the chance to monitor the Year 6 children's behaviour, which, together with the information provided by their primary schools, facilitated the identification of potential problems. It also allowed for introductory work on the school's discipline system to be initiated.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The advantages of getting to know the pupils and identifying those who might need help were felt to outweigh any perceived management problems.

The SENCO was aware that some teachers thought a week was too long for the Year 6 children to be in school. However, she believed that it provided an excellent chance for staff to get to know the pupils and a good opportunity to make contacts with parents.

**EXAMPLE FIVE**
**General preventative focus (primary)** **Counselling/mentoring roles**
**New school-based roles**

**Nature and focus:**
The school nurse in this case-study primary school provided support one afternoon a week for both pupils and parents experiencing problems. Parents could come and talk to her if they had any concerns about their children and she could see individual children to counsel them.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The headteacher believed the input of the school nurse was '*wonderful*'. She herself tried to be available as '*a good listening ear*' for the children but realised that, realistically, she could not always provide that with all the other constraints on her time. Therefore, it had been invaluable to have someone in school with the particular skills necessary to fulfil this role. The headteacher felt that there was a great need for counselling support in school for primary-age pupils and would like to have been able to have had a full-time counsellor in school.

**EXAMPLE SIX**
**General preventative focus (primary)** **Mediating roles in pupil conflict**
**New school-based roles**

**Nature and focus:**
This primary school had introduced peer mediation as a strategy aimed at defusing anti-social behaviour in the playground. Older pupils were trained in mediation skills in order to help other pupils in the school. One of the peer mediators explained that they went out in the playground at playtimes wearing special caps so that other pupils could identify them. When conflict arose, they stepped in and, after informing the member of staff on duty, took the pupils involved to the library. Here they would introduce themselves, explain their role and initiate discussion about what had happened and how all concerned might move forward, '*... then hopefully at the end we can say "So do you want to be friends?" and if they say "Yes", we shake hands with them and we congratulate them*'. The peer mediators dealt with incidents such as name calling or throwing things; for more serious incidents such as large-scale fights, they would alert a member of staff. Sometimes disputes arose in the classroom between two pupils who were both peer mediators. In this case, the teacher would ask them to each choose another person in the room to whom they could talk.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Staff interviewees felt that the initiative allowed the children to listen to each other and to put forward their opinions: '*... we take them seriously and that, I think, is the difference. I think that is the key thing*' (teacher). The initiative was felt to impact on other areas as well as the playground: pupils involved often came into school and reported arguments at home between family members in which they had been able to use their mediation skills. One peer mediator believed that the other children took it as a bit of a joke when they first went out in the playground wearing their special caps. However, pupils seemed much less inclined now to make jokes about them or mess about. He felt that this was probably because they did not want to lose their playtime through having to talk to the peer mediators.

## Remediating focus

The next eight examples are illustrative of strategies with a remediating focus – ones specifically targeted towards pupils with identified behavioural difficulties. The first

three were instituted within the schools' existing resources. Examples ten and eleven involved the introduction of new school-based roles while the remaining three examples utilised support and expertise from outside agencies.

**EXAMPLE SEVEN**
**Remediating focus (primary)** **Individualised behaviour modification strategies**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
A strategy implemented in one of the case-study primary schools had been the introduction of Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs), for those pupils placed on the special needs register for behavioural reasons. Approaches to modifying the pupil's behaviour were then detailed within the IBP. Parents would always be involved when these were written, the details would be discussed with them and then they would be asked to sign it. With some pupils, approaches had involved having a nursery nurse working with them in the classroom; with others, smiley faces or stickers had been introduced to encourage appropriate behaviour.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Staff felt that it would be difficult to quantify the success of IBPs as each plan was so individualised. Having a nursery nurse working alongside some pupils had proved successful, but limited resources meant that it could not be continued for more than a month. Equally, when a nursery nurse was working with one particular child, it meant she was not working with other children who might need support.

**EXAMPLE EIGHT**
**Remediating focus (secondary)** **Specialist behaviour forums**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
In this secondary school, when it was felt that a pupil's behaviour might be leading towards exclusion, a special '*Behaviour Panel*' would be set up involving senior staff, parents, the pupil themselves and, sometimes, a governor. This panel met in what was termed a '*roundtable*' discussion, to discuss the pattern of behaviour which was proving unacceptable. At this point, any difficulties that may have had an impact on the behaviour could be shared, and strategies suggested which might move the pupil forward. The pupil themselves would be given the opportunity to talk about how they felt they could improve.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The Behaviour Panel was seen by staff as a positive strategy aimed at helping the pupil to find ways in which to improve their behaviour. Equally, each case was looked at individually in order to find the most appropriate response. The headteacher highlighted the fact that, even if the behaviour had been particularly serious, they would still try to make sure that somebody attended who could flag up something the pupil had done well, '*so there's always a feeling that nobody's beyond redemption, that somebody's there who thinks you're good*'.

**EXAMPLE NINE**
**Remediating focus (secondary)** **Centre on site**
**Within-school resources**

**Nature and focus:**
The aim of this centre in one of the secondary schools was to prevent pupils being excluded from school. Pupils were referred for behavioural reasons, attending full-time, though usually for no more than three weeks at a time. Their entry to the Centre would be agreed with their parents at an initial meeting. Parents were kept informed of their child's progress throughout their time there. The pupils were then gradually reintegrated back into the school. Sixteen teachers from the school worked two or three at a time in the Centre, so the pupils followed the same mainstream timetable. No more than ten pupils would be attending at any one time. Pupils each had a monitoring sheet on which was written their target for the week. Targets would be achievable in order to build up confidence. Whilst attending the Centre, pupils received credits for their behaviour which led up to a first award of a letter home and then to a second award of a certificate plus a small gift (for example, a chocolate bar or a pen). If they misbehaved, they would be given a detention at break or lunchtime. The coordinator of the Centre was keen to point out that they had avoided referring to it as a unit, with its connotations of punishment. The Centre was regarded as a continuation of the school's pastoral system, to provide help and support for inappropriate behaviour. The emphasis was very much on positive reinforcement.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The Centre coordinator reported that, initially, pupils could be quite antagonistic, but once they realised that '... *if they behave well they get treated well*' and that the staff were '*on their side*', they responded very positively. They appreciated that this was a last chance and usually did not want to be excluded, so they were quite willing to give it a try. The rewards worked very well, especially the letter home: '... *they are so used to getting negative feedback that they love this kind of thing coming home.*' Equally, the detentions proved to be an effective sanction. Breaks and lunchtimes were the only times pupils in the Centre could meet with friends, and so they were reluctant to lose them. Staff in school were very supportive when the pupils were being reintegrated and often commented on the difference in their behaviour. The headteacher of the school firmly believed that the Centre had been effective in reducing permanent exclusions, especially those resulting from escalating poor behaviour.

It was considered important that staff coming to teach in the Centre did not come in with negative expectations. The Centre coordinator held a meeting with staff at the beginning of the year where she explained the strategies used. Generally staff came in with the attitude that they were there to help. The pupils needed to see the staff as being very fair and consistent so that '... *they know if you are doing that, that happens, and they learn to accept the consequences of their own behaviour*'.

The Centre had two years of funding left and, because of its success, the school was looking at ways to fund it, or a version of it, after that time. One option might be to have centres in particular schools which would serve a number of schools in the area. Discussions to look at the options available were currently being undertaken.

**EXAMPLE TEN**
**Remediating focus (primary/secondary)** **Learning support within the classroom**
**New school-based roles**

**Nature and focus:**
In three case-study primary schools, Learning Support Assistants (LSAs) were working in class with pupils experiencing behavioural difficulties. The emphasis was very much on positive reinforcement through praise and reward, and by taking small, more easily achievable steps.

In one of the secondary schools, more creative use was being made of classroom assistants. They were being linked to subject areas to work in the classroom with pupils who found it difficult to cope, in order to raise the pupils' self-esteem and to facilitate the teachers' role. There were five classroom assistants working in the school at the present time, including two who worked with children who did not have English as a first language.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Improvements had been noticed in the behaviour of the children with whom the LSAs were working. In one primary school, a boy benefiting from the support of a LSA for his learning and behaviour commented: '*It's less hard when she's there and easier to behave.*'

The deputy head in the secondary school commented that they would like to employ more classroom assistants: they were cheaper and could support the few who needed extra input in a way that a teacher of 30 could not. Many of the assistants were students who had completed a degree course and were gaining experience whilst waiting to go on to teacher training. The deputy head articulated a desire to see more adults helping in the classroom. She believed that positive support from adult role models enhanced the learning situation of the pupils.

**EXAMPLE ELEVEN**
**Remediating focus (secondary)** **'Matched' mentoring**
**New school-based roles**

**Nature and focus:**
Mentors from the local community came into this secondary school to work alongside pupils of African-Caribbean origin identified as having problems or potential problems. The scheme was set up because of concerns over the disproportionate numbers of pupils of African-Caribbean origin being excluded from the schools in the area. Originally, it focused on boys but now, two years on, it involved girls as well. The first year after its inception was spent in training the mentors, helping them to be able to provide a link between the school and the local community. The group coordinator saw their function as that of providing a '*buffer*' between home and school to facilitate any problems that might arise.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The group coordinator believed that the initiative was effective, that the young people they worked with appreciated having someone with the time to actually listen to them. He cited as an example of success a boy they were working with who had a history of problems and was not expected to achieve at GCSE. Now, after receiving support from a mentor, he had settled down, had gained awards for achievement and was expected to achieve four or five GCSEs with good grades. Similar success had been achieved with girls. It had been important to show the young people involved that it was acceptable to believe in education. The group coordinator was concerned that too many families just did not talk to each other, and so a lot of work focused on relationships in the home.

**EXAMPLE TWELVE**
**Remediating focus (primary)** **Support group for parents**
**External support**

**Nature and focus:**
This group was set up by a charitable trust in conjunction with the Schools' Health Service. Eight families with children between the ages of five and seven were targeted initially and invited to join the group. Only two of these subsequently dropped out. The group met in school for one afternoon a week for nine weeks, and parents were encouraged within the sessions to play and interact with their children. The aim of this was to foster the enhancement of parent–child relationships. Trained facilitators, including the school nurse, worked with them in order to provide support and advice on a whole range of different issues and situations. The sessions enabled project staff to get to know the parents and children, to observe the interaction, to identify behavioural issues and thus to implement and monitor changes. It was felt that if problems could be resolved, then that would have a beneficial effect on the school environment itself. At the same time, parents would benefit from the establishment of a self-help network, '... *so that they would realise that there were other people whose children didn't behave well and they could support one another*' (headteacher).

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Parents were asked to complete evaluation sheets at the end of the nine weeks. The evaluation report compiled from these noted that all the parents involved reported improvements in the behaviour of their children. Parents felt that they had gained from being part of the group, and now felt less isolated and more confident to deal with situations which arose. Teachers in the school also reported noticing improvements in the behaviour of the children whilst in the classroom: '*I have to say that I think it has proved very positive*' (deputy head). Reports from subsequent parent–teacher interviews also provided positive feedback on the project.

Some of the parents felt that attending for the nine weeks had been a large commitment to make. The suggestion was made to have two blocks of sessions with a break in the middle. Parents had initially expressed fears about the children being labelled as the '*naughty gang*' or getting behind with work, but these fears had proved unfounded.

The headteacher confirmed that the school was considering running a further course of sessions, this time aimed at an older section of the school population and perhaps in shorter blocks of time.

**EXAMPLE THIRTEEN**
**Remediating focus (secondary)** **Additional personal and/or social education opportunities**
**External support**

**Nature and focus:**
In this case-study secondary school, a specialist EBD teacher worked in school, running Circle Time slots with tutor groups together with other, more specialised groups. The SENCO had identified a need for more provision in school for pupils experiencing emotional and/or behavioural difficulties. Funding was made available to employ the EBD teacher through the money coming into school for pupils with statements. The specialist groups she ran included an assertiveness group for those pupils identified as likely to be easily bullied, a self-esteem group for vulnerable children, a friendship group for Year 7 pupils having problems associating with their peers, and a group for Year 8 pupils looking at more appropriate ways of dealing with people.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
Some of the pupils in the assertiveness group had, the SENCO felt, benefited a lot from being involved and, as a result, were much happier in school. The other groups had been successful in raising levels of self-esteem, although the friendship group was often considered to be difficult for the Year 7 pupils involved because it made them actually confront their anti-social behaviour.

Time in school was limited for this specialist and so she had to be very clear about what she could achieve in the time available to her. The SENCO believed that the ideal situation would be for the specialist to be working in school more often. However, present funding constraints prevented this.

**EXAMPLE FOURTEEN**
**Remediating focus (off-site)** **Alternative vocational provision**
**External support**

**Nature and focus:**
This off-site facility was offering a special package for Year 11 students, involving the core basic skills of English, maths and science with the addition of college courses and work experience, alongside community projects and sporting options. At the end of Year 10, the students who would form the Year 11 group for the next year had a taster session where they met with a careers adviser, and the tutor talked them through what the programme would involve.

**Views and evaluative comments:**
The head of the centre believed that what was on offer for the students could build up to a very busy package, '*... and the beauty of it is the flexibility of it*'. It was felt that students tended to get out of it what they put into it, but the majority tended to take full advantage of the opportunities on offer. A Year 10 girl attending the taster session commented that she was really looking forward to taking part in all the activities the following year, especially the outdoor pursuits as she was very interested in sport.

**Research vignette: Pastoral and curriculum opportunities to address behaviour**

In the case-study schools, interviewees were asked what, if any, pastoral and curriculum opportunities there were to raise behaviour as an issue in school.

**Assembly** was cited as the most common pastoral opportunity to address behaviour at both primary and secondary level. Other opportunities were **Circle Time** (primary level), **form tutor time** (secondary level) and **special whole-school events** like 'Behaviour Day', 'Bullying Awareness Day' and 'Courtesy Week'. At secondary level only, school councils and year councils were highlighted as they offered '*a platform for pupils' views*'. In both phases, less explicit means were also identified like the school ethos and the example set by staff: a deputy head commented that it was unusual for some pupils at his secondary school to see adults behaving well; therefore the explemplary conduct of staff was an important means by which behaviour was addressed in the school: '*... the message they give out is a positive one of having respect for their fellow man, respect for the pupils, consideration for the pupils.*' In one secondary school, two interviewees felt that more use could be made of pastoral opportunities to raise behaviour as an issue, one adding that this sentiment was also shared by the pupils: '*... behaviour is one of the things that pupils highlighted as an area that needs probably to be addressed a little bit more*' (head of year).

At both primary and secondary level, **PSE** emerged as the principal curriculum opportunity to raise behaviour as an issue. Interviewees, especially those working at primary level, had found PSE to be an important subject through which pupils could develop social skills and practise listening, thinking and articulating their views. Further, because it '*gives children a voice*', it could also raise their self-esteem: '*... it's important that children can actually give their point of view ... I think then they know that they're worth listening to*' (SENCO: primary). National Curriculum subjects were rarely highlighted as opportunities to raise behaviour issues. Where they were mentioned, the focus on behaviour tended to be through ways of working in that subject rather than through the curriculum content; for example, at primary level, taking turns and sharing instruments in music was highlighted, and at secondary level, team-working in PE and the constant reinforcement of behavioural issues in science for safety reasons were cited. There was some recognition of the difficulty of incorporating behaviour issues into the National Curriculum subjects. Pressures on time in a busy curriculum were cited as an explanation. In addition, at secondary level, it was acknowledged that some teachers might be reluctant to address behaviour issues through their subject because they did not view it as their role to take responsibility for behaviour. As one head of year noted: '*90 per cent of the staff would not be happy doing that because of the demands on their time, and they feel that it's not their place to do it. It should be the place of somebody else – they are the teacher of a subject.*'

There appeared to be a difference between primary and secondary schools regarding curriculum opportunities to address behaviour issues. At primary level, there was a greater focus on real and personal discussion, and at secondary level, more emphasis on role play and drama: '*I think behaviour is most sharply focused in areas like PSE and drama where they actually role play and act out*' (deputy head: secondary). None of the interviewees from primary schools mentioned using drama or role play as a means to address behaviour issues. This difference between the two sectors of schooling is noteworthy and well exemplified by two of the case-study schools. In a primary school, pupils actually devised solutions themselves for the real behaviour problems which occurred in class. In a secondary school, a similar exercise requiring pupils to decide on appropriate responses to behaviour was hypothetical: '*... we are looking at consequences of behaviour and we are looking at patterns of behaviour involving assertive, submissive and aggressive responses, which they are doing in role plays, and they are deciding themselves what they actually think is the best response*' (head of year).

***Strategies for behavioural difficulties*: *key findings***

- Schools did not readily utilise their own staff in providing alternative relationships or additional PSE opportunities for youngsters with behaviour difficulties.

- Support from external agencies was felt to be affected by funding and time constraints: sometimes lack of feedback to school staff or awareness of the demands of whole-class teaching were noted.

- Assemblies emerged as the most frequently mentioned pastoral opportunity to raise behaviour issues.

- National Curriculum subjects were rarely mentioned as occasions for addressing behaviour.

# CHAPTER 5

# BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT AND SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

## 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the issue of how far, and in what ways, behaviour problems were perceived to come within the aegis of special educational needs. It reports on a range of educational views and also on SEN activity regarding behaviour in the case-study schools. In addition, the chapter concludes with a section relaying the findings from the survey on this aspect of behaviour management. The sample of secondary teachers and senior managers were asked for their perceptions of SENCO involvement with youngsters experiencing behaviour difficulties, and the existence and efficacy of Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs) and target setting as a strategy for such pupils in their school.

## 5.2 PERCEPTIONS OF BEHAVIOUR AS A 'SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEED'

At what point does inappropriate behaviour become a 'special educational need' requiring specialist intervention? When asked, most teachers in the case-study sample reflected the guidance in *The Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs* (GB. DfE, 1994), stating that it was when a pupil's behaviour impeded their learning and development. Other teachers added that it might be when a pupil's behaviour interfered with others' learning or that the Code should be applied to the minority of pupils for whom the usual strategies were unsuccessful; in other words, those pupils '*outside the reach of our Assertive Discipline* [policy]'. A number of those who were interviewed made direct reference to the Code of Practice when considering the extent to which behaviour came under the umbrella of special educational needs, sometimes adding that this was how to get access to specialist help. Almost every school in the case-study sample used the SEN register to identify behavioural as well as learning difficulties. Only two schools (both primary) reported that they had not experienced the need to place pupils on the SEN register for behaviour reasons. In a minority of the secondary schools, the SEN

department had little direct involvement in the process of identifying and making provision for pupils with behaviour concerns. In such cases, it was the pastoral staff who followed procedures in the Code of Practice. In one school, there were mixed opinions and a perceived lack of will (on the part of the senior management team) to use the Code for behavioural issues at all.

Overall, many interviewees noted that there was usually an emotional explanation for persistent behaviour difficulties which set some pupils apart from those who were simply mischievous or naughty from time to time. In some cases, behaviour could be attributed to circumstances pertaining to a pupil's home background:

> *We are well tuned-in to the difference between plain naughtiness and inappropriate behaviour that has an underlying emotional cause ... teachers know which kids are coming in with emotional baggage* (SENCO: primary).

However, the need to acknowledge and eliminate other related factors, such as the quality of interpersonal relationships, the impact of classroom management and the appropriateness of the curriculum, sometimes gave rise to uncertainty in the diagnosis of this type of special educational need. Teachers often spoke about the dilemma in terms of the 'chicken and egg' metaphor. In secondary schools, pupils with behaviour difficulties were sometimes said to be easily identified if the problem presented itself consistently, with a range of teachers across the curriculum. It was felt that effective information-sharing between colleagues could help to analyse and remedy the problem. In some schools, it was the SENCO who collated the data and looked objectively at the evidence.

A number of teachers mentioned the importance of raising the awareness of other pupils, colleagues and parents in relation to behaviour and special educational needs. Pupils with behavioural and/or emotional problems often needed sensitive handling, an alternative approach to the mainstream system of sanctions and rewards, and a higher tolerance level from those around them. Unless this was understood, it could be construed in terms of low expectations, unfair treatment or even favouritism. Interestingly, all of the comments in relation to this issue came from primary schools and off-site provision rather than secondary schools:

> *Perhaps what people need to do is step back and look at the* ***behaviour*** *as a difficulty and not the child. Therein lies the problem – that people are not very readily able to divorce themselves from the emotion* (teacher: PRU).

It was apparent that these schools believed that even very young children were able to accept that some peers were 'learning how to behave', and that they themselves could help and support such children. One primary headteacher noticed that when pupils with significant difficulties behaved in an inappropriate way, other pupils looked on without giggling or attempting to join in. In a different school, it was noted that:

> [The other pupils] *have learned to be more tolerant ... with difficult children. They have learned to ignore* [the behaviour] *when it is necessary to ignore it, in a remarkable way sometimes. And, they can also be extremely supportive and many of them can do a better job, sometimes, than the adults* (SENCO: primary).

Another respondent, asked whether children were aware of a distinction between behaviour difficulties and 'naughtiness', responded in this way:

> *Yeah, they do, they do* [know the difference] *... 'cos they see it going on around them. And OK, the ones who are normally sort of ... a bit volatile, a bit silly, you know, the 'Jack the Lads' if you like, who get the normal sanctions, they would get very, very unhappy if they saw children behaving worse than them who, supposedly, were not being sanctioned. And that is why we have had to do a lot of work on understanding behaviour, which they have coped with extremely well. And parents as well. You get the parents saying 'That naughty child', you know, 'Why let that naughty child in school?' and we have done meetings on special needs and the Code of Practice and all sorts of things for parents to come along to, where we have explained the whys and wherefores* (headteacher: primary).

In another primary school, the deputy head affirmed that children accepted that some of their peers had less control over their own behaviour and therefore would not necessarily be treated in the same way. Although behaviour policies in schools were deemed successful and appropriate for the overwhelming majority of pupils, it was important to acknowledge that, for a small minority of pupils, different applications would sometimes be required:

> *Just as individual children have educational differences and they can't cope with the curriculum that's being offered to the rest of the children ... some children cannot cope with the behaviour programme that's throughout the school* (deputy head: primary).

In view of this, IBPs were considered to be a very useful tool which enabled the different approaches needed for individual pupils to be set out clearly.

## 5.3 THE INVOLVEMENT OF SENCOS

The extent to which SENCOs were involved in, or were responsible for, coordinating procedures for meeting the needs of pupils with behavioural problems varied amongst schools and appeared to depend on factors such as:

- the proportion of pupils in the school with identified special educational needs;
- the perceived success of the overall school behaviour policy;
- the confidence and experience of the SENCO in the field of behaviour difficulties; and
- the role of the pastoral team.

On the whole, primary school SENCOs in the case-study sample tended to adopt a more generic role and maintain an overview of behaviour difficulties as part of their duties. The class teachers interviewed felt it entirely appropriate to approach the SENCO with their initial concerns and seek advice as to whether this was for a literacy-based or behaviour-related concern. One SENCO held a weekly 'clinic' where teachers and parents could go to discuss either type of concern. In two cases, however, this responsibility had seldom been discharged because it was said to be a rare occurrence for pupils to be placed on the special needs register for behaviour difficulties.

In the secondary phase, it was felt to be more common for SENCOs to focus the bulk of their work on the needs of pupils with literacy problems, only becoming involved in terms of liaising with outside agencies if a pupil with behaviour difficulties moved to Stage 3 of the Code of Practice, or if there were clear learning difficulties as well as

behaviour concerns. In most cases, it would be the head of year or head of upper/lower school who took the lead in behaviour issues. Sometimes, this was deemed necessary in view of the heavy workload facing SENCOs in schools with large numbers of pupils on the special educational needs register. In one school, the population was described as '*heavily skewed towards the lower end of the ability range*' with more than 40 per cent of the Year 7 pupils considered to have learning and literacy difficulties.

In two secondary schools, however, the SENCOs spoke enthusiastically about their interest and involvement with pupils who had behaviour difficulties:

> *Behaviour is what fascinates me. That is my interest as a special needs teacher* (SENCO: secondary).
>
> *In lots of high schools, the SENCO doesn't get involved in the behaviour side, but I have a lot of experience in behaviour management and I don't see that the two can be divorced* (SENCO: secondary).

Both of these teachers were committed and confident about this aspect of their work. One had taken responsibility for organising and delivering INSET on this within her school. Although these SENCOs appreciated the complementary role of the pastoral system and worked in close collaboration with tutors and heads of year ('*there needs to be a corporate approach*'), the same set of procedures was adopted whether a pupil was identified for literacy or behaviour concerns. It was whenever teachers got to the stage of saying 'What are we going to do with this child?' that the SENCOs became involved.

In a few schools across the phases, the involvement of the SENCO was less straightforward. In one case, for example, there was a mismatch of expectations. Teachers stated that they would go to their SENCO with initial concerns or if they needed to get advice about behaviour management, whereas the SENCO herself felt anxious about her ability to fulfil this role: '*I don't feel confident enough to make it my own domain ... I am happy for it to come under pastoral care rather than just special needs*' (SENCO: secondary).

In a small number of the secondary schools, where the SENCO had no specific responsibility for behaviour difficulties, senior colleagues mentioned that they were looking to appoint a 'behaviour specialist' or that they were considering ways of broadening the SENCO role to encompass emotional and behavioural difficulties. One explanation for this development may be that the Code of Practice has brought the issue into sharper focus. One headteacher explained that, prior to the Code, his LEA had a policy of not issuing statements for behavioural reasons. This had since been reversed. Interestingly too, few SENCOs had played a key or central role in the development of their school behaviour policy and others described their input as '*no more so than any other member of staff*'. However, as one reflected: '*It is becoming more apparent that SENCOs need to be involved in behaviour policies.*'

It was common for pupils to be referred on to the Code of Practice register via the pastoral system. The distinguishing pattern in secondary schools was for pupils with behaviour difficulties at Stages 1 and 2 of the register to come under the auspices of heads of year or heads of house. At Stage 3 or, in some cases, once a statement was issued, the SENCO then had a more discernible input:

> *I suppose in a way, I am more involved in the more extreme behaviours. So, on a day-to-day basis where there are incidents and 'naughty' children ... I wouldn't see a lot of those ... that's more down to the subject teacher, the head of that subject and the form tutor* (SENCO: secondary).

In some schools where this was the model, SENCOs still had responsibility for drawing up Individual Education Plans (IEPs) across the board and one or two mentioned the need to encourage heads of year to take on a more active role in generating and monitoring pupil targets as they were the ones who had the most contact with those particular pupils. In these cases, some SENCOs were supporting pastoral staff by drawing up IEPs collaboratively, while others expected heads of year to monitor target sheets on a weekly basis. In most of the schools, SENCOs and pastoral staff met together on a regular basis and described their working relationship as 'close'.

There were, however, some practical difficulties for pastoral middle managers in taking responsibility for dealing with pupils with ongoing behavioural concerns. One SENCO illustrated it this way:

> *I mean, our heads of year here are really brilliant at managing the most extraordinarily difficult children, but at great personal cost. We put things down, like 'will meet with head of year every week' ... what the heads of year say, and I am absolutely sympathetic, is that they do not have the time to maintain that. I mean events overtake them, they are used on cover ... or, you know, there are emergencies. They are so often fire-fighting that they do not have time to carry out the proactive work that they know needs doing* (SENCO: secondary).

It is worth, at this point, revisiting the vast amount of differences in non-contact opportunities for pastoral staff, as described in Chapter 3.

## 5.4 APPLYING THE CODE OF PRACTICE FOR BEHAVIOUR DIFFICULTIES

### Identification of need

The use of the special educational needs register was often considered less straightforward in relation to the identification of emotional and behavioural difficulties. Because behaviour tended to be less predictable than, say, physical, sensory or literacy difficulties and was susceptible to a wide range of external influences, it was more difficult to plan for. Some interviewees pointed out that because behaviour did not manifest itself progressively, problems could escalate very quickly and some pupils could effectively 'jump' from Stage 1 to Stage 4 in as many days. Consequently, SENCOs did not always feel they could accurately pinpoint the stage at which a pupil should be entered onto the register. Not surprisingly, there were a number of different applications evident in the sample:

- One primary school had not felt the need to apply the Code at all for emotional and behavioural problems, whereas the staff at a secondary school felt that almost all the pupils could be justifiably identified at least at Stage 1 for either learning or behaviour reasons.

- One primary school claimed to omit Stage 2 altogether for pupils with behavioural concerns as outside specialists tended to get involved at this point anyway. A secondary school SENCO reported that she did not use Stage 1 for

behaviour. If pupils were causing concern, they went straight to Stage 2. On the other hand, another primary school had augmented the procedure with a 'Stage 0' for recording initial concerns on an even less formal basis.

- One secondary SENCO observed that it was very difficult to go beyond Stage 3 for behavioural reasons unless the pupil was also seriously underachieving in lessons. This had implications for pupils of average or higher ability, who were disruptive.

A particularly supportive arrangement for dealing with this issue was described in one school:

> *Every half term, there is a staging meeting where all the professionals meet. That would be the EWO, the SENCO, the heads of house, the pastoral deputy, sometimes the school nurse and I think sometimes in the past the educational psychologist has been there. It depends. Names can be put forward at the staging meeting by anybody, any of those professionals. Then we talk as a team about each individual child involved and we sort of make an agreed decision about what our action should be. So I get a lot of referrals that way because you know they've gone through Stage 1 and Stage 2. All the documentation is sent out on that child – we get that before the meeting – and then all the notes are typed up, action is written down and then, if it's a referral I deal with those students ... it's flexible, it's very good* (behaviour support teacher: secondary).

Having placed pupils on to the register, another concern was raised in relation to making appropriate provision:

> *I think what became quite clear when the Code of Practice came out ... making it incumbent on us to identify children with emotional and behaviour difficulties through the same processes as learning difficulties, was that although we had quite a lot of provision for learning difficulties children in the sense of some in class support, reading groups, spelling groups, we had very little that mirrored that on the EBD side, and I would say that we still have a serious shortfall there. One of the things that I would do is sit down with the head of year and draw up Individual Education Plans, and we are very good here at identifying the children and putting them on, I believe, the correct stage and we are quite good at assessing the detail of their behavioural difficulties or emotional problems. We had nothing to put down for strategies over and above the normal things or, you know, 'Head of year monitors regularly' ... and it was quite serious because we were standing there with a piece of paper and a pen in hand with nothing to write and that is still a problem* (SENCO: secondary).

Others mentioned that parents sometimes felt unhappy about their child being formally identified as having special educational needs or that certain colleagues had a tendency to perceive all 'naughty' children as suitable candidates for the SEN register.

There were also some positive comments about the Code of Practice. Staff at one primary school noted that, whereas in the past, they had regarded minor misdemeanours as just an accepted part of school life, particularly in the reception class, the Code had made them realise the importance of early identification and the value of recording written evidence. They were now flagging up concerns at a much earlier stage to avoid unnecessary delay. In another school, the Code was described as a useful tool for monitoring the school's behaviour policy. A significant reduction in the number of pupils being entered on to the register for behaviour reasons was regarded as a performance indicator. The Code was also described as a highly effective system for supporting behaviour management as it ensured that targets were set and reviewed, and it promoted access to a range of professional input as well as encouraging staff to own the issue of behaviour: one secondary school took the view that pupils would move up or down the register '... *depending on how effective* ***we are*** *in managing their behaviour and helping them*' (SENCO: secondary).

**Use of Individual Education Plans (IEPs)**

IEPs were being used from Stage 2 in all the case-study schools, although in two cases, these were known as 'action plans' and had been in operation for some time prior to the introduction of the Code of Practice.

In all of the primary schools, IEPs were written in a collaborative manner and, generally speaking, teachers felt comfortable about drawing up behaviour targets as part of the overall system for meeting special educational needs in school. In one case, though, teachers were only just beginning to include behaviour targets as a matter of course and in another school, where there was a large proportion of children with behaviour difficulties, it was felt that there was a need to make a distinction between IEPs and IBPs:

*We developed the IBP because we felt that the IEP didn't really fit some of these children. We wanted a system that was more suitable for behaviour difficulties* (headteacher: primary).

For some pupils, staff and parents together drew up a 'home' IBP together to make the approach more holistic. Like others, this primary headteacher stressed the importance of having targets which were specific and measurable, and had worked closely with staff on an individual level in order to ensure that this became an established practice.

Invariably, it was the SENCO who provided the main source of support at Stage 2 within the primary schools. This was seen as a pivotal role. Help and advice were usually readily available for teachers writing IEPs and it was the SENCO to whom most teachers turned for advice on strategies for improving a pupil's behaviour. In two primary schools, it was sometimes possible for teachers to enlist the help of another colleague to observe a pupil in class and analyse or monitor the problem, using the 'A, B, C' approach (Antecedent, Behaviour and Consequences). Another primary school employed a highly skilled nursery nurse to focus on the needs of identified individuals on a fixed-term arrangement, and one headteacher described how she gave additional support to pupils with behaviour problems in the same way that she would give a weak reader extra individual attention. In two of the primary schools, however, the SENCOs stated that they effectively '*skipped*' Stage 2 and moved straight on to involving outside specialists.

In the secondary schools, practicable systems for using IEPs were, it was often stressed, still 'evolving' and the following approaches were described:

- The SENCO or special needs department produced a 'menu' of targets and strategies which subject teachers used to select appropriate objectives for pupils that they taught.

- The SENCO drew up a standard IEP for pupils which had general targets rather than subject specific ones.

- The SENCO wrote all IEPs, but in collaboration with the pastoral team.

- Heads of year were being encouraged to take on the responsibility for drawing up behaviour-related IEPs.

- Subject teachers wrote their own IEPs with the support of the faculty SEN representative.

- Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) were used for all pupils regardless of whether they had identified special needs. The ILP was essentially a list of objectives from which pupils and staff prioritised their individual targets. A space at the bottom of the page was used to write any additional behavioural or statemented-related targets.

- Different people had responsibility for writing the IEPs. If it was a Stage 3 pupil, then it would be the behaviour support teacher. If it was Stage 1 or 2, it would be the heads of year.

- Pupils were heavily involved in drawing up and monitoring targets. They were encouraged to identify areas for development as well as appropriate rewards.

- Separate IBPs were not favoured because subject teachers wanted a complete picture of a child.

The difficulty of writing IEPs for behaviour was noted on a number of occasions, suggesting an important area for professional development:

> *With a learning IEP you can be very precise and it's much easier ... because if I am teaching you the alphabet, I know exactly what I have got to teach you, and if you are starting with nothing, I can take you through it. If you are a naughty little boy, and I want you to stay sitting in your seat, I don't know what on earth is going on in your head and I don't know what behaviours you have learnt already, and what behaviours you think are accepted. So it's harder. I can tell you what I want you to do, and I can give you those targets. What we are finding difficult is telling you how to actually do that specific thing. Every behaviour case is so different, and we are finding that extremely difficult* (SENCO: primary).

**Monitoring and review**

A number of the SENCOs considered there to be a need for more frequent reviewing of behaviour targets than the Code had suggested, but this was not always possible to achieve. In one school, for example, where there were a large number of pupils at Stage 2 or beyond, individual IEPs were reviewed no more than twice a year. Others pointed out that a more flexible response was required and, if identified strategies failed to prove effective, then it was meaningless to wait until the set review date. A different approach needed to be discussed and implemented immediately. One

primary school SENCO found the cycle of reviews difficult to sustain and described it as a '*nightmare task*' which had to be tackled in order to '*satisfy the educational psychologist*'.

A number of teachers mentioned the effectiveness of involving both parents and pupils in the review process. In some schools, pupils had their targets written on to cards or inside their personal planners in order to remind them and encourage an element of self-monitoring.

**Stage 3 and beyond**

A number of outside agencies were reportedly brought in to advise at Stage 3 including:

- educational psychologists (in two schools this was normally triggered at Stage 2)
- Behaviour Support Service
- outreach support from a pupil referral unit
- mentor or counsellor
- temporary placement at a pupil referral unit.

Although one teacher was regretful that the Code had limited certain types of informal intervention (for example, between special and mainstream schools), an outreach teacher who was interviewed was pleased that the new requirements had given him a clear structure within which to work and which placed behaviour difficulties appropriately within the special educational needs aegis.

Without exception, pupils with statements for behaviour difficulties were uncommon in the case-study schools. At most, secondary schools reported having three or four pupils with such statements; others had no identified pupils. Explanations for the low incidence varied. One LEA, for example, had only recently reversed its policy of not issuing statements for behaviour since the introduction of the Code of Practice and the appointment of a new SEN officer, whereas in another area, pupils with behavioural

difficulties were routinely placed in unit provision even though the trend was for pupils with learning difficulties to remain in mainstream. However, common difficulties relating to the resourcing of, and subsequent provision for, pupils with identified behaviour difficulties were described. A number of interviewees mentioned that it was extremely difficult to get a statement produced. The process was described as more complex and restrictive than for learning difficulties. Where behaviour-related statements were issued, the funding mechanism was not always transparent. In one school, a senior teacher complained that the '*cash value*' for behaviour statements was only a fraction of that for learning difficulties, although the SENCO had no knowledge of this arrangement. Another SENCO reported that she found it very hard to obtain information relating to additional funding attracted by statements. Where resourcing levels were considered inadequate, provision was unlikely to meet needs. In two schools, teachers explained how their best efforts to make provision for pupils with seriously challenging behaviour had been unsuccessful. Making adequate provision from limited resources was described as '*outrageously difficult*' by another SENCO, who added that it was extremely hard to make sense of statements for behaviour because a different and more flexible approach to support was usually required.

**Areas of concern**

A number of teachers described the difficulties they faced in implementing the Code of Practice for behaviour. These included:

- Some children needed help very quickly and the Code did not readily allow for this. Fast-tracking was not always possible as LEAs sometimes revoked such cases for lack of evidence and Educational Psychology casework was sometimes pre-planned a term in advance, leaving little scope for emergency response.

- The normal review cycle was not flexible or responsive enough for behavioural concerns.

- Some children were not in one place long enough to build up evidence or to achieve a consistent approach. They simply left behind them a series of action plans that had been tried and failed.

- Pupils with chronic behaviour problems tended to be excluded before the Code could be followed through. Immediate support was often what was needed. It

could be quicker for parents to be advised to go through their GP and a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist. As one respondent noted wryly: '*The system for helping these kids is much slower than the system for getting rid of them! It is also cheaper.*'

- The Code of Practice seemed more geared to the primary model of classroom relationships. In secondary schools, it was more difficult to implement IEPs effectively, as there were so many different teachers involved.

- LEA criteria for additional support was usually based on National Curriculum levels of achievement. This system failed to take account of average to bright, yet disruptive pupils.

- The Code worked well when there was clear medical evidence. Several respondents noted that, as a teacher, it was sometimes difficult trying to convince educational psychologists of their own professional judgement about behavioural difficulties.

## 5.5 THE SURVEY

In order to explore the issue of behaviour management and special educational needs further, two questions in the NFER questionnaire were put to both survey samples. Senior managers and teachers in the secondary school survey were asked to indicate if the statement '*The SEN department/SENCO have considerable involvement with children experiencing behavioural problems*' reflected their school's current practice regarding managing pupil behaviour. Options of '*yes*' '*no*' and '*not sure*' were given. Following that, the statement '*Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs) and target setting are used as a way to manage problem behaviour*' was offered and if the response was '*yes*', respondents were then invited to comment on a follow up statement, '*IBPs and target setting have been effective in managing problem behaviour*'.

Table 5.1 shows the overall results of the responses to the first statement:

**Table 5.1** **Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to the statement '*The SEN department/SENCO have considerable involvement with children experiencing behavioural problems*'**

| | Senior Managers | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 117 | % | N = 356 | % |
| Yes | 76 | 65 | 179 | 50 |
| No | 32 | 27 | 109 | 31 |
| Not sure | 9 | 8 | 68 | 19 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–98.*

Thus, only half of the teacher sample considered there to be any substantial SEN involvement in behaviour problems, in comparison with the two-thirds (65 per cent) of senior managers who affirmed this. However, one in five teachers (19 per cent) were '*not sure*', and it appeared that teachers with less than ten years' experience were much more likely to express this uncertainty (one-quarter of the 126 respondents in this category gave that response compared with seven of the 78 teachers with over 20 years in the profession). Equally, nearly one in three respondents with pastoral responsibilities (ten out of 36) also recorded they were unsure about SEN involvement.

Almost a third of teachers (31 per cent) appeared to dismiss outright the notion of any substantial SEN role in behavioural problems, and more than a quarter (27 per cent) of the senior managers did likewise.

On the issue of IBPs and target setting, there appeared far greater certainty from both subsamples that these were used. Table 5.2 shows that about one in ten senior managers felt their school did not use IBPs, while one in six teachers recorded no use of IBPs or target setting.

**Table 5.2** **Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to the statement '*IBPs are used to manage behaviour*'**

| | Senior Managers | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 118 | % | N = 357 | % |
| Yes | 101 | 86 | 251 | 70 |
| No | 13 | 11 | 59 | 17 |
| Not sure | 4 | 3 | 47 | 13 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–98.*

**Table 5.3** **Effective behaviour management in schools: responses to the statement '*IBPs and target setting are effective in managing behaviour problems*'**

| | Senior Managers | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 97 | % | N = 264 | % |
| Yes | 55 | 57 | 90 | 34 |
| No | 7 | 7 | 40 | 15 |
| Not sure | 35 | 36 | 134 | 51 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–98.*

However, while their use was not in doubt, as Table 5.3 shows, the matter of their efficacy seemed more questionable. Half of the teacher sample noted uncertainty about the effectiveness of IBPs and target setting, as did over a third of the senior managers. About one in six teachers appeared to reject their value outright. Over half (57 per cent) of senior managers, but only one in three teachers (34 per cent) affirmed their effectiveness.

***Behaviour management and special educational needs: key findings***

- The case-study primary schools and off-site provision were far more likely to acknowledge the need for alternative approaches to the mainstream system of sanctions and reward for youngsters with behaviour difficulties than was evident in the case-study secondary schools.

- SENCOs in the case-study primaries maintained an overview of behaviour difficulties more often than was the case in most of the case-study secondary sample. More than one in four (27 per cent) senior managers in the survey secondary schools did not think their SENCO/SEN department had any considerable involvement with children experiencing behaviour difficulties.

- A number of different applications of the Code of Practice for behaviour difficulties were noted: some case-study schools said they omitted Stage 1, others Stage 2; equally, a paucity of strategies for youngsters on these early stages was reported.

- The Code of Practice was sometimes felt to better suit a primary model of classroom relationships. IEPs/IBPs could be more difficult to implement in a secondary system, given the likely number of teachers involved.

- A need for more frequent reviewing of behaviour targets was suggested by some SENCOs.

- Over half of respondents in the secondary teacher survey and a quarter of senior managers recorded they were '*unsure*' whether IBPs and target setting were effective.

# CHAPTER 6

# PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MANAGEMENT OF BEHAVIOUR

## 6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the issue of INSET and professional development in the area of behaviour management. It particularly addresses training with regard to the Code of Practice as it might relate to behaviour issues, IEPs and also more general approaches in the managing of young people's behaviour.

## 6.2 TRAINING AND DISSEMINATION FOR THE CODE OF PRACTICE

The publication of *The Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs* (GB. DfE, 1994) generated widespread GEST-funded training for schools. According to previous research, most LEA training packages were aimed primarily at SENCOs, headteachers and governors, who generally received adequate levels of initial training when the Code was introduced in 1994 (Evans *et al.*, 1995; Lewis *et al.*, 1996; Derrington *et al.*, 1996). The expectation was that knowledge and skills would then be cascaded to all staff in schools. This was an important consideration, for the Code designates clear responsibilities to class and subject teachers in relation to identifying, monitoring and meeting pupils' special educational needs at Stage 1 and beyond. Paragraphs 3:64 to 3:70 of the Code of Practice exemplify the characteristics of a range of emotional and behavioural difficulties which may create learning difficulties as defined in paragraph 2:1 and which are therefore to be regarded as a special educational need.

Staff in the case-study schools were asked about the training they had received in relation to the Code of Practice in general. The main points which emerged were:

- In the majority of cases, INSET provision for SENCOs, headteachers and governors was perceived to be good.

- SENCOs tended to adopt a staggered approach in the dissemination of knowledge to colleagues and, in some secondary schools, there was still a lack of awareness.

- Some key staff, including headteachers and SENCOs, who had been appointed since 1994, had not received background training on the Code.

- Some teachers wanted further training to clarify the relationship between behaviour difficulties and the Code of Practice.

Where training programmes were described as worthwhile and useful, LEAs had typically organised a series of workshops or seminars in 1994, supported by comprehensive documentation for schools. One SENCO noted that it was the Code of Practice training which had effectively propelled a network group for SENCOs within her LEA which subsequently provided her with a valuable source of support and ongoing professional development opportunities. In one LEA, there had been a very similar staged approach in operation prior to the Code and, although schools were already familiar with many of the prescribed procedures, officers responded to the formal guidance by compiling a comprehensive programme of training which lasted for approximately two years. According to one SENCO, there had been '*filing cabinets full of materials and documentation*' sent out from this LEA.

A number of secondary SENCOs spoke favourably about the way in which their LEAs had provided financial support for their own personal, professional development, but felt concerned that opportunities to train up their colleagues did not present themselves as readily. This was less of an issue in the primary schools, where SENCOs were either able to use regular staff meetings as a mechanism for briefing colleagues or were able to speak to, or work alongside, people on an individual basis.

One secondary school SENCO approached the problem by training colleagues within the SEN department first and subsequently used them to help cascade skills and knowledge throughout the school. Others used their structure of faculty link teachers or SEN representatives to disseminate information back to departments, but there were a number of subject teachers who could not recall having received training on the Code of Practice as such. There were apparent gaps in knowledge even where LEA training had been aimed at a wider audience. One LEA, for example, had

provided and funded an intensive two-day course to which schools were able to send a number of key personnel. Although one case-study school had sent a large delegation of staff, levels of awareness and confidence were felt to be relatively low. In a different LEA, staff members in one primary school gave three conflicting accounts of the way in which training had been delivered to them and none had ever needed to apply the Code for behaviour reasons. Conflicting accounts of the training teachers had or had not received might be explained both in terms of the time which has since elapsed, as well as the overall impact that the Code had on schools when it was first introduced. One SENCO remembered that everyone just felt '*daunted*' by the whole concept and several others could remember only hazy details about the training they had received at that time. Despite this, most teachers seemed to be well aware of the Code's importance and quasi-legal status. As one SENCO observed: '*Staff are aware it is an official document and not just something we dreamed up.*'

Given that the bulk of this training took place around 1994, it is not surprising that a number of the practitioners interviewed were not involved in the key training opportunities at the time the Code was launched. This group included newly promoted headteachers and SENCOs as well as recently appointed support assistants. Some admitted quite openly that they lacked confidence, while others demonstrated uncertainty about procedures and terminology. Newly qualified teachers, however, mentioned that there had been some input on the Code of Practice either in their initial training or as part of their induction to the LEA. One primary headteacher was concerned to discover upon her appointment that, clearly, none of her staff had received any training on the Code. At another primary school, training on the Code of Practice was now firmly embedded in the induction programme for all new staff.

## 6.3 TRAINING IN USING THE CODE FOR BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES AND DEVISING INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLANS

A previous NFER study on the implementation of the Code of Practice (Derrington *et al.*, 1996) found that two of the most common concerns amongst teachers, in terms of their professional development needs, was the use of the Code in the identification and assessment of behavioural difficulties, and the writing and implementation of

IEPs. In the current study, one primary school headteacher pointed out: '*The Code of Practice was very well-defined in terms of learning difficulties but not for behaviour.*' In order to help clarify this situation, she asked a teacher from the Behaviour Support Service to provide INSET, to show staff how behaviour could be slotted into the procedures they were already using and ways of identifying and recording stages of behavioural concern. This approach was felt to be highly effective. Staff at a primary school elsewhere were looking for a similar kind of input and a secondary school SENCO noted that, in response to requests from schools, her LEA was in the process of producing guidance and criteria for behaviour.

Staff in schools were asked about the training they had received on the writing and implementation of IEPs. Their responses highlighted the following traits:

- Some schools had already been using detailed target setting for pupils with special educational needs so staff did not require much training.
- A feature of primary schools was the collaborative process they employed in writing IEPs. Training in these schools, therefore, was informal and task-orientated.
- Some secondary schools were still trying to establish a workable system and had identified the need to revisit training in this area.
- Some schools were introducing Individual Behaviour Plans (IBPs) and sought additional training on this.

Staff in two of the primary schools maintained that the introduction of IEPs had created no marked impact upon identified training needs. These schools were well-used to planning and using individual pupil targets. Their only consideration was to ensure that target writing became sharper, more precise and reader-friendly and that reviewing was introduced on a more systematic basis. Similarly, the SENCO in one of the secondary schools remarked that it wasn't '*a horrendous new thing*' to come to terms with. Staff in the department had always written targets for pupils with special needs. '*It seemed the logical thing*' and was something that had been developed and refined over a period of time.

As with other aspects of the training on the Code, the focus on IEPs was aimed primarily at SENCOs and apart from two secondary SENCOs who reported that they had not received any training on IEPs, those who were interviewed were reasonably satisfied with the INSET provided. In primary schools, the common trend was for SENCOs to take responsibility for writing IEPs in the first instance and then, using a scaffolding approach, gradually withdraw support and delegate more responsibility to class teachers. An important element of this approach was to allow class teachers an opportunity to write IEPs as a group, with the SENCO being on-call to support if needed. This was useful as it gave teachers a chance to '*bounce ideas off one another*'. Some headteachers allocated non-contact time for staff to write and review their IEPs. One school had reached the stage where teachers took full responsibility for writing their IEPs but were able to consult with the SENCO at a weekly 'clinic'. Where schools were supported by a teacher from the centralised Learning Support Service, IEPs also tended to be written collaboratively so that skills could be imparted through example. One primary school mentioned that the LEA had produced a blueprint IEP to help schools, but the staff had decided to develop their own version instead.

The situation in secondary schools was more complex. In over half the case-study schools, SENCOs and other teachers expressed some level of concern in relation to IEPs. In two of the schools, SENCOs themselves felt they lacked training and in a number of others, the problem was inextricably linked to structures and roles. In one school, for example, the SENCO had initially trained all of the teachers to write subject-specific IEPs, only to find that the system was unwieldy. Following a review of procedures, it was decided that the special needs department would write overall targets instead. In another school, the previous SENCO had left his post without disseminating all the required knowledge to the (then) second in department: '*A lot of time was spent rushing around trying to discover what had to be done.*' Difficulties associated with implementing change when faced with an already overburdened staff were highlighted by one SENCO who described how she had needed to tread lightly in the first instance – '*You can't go in straightaway saying "Right, staff. Everyone's got to be writing IEPs*'" – but was now finding there was insufficient involvement at Stage 1. In those secondary schools where training concerns were not raised, SEN

link teachers seemed to be used effectively in a supporting role to facilitate a more active contribution from subject teachers.

Two primary schools and a PRU identified the need to seek additional support and training in the drawing up of behaviour-specific targets or IBPs. This was achieved by involving educational psychologists or behaviour support teachers. At another pupil referral unit, staff were planning to utilise the expertise they had acquired, by developing a database of behaviour targets together with success indicators, strategies and monitoring arrangements for use in schools.

## 6.4 BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT TRAINING

More general training in the area of behaviour management was high on the agenda for many schools. As one deputy head remarked: '*Behaviour could actually take up most training days.*' It was perceived as an ongoing need for which there was no simple or single solution. It was more a case of, as one head put it, '*chipping away*' on a regular basis. Time, therefore, was an important factor, but lack of financial support was not identified as a major issue. For teachers in the case-study secondary schools, the pupil referral units and the special school, the main concern in relation to behaviour management was often associated with the quality and experience of trainers.

A number of secondary school teachers noted that it was difficult to find effective training, largely because they wanted deliverers who could demonstrate a realistic understanding of '*what school is about*'. One head of year complained that, in his experience, educational psychologists were '*out of touch*' and gave strategies which the pupils would simply laugh at if he tried them out. Another head of year pointed out that it was very difficult for trainers to gain credibility if they had not been practitioners themselves. He felt what teachers wanted was '*... an expert who has been and done it rather than read about it and tried it 40 years ago*'.

Two schools chose to use their Educational Psychology Service for training purposes, three others used their Behaviour Support Service, two mentioned outside consultants

and another two reported using staff from other local special and mainstream schools. In one LEA, a teacher had been funded to undertake a diploma in behaviour management and in another, a teacher was being funded through GEST to attend training on the management of disruptive pupils. In one or two cases, the SENCO took some responsibility for delivering training.

In the primary case-study schools, this concern about the quality of trainers did not present itself, although one deputy head admitted to feeling '*a bit sceptical*' of outside providers and another early years teacher complained that courses tended to be geared towards upper primary- or secondary-age pupils. In one LEA, teachers spoke highly of their adviser, who was an experienced teacher. In their eyes, he had both credibility and skill in putting information across well. One primary deputy head summed up her school's view on external support: '*We have expertise in the school but we like to have a mix of external trainers as well as in-house training.*' Overall, primary school teachers reported using a wider range of external providers including: LEA advisers; educational psychologists; Behaviour Support Services; multi-disciplinary teams; child protection teams; educational consultants; and higher education establishments.

Special school and PRU staff, on the other hand, found it more difficult to find effective training because they perceived themselves to be (or felt that others perceived them to be) the 'experts' and were therefore unsure who they could turn to for their own professional development. In two of the PRUs, staff were keen to develop their role in terms of delivering training to mainstream colleagues but this had yet to be realised.

The overwhelming view across all phases was that teachers valued informal, school-based training extremely highly. Discussions about behaviour management were a regular feature of most primary school staff meetings and this was perceived to be an effective style of professional development. A number of primary headteachers emphasised the importance of establishing and encouraging an 'open' atmosphere in which teachers could freely discuss any concerns they were experiencing in terms of behaviour management without feeling threatened.

One primary school headteacher noted the value of sharing good practice by using a team-teaching approach to classroom management and in another school, new staff were paired up with more experienced colleagues and time was allocated to enable teaching pairs to go into one another's classrooms.

In contrast, staff in secondary schools had less opportunity to see colleagues in action. As one head of year observed: '*Most teachers are autonomous in the classroom and very much alone with problems of managing behaviour.*' Another head of year in a different school reinforced this viewpoint: '*One of the problems is you never see anyone else teach, do you? Staff need to watch one another with classes they find difficult.*'

One SENCO observed that their behaviour support teacher came into school on a frequent and regular basis and this had enabled staff to garner useful strategies. Another SENCO praised the way in which colleagues from the learning support and bilingual support services worked in classrooms and provided an excellent role model for teachers: '*We learn good practice by watching them.*' The Behaviour Support Service in this LEA, on the other hand, worked out of classrooms and was seen as a less useful influence as it did not impact on staff development.

While opportunities for on-the-job training were more limited, secondary teachers also reinforced the positive contribution that informal discussions can make in learning how to manage behaviour more effectively. Some felt that this approach was actually more valuable than attending courses because of the need to talk to colleagues and learn from one another. In one school, an entire training day had been used to enable staff to share professional 'tips'. Because of the number of staff involved, meetings in secondary schools which focused on discussion about behaviour management tended to be either at departmental or house level, although a number of interviewees mentioned that whole-staff sessions were held on an annual basis in order to review the behaviour policy. This was considered to be an essential factor in maintaining the impetus of the whole-school response. A number of the case-study senior managers felt that staff needed a training 'boost' every so often, to prevent the system from

faltering: '*We always kick off the school year reminding ourselves what we are aiming for.*'

There were isolated examples of SENCOs taking a key role in the delivery of training on behaviour management issues. SENCOs in only two secondary schools felt sufficiently equipped to plan and deliver training in this area. Others explained that they did not have the expertise to get involved in that aspect of special needs training. Where formal training was delivered in-house, this tended to be a well-received element of a designated INSET day. Where follow-up training was offered on a discretionary basis, the level of attendance was sometimes disappointing. As one subject teacher explained: '*Some weeks we have four or five meetings so the last thing you want is voluntary training after school.*'

## 6.5 BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND OTHER RELATED TRAINING

### Assertive Discipline (AD)

Six of the secondary schools and three of the primaries had received a training input on AD methods.

Three of the secondary schools involved were from the same LEA and these had received considerable input from an adviser who had a particular interest and expertise in the field. Typically, the whole staff had come together for one or two days, viewed the Lee Canter training videos and spent many follow-up meetings '*thrashing-out*' the issues until staff felt comfortable with the tailored policy. One of these schools had since moved away from its original starting point, preferring the Bill Rogers approach. Another secondary school had received INSET on AD aimed at year tutors from an outreach PRU teacher; others noted only that the training had occurred some years ago.

Staff in one of the primary schools were trained by an educational psychologist in the AD approach. This training was instigated by the newly appointed headteacher, who was anxious to improve standards of behaviour across the school. In another school, training was delivered jointly by staff from a PRU outreach service and the behaviour

support team. According to the headteacher, many of the strategies were already in place; they just wanted to formalise everything. The third primary school had training provided by the educational psychologist and a teacher seconded to the Behaviour Support Service. This was a useful starting point for the school in developing a behaviour policy.

The importance of follow-up sessions was stressed in a number of instances, not only for purposes of review once the policy was in place, but as part of the introduction process so that schools could 'customise' and select what it was that staff wanted from the overall package.

**Personal skills development**

Six of the schools (across all phases) reported that they had used the Bill Rogers training videos as part of staff development on behaviour management. Typically, they had been used to promote discussion in the first instance and to raise awareness amongst staff about aspects of their own professional behaviour. It was thought to be a useful approach in dealing with more challenging behaviours, improving relationships, reducing conflict and enhancing staff morale:

> *It is very important in terms of keeping people's morale going because it is emotionally demanding for teachers to deal with children's behaviour difficulties and they often feel deskilled by it* (headteacher: primary).

In three cases, schools were planning to follow up this kind of work in more depth and two had booked further sessions with Bill Rogers himself.

In three other primary schools, interviewees mentioned the effective training they had received on 'Circle Time'. Another noted an input from an LEA officer in order to help support a pupil with a statement for emotional and behavioural difficulties, while social skills development and team-building were also mentioned briefly by staff in primary schools as examples of behaviour-related training.

**Dealing with bullying**

One primary, three secondary schools and one special school mentioned recent INSET in this area as an example of behaviour management training. In most cases, this was a whole-school policy development activity, although one secondary SENCO had delivered discrete training to lunchtime supervisors.

**Tutorship**

Two secondary schools identified this as an area of development and had introduced a training element for form tutors. One of the headteachers was saddened by the fact that a lot of new teachers had apparently not been trained to work pastorally. In his experience, some of the most highly qualified teachers were least effective in a tutor role. They saw their contribution in the narrow sense of simply providing knowledge. In the other school, there was a belief that some form tutors placed PSE well down their list of priorities. In order to provide pastoral development opportunities, the post of assistant head of year was opened up to applications on a rotating system. The need for training was highlighted by one recently qualified teacher who remarked: *'I wasn't told how to be a form tutor – just "Take the register and be nice to the class!"'*

Other examples of behaviour-related training included:

- Three primary schools who had, or were planning to use, continuing professional development (CPD) days to look at the impact of school grounds on behaviour and examine ways of enhancing the playground.

- Three schools reporting that teachers had attended courses on Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This was prompted by the fact they had pupils identified as such in their class at the time.

- One primary school which organised gender equality training because traditional, stereotyped behaviour in the pupils' homes was felt to be having implications for relationships within school.

## 6.6 TRAINING NEEDS

The need to maintain the high profile of behaviour management training was frequently articulated. It was clearly viewed as a theme which needed to be revisited on a regular basis. This was the case even amongst highly experienced and well-qualified teachers. Only a tiny minority of those who were interviewed felt that further training in this area was either unnecessary or a low priority for their school. Some explained that original aims and principles could easily become lost unless training was ongoing. Professional development was also perceived as a way of empowering staff to take responsibility for behaviour. Where schools had developed something of a reputation for 'turning bad behaviour around', staff were generally confident about managing behaviour, but senior teachers spoke about the importance of building confidence amongst less experienced colleagues. There was awareness that some staff may need more training than others.

Three associated areas were also regularly identified as training needs in relation to managing behaviour: teaching and learning styles in secondary schools; training for non-teaching staff; and networking opportunities.

### Teaching and learning styles

The need to develop teaching and learning styles in order to improve behaviour management was identified (often by SENCOs or heads of year) in the majority of secondary schools visited. This issue was not raised as a priority area by any of the primary school staff, who, perhaps, generally had greater opportunities to share professional practice and teach in a more collaborative style. SENCOs tended to have an overview of the situation in their schools and often recognised the complex interrelationship between learning and behaviour. In some cases, the main concern was curriculum planning and delivery; in others, it was more to do with practical strategies for effective classroom management or making improvements to the classroom environment. Heads of year raised issues to do with the lack of monitoring in secondary classrooms and saw training as a way of feeding in fresh ideas and '*refreshing people's memories*'. This was aimed at staff of all levels, including senior colleagues: '*We could all benefit from regular INSET on classroom management.*' One school had asked the Behaviour Support Service to provide training on behaviour

management linked to teaching and learning styles. The focus was to be on the role of teachers as change agents and how colleagues could support one another most effectively.

**Training for non-teaching staff**

This was raised as an important issue in the majority of the 11 primary schools but only in a small number of the secondary schools and the off-site provision. The main priority was to arrange ongoing training for lunchtime supervisors. In most cases, some training had been undertaken, either through consortium-based courses or by way of informal discussions with senior staff, and most primary schools had involved the lunchtime supervisors when the behaviour policy was discussed and written. This was seen as a positive and beneficial influence but further training needs had been identified. It was noticed in one school, for example, that although lunchtime staff had been fully involved in the training on Assertive Discipline, they were having difficulty in putting the policy into practice. They were '*overdoing the sanction bit*', as one teacher described it. In a small number of schools, lunchtime supervisors themselves were interviewed. Opportunities for staff development were recognised and valued. In some cases, future training needs were identified. One assistant voiced her personal concerns about the issues of physical restraint: '*How would I break up a fight between the bigger boys? Because you can't touch them, can you?*'

This aspect of behaviour management had been addressed, however, in another school, where lunchtime staff had received training on restraint from the local child protection team. One headteacher was prompted to organise a training programme for lunchtime staff as the school was attempting to achieve an Investors in People award and she recognised that this was a weak link. In most cases, training grew out of an increased awareness of the difficult and 'thankless' task facing non-teaching staff at lunchtimes: '*We felt they were quite vulnerable and probably needed the training more than the teacher*' (headteacher: middle school).'

In one LEA, training was being planned which required a teacher and a lunchtime supervisor from each school to attend a course together.

Training for classroom or learning support assistants was also mentioned in a few instances. It was recognised that support assistants had an important contribution to make in terms of acting as an extra pair of eyes and ears in the classroom. They were often the ones who noticed the kind of low-level disruptive behaviour that pupils gauged they could get away with, and therefore needed to present a response which was consistent with the school policy. In some cases, support assistants had access to accredited training, or courses were organised within clusters and led by LEA staff.

Specific training needs for certain care staff were also raised by the headteacher of a special school in which staff were required to support pupils on integration placements in mainstream schools. His main concern was that this group of staff had good skills which were not supported by paper qualifications. The problem was one of funding.

**Networking**

Staff in both primary and secondary schools identified the need for networking with colleagues in other establishments. In those schools where links had already been established, there was a desire to develop this further. Some teachers were curious to know how other schools interpreted approaches such as Assertive Discipline. Others felt they may have something positive to offer other schools which appeared not to be coping as well with difficult behaviour. There was some evidence that earlier GEST-funded projects had encouraged, or were encouraging, a more collaborative response from schools within clusters. Two SENCOs were enthusiastic about the professional support and training they received from SENCO groups in their LEAs. Others regretted the fact that SENCO groups had not been established in their area as it would have been useful to share views and obtain a wider view of how their role expectations were interpreted in relation to behavioural issues.

Staff in pupil referral units also identified the need for closer collaboration with mainstream staff, and one teacher had offered an open invitation to colleagues as he felt there needed to be a heightened awareness of the behaviour management approach he and his colleagues used at the PRU. His argument was that mainstream staff did not fully appreciate what he did and because he did not deal with large classes, there

was a certain lack of appreciation and understanding. In his opinion, there ought to be some mutual shadowing of roles.

***Professional development in behaviour management: key findings***

- Professional development in behaviour management remained an important consideration for all the case-study schools, and was recognised as an area needing constant revisiting. In addition, the need for training in the application of procedures for identifying and monitoring behaviour difficulties within the Code of Practice principles was noted.

- Interviewees in the case-study primary schools noted the opportunities to share ideas, concerns and strategies regarding pupil behaviour, including observation of colleagues; this was less apparent among their secondary counterparts.

- Secondary schools and off-site provision often expressed concern about the quality, relevance and availability of appropriate INSET providers in the area of behaviour management.

- In a number of the case-study secondary schools, senior managers and SENCOs wanted to see further training in the area of teaching and learning styles as a corollary to improving behaviour management.

# PART THREE
# MANAGING BEHAVIOUR: CLASSROOM PRACTICE AND PRINCIPLES

## CHAPTER 7

## EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT: KEY FACTORS AT CLASSROOM LEVEL

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents perceived key factors in effective behaviour management at classroom level as highlighted by interviewees in all of the case-study schools, and also by respondents to the questionnaire survey. During interviews in the case-study schools, a total of 86 interviewees were asked to cite what they saw as the key factors in achieving effective behaviour management at classroom level. Their responses then informed the construction of 13 statements about classroom behaviour management which were offered to all respondents in the survey exercise.

### 7.2 CLASSROOM FACTORS IN EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT: CASE-STUDY SAMPLE

The rank ordering of factors mentioned by interviewees as important in effective behaviour management is presented in Table 7.1. Most striking perhaps is the sheer range of factors which were identified by the interviewees, and, to some degree, the lack of consensus about what constituted an effective manager of behaviour at classroom level: of the 86 interviewees, only 24 (less than one in three) cited the most frequently mentioned factor, good organisation and planning. Equally noteworthy is that this highest-ranking response points up perceptions of the key relationship between pedagogical expertise and behaviour management. The association of good teacher preparation and organisation with good pupil behaviour may be particularly telling: by inference, behavioural difficulties are seen to relate to skills often in

operation, away from the classroom (e.g. planning) rather than some interpersonal breakdown at the point of pupil–teacher interaction.

**Table 7.1 Effective behaviour management in schools: the rank ordering of key factors at classroom level offered by 86 case-study interviewees**

| Key Factors Identified in Classroom Behaviour Management | No. of Interviewees |
|---|---|
| Good organisation and planning | 24 |
| Consistency | 19 |
| Fairness | 17 |
| Non-confrontational, calm approach | 17 |
| Praise and reward | 16 |
| Understanding of individuals' needs | 15 |
| Stimulating work and curriculum | 14 |
| Clear boundaries | 14 |
| Clear expectations regarding behaviour | 14 |
| Good relationships with pupils | 11 |
| Firmness | 11 |
| Differentiation | 11 |
| Sense of humour | 10 |
| Rules | 9 |
| Respect for pupils | 9 |
| Clear instructions about work | 9 |
| Anticipation of inappropriate behaviour | 8 |
| Awareness of everything happening in the classroom | 7 |
| Caring for pupils | 7 |
| Knowing pupils well | 6 |
| Classroom environment | 6 |
| Knowledge of subject | 5 |
| Marking work | 5 |
| Setting expectations regarding work | 4 |
| Use of behavioural strategies | 4 |
| Home–school relationships | 4 |

Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project: case-study interviews.*

Looking at this overall audit of responses, the factors identified actually fell into four broad categories:

- those focusing on teachers' classroom mediation or delivery of the curriculum
- those focusing on specific teacher techniques and approaches for the management of behaviour in the classroom
- those focusing on aspects of teacher–pupil interrelationships
- those focusing upon teachers' personal qualities.

It should be acknowledged that, typically, interviewees' answers to the question spanned several of these categories: for example, one headteacher of a PRU stated: '*I would say that being very organised and prepared; being flexible and tolerant and having a sense of humour: all those things go to make a good teacher in terms of behaviour.*'

**Teachers' classroom mediation of the curriculum**

The factors specified by interviewees as components of effective behaviour management which concerned teachers' classroom preparation and mediation of the curriculum included: good organisation and planning of lessons; the provision of stimulating work and curriculum tasks; differentiation; giving clear instructions; teachers' knowledge of the subject; feedback and marking of work; high expectations regarding work; and ensuring an attractive classroom environment. Pedagogical skill was intrinsically bound up with effective behaviour management:

> *We think that good practice is really about managing their behaviour. You know, if the class is losing concentration, what do you do? Do you shout at them or do you tweak your lesson plan a bit so that they get rechallenged and the behaviour disappears? ... I think those devices are good teaching and good behaviour management – I don't know where the join is but if it works, it works in both ways* (headteacher: secondary).

As noted already, good organisation and planning emerged as the most frequently mentioned factor of all in effective behaviour management, and was cited by personnel from all levels of school, though more often by those at secondary level.

The actual curriculum or work set was also highlighted, with interviewees stating that if pupils perceived the work and curriculum to be enjoyable, valuable and stimulating, it diminished the potential for inappropriate behaviour. Lessons should be well-paced, ensure the use of a range of resources and materials, and incorporate a variety of tasks which actively involved pupils.

Eleven interviewees mentioned '*differentiation*' as a key factor in effective behaviour management: interestingly, none of these were from primary schools; rather, nine were from secondary schools. Furthermore, only one classroom teacher elected to highlight differentiation as a factor in effective behaviour management; instead it was cited by those who were in some way specialists in behaviour management (a head of learning support, a SENCO, a behaviour support teacher and an EBD support teacher), and by those in middle and senior management. Differentiation was specified in terms of the level of the work – ensuring that there was work which could be accessed by pupils of all abilities in the class – and also in terms of the type of learning task, so that pupils' different learning styles were catered for.

Like differentiation, '*knowing your subject well*' was not mentioned at all by primary school personnel or by classroom teachers. Rather, it was highlighted by SENCOs and senior managers, working mainly at secondary level. Another factor, the marking of work, was also specified mostly by secondary school staff and also by senior management. Other factors to emerge were the need to give clear instructions regarding work (cited across all sectors), and helping children set high expectations with regard to their work, again most often cited by secondary school staff and senior management. A classroom's physical environment was also highlighted as a key factor, with interviewees commenting that it should be welcoming and attractive.

As a whole, secondary school staff were more likely to link effective curriculum delivery and good behaviour management. It is possible that the lesser emphasis on these factors amongst primary interviewees indicates that they did not connect curriculum factors with behaviour: it may be the case that at primary level, work and the curriculum are not as overtly rejected by pupils as they can be at secondary level. The citation of factors like differentiation by practitioners who were behaviour

specialists and senior management, but to a much lesser extent by classroom teachers, might suggest secondary mainstream practitioners did not as readily perceive opportunities to address behavioural problems by amending the level and type of learning task proffered.

| ***TEACHERS' CLASSROOM MEDICATION OF THE CURRICULUM*** | |
|---|---|
| **Organisation and planning** | *I think you have to be very well organised; I think that's probably number one* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*I think organisation and planning are the two most important factors* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*I think central to being a good manager of behaviour is to be very well organised* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Stimulating lessons and curriculum** | *If children aren't engaged in what they are doing, there's an awful lot of scope for behavioural problems* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*... providing the kids with stuff that they will enjoy doing ... getting them to value themselves and value what they are doing can often diminish or get rid of disruption. Some of the people who have fewest problems in the classroom are also superb teachers* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*I think you go a hell of a long way to solving your behaviour difficulties if you have got your curriculum right* (SENCO: secondary). |
| **Differentiation** | *I think there are elements of the work being at the correct level for the child, especially with the older children. Some of our behaviour issues have quite a lot to do with work.* [The kids think] *'I would rather my friends thought that I am not doing this because I am choosing not to do it rather than because I can't do it'* (deputy head: middle).<br><br>*You have to make sure you are catering for the different learning styles within the curriculum* (EBD support teacher: secondary).<br><br>*Differentiation, I think, is important; different tasks, you know, because of the way children learn ... meeting the individual's needs when it comes to learning* (behaviour support teacher: secondary). |
| **Clear instructions regarding work** | *The lesson has a focus and the children know what they are doing and that there is clear guidelines to what they are doing* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Knowledge of the subject** | *... knowing your subject, feeling confident with what you're teaching* (SENCO: middle).<br><br>*... know what you're talking about* (deputy head: secondary). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Marking work** | *... quality of the response ... in other words, books need to be marked very, very quickly, returned to youngsters very, very quickly. You need to be talking to youngsters about how they have made progress, and what wonderful things they have done, as well as how they can improve* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*One of the biggest factors, I think, is if students do work and it's not marked. That to me really must be a turn-off, if you have sweated and done it, even if you have only done four lines and you have done your best* (deputy head: secondary). |

**Specific teacher techniques and approaches for managing behaviour**

Typical references in this category were '*consistency*'; '*a non-confrontational, non-aggressive approach*'; having '*clear boundaries*', rules and expectations regarding behaviour; the teacher's ability to anticipate or defuse '*inappropriate behaviour*'; and awareness of what was happening in the classroom at all times.

'*Consistency*' was the second most frequently cited factor in effective behaviour management, mentioned by 19 interviewees, 11 of whom were from primary schools. This was not a factor greatly highlighted by those working in the PRUs or the residential special school, which may indicate that these interviewees did not regard consistency *per se* as an appropriate or achievable approach when managing the behaviour of pupils who experience emotional and behavioural difficulties. There appeared to be some difference in what interviewees regarded as the exact meaning and outcome of consistency: whether it operated at whole-school level with all teachers managing behaviour in the same way, or whether it mattered only that individual teachers were consistent in the management of their own classes. Being consistent was strongly associated with being fair, especially by primary school staff, and was also linked with the creation of a feeling of security in the classroom, as interviewees stressed that consistency was important so that pupils knew where they stood at all times.

Those working at secondary level, and classroom teachers particularly, saw the existence of clear boundaries in the classroom as a key factor in effective behaviour management. Although interviewees from these good-practice case-study schools did highlight the need for clear parameters, a teacher from a PRU stated that, in his experience, teachers in mainstream schools often failed to establish boundaries for

pupils. Having '*clearly defined expectations*' regarding behaviour was also cited as a factor, most often by secondary school staff. The same issue emerged here as with the terminology of consistency: some interviewees stated that individual teachers should be clear about their own expectations regarding behaviour, whereas other interviewees stressed the importance of all staff in the school sharing the same expectations.

'*A non-confrontational approach*' was identified as a key factor by interviewees at all levels and from all types of school. It was said that teachers should never lose their tempers, shout, or speak to pupils in an inappropriate tone as this was likely to incite further disruption. Rather, teachers should be calm and keep misbehaviour in perspective. Several interviewees referred to a sense of failure if they were to experience and express real anger in relation to a pupil.

The importance of praise and reward was cited equally at primary and secondary level. However, it was specialists in behaviour management who were especially likely to suggest this as a factor: among the 16 interviewees to acknowledge this, there were five SENCOs, an EBD support teacher, the coordinator of a centre for pupils with behavioural difficulties which was attached to a mainstream school, and a teacher from a PRU. In contrast, the role of praise and reward was highlighted by only one classteacher. Interviewees considered praise to be more effective than tangible rewards.

Nine interviewees noted that the operation of rules in the classroom contributed to effective behaviour management. Four of these nine interviewees were from the same primary school, probably reflecting an emphasis on rules in the school (it is interesting to note that instead of a set of whole-school rules, each class devised their own rules). A SENCO in a primary school and a teacher in a PRU stressed the need for the pupils to fully understand the rules in operation, the SENCO noting that involving pupils in the formulation of rules could help in this.

The anticipation of poor behaviour and an awareness of what was happening in the classroom at all times were highlighted as a key factor, most often by those working a secondary level.

A most interesting finding was the preponderance of specialists in behaviour management who acknowledged the importance of praise and reward in behaviour management, compared with their mainstream colleagues.

| ***SPECIFIC TEACHER TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES*** | |
|---|---|
| **Consistency** | *I'll actually go so far as to say that in some ways it doesn't always matter if the consistency is not spot on from classroom to classroom as long as over a period of time you're consistent within each place, because those kids will adjust to each quirk and personality for each different teacher* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>[Consistency is] ... *so important. Children respond to you being the same, and having the same expectations put on them* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*If you tell someone off for something and if someone else does it, you have got to be consistent and do the same to them* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*Fairness and consistency, so that whoever does misbehave, they will get punished, they will know that they will get punished and they will know what the punishment is, but at the same time rewarding all those children who don't misbehave – those are the two key words: fairness, consistency* (deputy head: primary). |
| **Non-confrontational approach** | *You can't be a sergeant major. If you are a sergeant major, they will kill you* (teacher: secondary).<br><br>*One of the things that our kids say they don't like is they don't like teachers that put them down and shout: they are the teachers that our kids would react most to* (headteacher: PRU).<br><br>*Just shouting in the face of children, that doesn't work at all. In fact, for some children, they would shout back, and that makes a situation worse* (deputy head: primary).<br><br>*I find it extremely difficult to understand how teachers can speak in an offensive way to children of whatever age and not expect the children to return that. Tone of voice matters* (headteacher: primary). |
| **Praise and reward** | *Praise, it's the most important thing* (acting headteacher: primary).<br><br>*If the noise level in my classroom is too high and I want it lower, I don't say 'It's too noisy'. I look around for two people who are working really hard, and I say 'Oh well done, Joe and Sophie. Five points each. You are on task and working really beautifully': you get the same effect* (acting headteacher: primary).<br><br>*... try to reward somebody before you sanction somebody. You know, try to be positive* (SENCO: primary).<br><br>*I think you do have to have sanctions, but I do think that praise and success carry further than sanctions do* (SENCO: secondary). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Clear boundaries** | *... having very clear boundaries at all times and children knowing exactly where they stand* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*... very clear guidelines as to what is acceptable and what isn't and the kids know where they stand and it's very much clear-cut* (headteacher: PRU).<br><br>*I think you can smile right from the start. It doesn't make a bit of difference at all to the children, as long as they know where they stand and where you draw the line as teacher/pupil* (teacher: secondary).<br><br>*Obviously they've got to know where the lines are. If they step over that line, that gets pointed out to them in some form or another* (head of house: secondary).<br><br>*We sometimes find that in classes in mainstream, the teachers don't set their limits, there's no boundaries and the kid finds out by getting shouted at and they don't know why because they haven't done anything wrong as far as they are concerned* (teacher: PRU). |
| **Clear expectations regarding behaviour** | *... having very clear expectations and having it quite clear for the children to see that there will be certain outcomes if they behave in unacceptable ways* (headteacher: primary). |
| **Explanation of rules** | *I think a lot of the times a lot of the rules are put there but they are not explained, and the kid doesn't have any idea of what the rule means. There is a lot of early explanation got to be done, I think* (teacher: PRU).<br><br>*I think you've got to make sure that the children are fully aware and fully understand the rules that they've written* (SENCO: primary). |
| **Anticipation of inappropriate behaviour** | *I think one of the skills you learn when you've been teaching a long time is, in a sense, to nip things in the bud* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*You have to have the skills of defusing confrontation early, rather than letting situations escalate* (teacher: residential special school).<br><br>*I don't think a classroom should be a battleground. It isn't necessary – there are ways of dealing with situations without it getting to that stage. If you can nip things in the bud just by a look or a word or just wandering in that direction, you know; it doesn't need to blow up into something major* (head of house: secondary). |

## Teacher–pupil interrelationships

Another group of factors cited by the interviewed teachers and managers was concerned with aspects of relationships between pupils and teacher. Reference was made to the consideration of individuals' circumstances; the teacher respecting pupils; knowing pupils well; caring for pupils; liking children; establishing good home–school relationships; and an awareness of pupils' educational and special educational needs (particularly mentioned by senior staff).

Good relationships with pupils were a factor highlighted mostly by secondary school personnel: only two of the 11 interviewees to cite this were from primary schools. It is also noteworthy that only two classroom teachers commented upon this (though it may be that the establishment of good relationships with pupils was so second nature to classroom teachers and primary school staff that they did not directly associate it with effective behaviour management). Linked to this, respect for pupils was also identified as an important factor, with interviewees commenting that teachers should show pupils the respect which they expected themselves, particularly in the manner and tone in which they addressed youngsters.

Straightforward aspects such as '*caring for pupils*', '*liking young people*' were mentioned. '*Knowing individual pupils well*' was also highlighted. Finally, establishing good relationships between home and school was acknowledged by four interviewees, all primary-level personnel. In effect, a relationship with an individual rather than just the learner seemed to be stressed in this type of answer.

| ***TEACHER–PUPIL INTERRELATIONSHIPS*** | |
|---|---|
| **Understanding of individuals' needs** | *It is the teacher who sees the individual ... and that individual's needs, can read beneath the questions* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*You need to know about individual children's needs* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*A good manager of behaviour in the classroom understands the special needs of pupils and sees some behavioural problems as special needs rather than as an attack on that particular teacher* (deputy headteacher: secondary). |
| **Good relationships with pupils** | *You have got to want to have a relationship with kids that is positive* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*Building up good relationships is most important because I think you gain respect from that to begin with* (teacher: secondary).<br><br>*If students think that you don't like them, then they have no reason not to upset you, but if you develop human relationships, they will tend not to upset you: they will be upset that you are upset* (teacher: secondary). |
| **Respect for pupils** | *... shows respect of the children which they expect themselves* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*The way that children respond to the way that we speak to them and the way that we respect them as individuals is so crucial. Respect is not a soft term. It is about respecting them as people but challenging them in academic ways, challenging them in behaviour ways: to say 'This is what we expect of you for your benefit and for your community of which you are a part'* (deputy head: secondary). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Caring for pupils** | *Genuinely caring for the children* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*A good manager of behaviour in a classroom is first of all somebody who loves kids* (deputy head: secondary). |
| **Knowing pupils well** | *I think it's knowing your children, knowing how they will react. Knowing what is the best sort of thing to actually say to that particular child to get them back on track, really* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*A good manager has got to see beyond the immediacy of what a child is now, but what a child might well become* (deputy head: secondary). |

### Teachers' personal qualities

A further set of responses all addressed the qualities and attitudes of the teacher as a person. Factors mentioned within this category were fairness, firmness, sense of humour, humility (the ability to apologise to pupils when mistaken), tolerance, and an openness to changing practices.

Fairness was particularly emphasised by primary school staff, and was associated with consistency, while firmness was highlighted particularly by classteachers and those working at secondary level. Interviewees stressed that teachers should be firm without being aggressive. Being firm was associated with being fair as six of those interviewees who offered firmness as a key factor also identified fairness. '*Having a sense of humour*' was mentioned as it meant that there was empathy between the teacher and pupils, and humour could help to keep in perspective incidents of inappropriate behaviour. An openness to new ideas and changing practices was also highlighted. A teacher in a PRU affirmed that with changing times, it was important to learn new ideas, and stated that it was necessary that teachers' classroom practice adapted over the course of their teaching career to take account of the inevitable changes in society and in young people's lives. Further teacher qualities included assertiveness, conscientiousness, enthusiasm, sympathy, friendliness, determination, confidence, humility, sincerity and decisiveness.

| *TEACHERS' PERSONAL QUALITIES* | |
|---|---|
| **Fairness** | *When teachers shout, there are always a significant number of children in that classroom who have done nothing wrong – why should they live in an environment where shouting is going on? That's not fair; it comes back to fairness* (headteacher: primary). |
| **Firmness** | *... be very firm without being aggressive* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*Somebody who's firm, somebody who's fair* (headteacher: residential special school). |
| **Sense of humour** | *... having a sense of humour* (teacher: secondary).<br><br>*If you take everything that* [pupils] *say seriously, then you would end up with a class of one because you can't overreact to all situations* (head of year: secondary). |
| **Openness to changing practice** | *The teachers are learners as well ... somebody who will accept that in teaching you will have major success but also have things where you'll have something that you feel is a failure but will learn from it* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*Even if you are 56 and you have been teaching since you were 21, you have got to accept the fact that some kids you don't know, and you need to retrain, you need to re-evaluate what you do because things are changing all the time, situations outside are changing, the environment the kid lives in. If they are bringing that to school, you have got no chance really* (teacher: PRU). |
| **Other 'teachers' personal qualities' factors** | *I want somebody who's tolerant with children, but on the other hand, I don't want them that tolerant that there's mayhem in class* (headteacher: residential special school).<br><br>*I think they have got to have an appetite for the bloody job, to be honest with you. I think they have got to want to do it. When you look at some teachers, you think they don't even look like they want to be here, so I think there's a certain element of enthusiasm* (deputy head: secondary). |

The sheer range of factors which were cited by interviewees as key in effective behaviour management at classroom level perhaps indicates the complexity in defining exactly what constitutes a good manager of behaviour in the classroom. Four broad categories of factors clearly emerged, but the combination of factors needed to enable a teacher to manage behaviour well was seen by some interviewees to be very individual. It was acknowledged that all teachers must '*develop their own unique technique*' (deputy head: secondary), and that it was '*very difficult*' to specify what made a good manager of behaviour because '*there's no standard format because we all work in different ways*' (headteacher: PRU). In fact, it appeared that some teachers could manage behaviour very effectively without using several of the factors which were cited as being fundamental. For instance, while good organisation and planning of lessons was the most frequently mentioned factor, one headteacher in a PRU noted that '*some teachers are very charismatic, and the children could have a very*

*disorganised lesson but the children like that person so much they will go along with them whatever*'. Likewise, the importance that interviewees placed on praise when managing behaviour has been shown, but a headteacher from a secondary school acknowledged that amongst his staff '*there are effective teachers who may use more sanctions than praise but they still seem to be effective teachers*'. Indeed, one respondent noticed that in his school, staff with markedly different approaches were managing behaviour equally well:

> *If you look at the school round here, there is lots of teachers who have got really good discipline, who have got really different styles. It has got to be one that suits you. Some will not smile for the whole day ... others will have big cheesy grins on all day and they have got the same sort of discipline* (head of year: secondary).

Other difficulties in determining an effective manager of behaviour were also highlighted. A SENCO from a secondary school raised the issue that '*a strict disciplinarian seems to manage behaviour well, but very often a teacher who has a more laid-back approach gets more out of the children*'. Further, the type of lesson was also recognised as having a significant impact on behaviour management, with teachers of desk-bound subjects like maths being seen to require a different approach from those of more expressive subjects like English. Two members of staff from a secondary school commented that it would be very beneficial if teachers had the opportunity to observe good practitioners in the classroom so that they could gain new ideas from them. It thus appeared that the identification of the many factors which were seen to contribute to effective behaviour management was very complex, and was therefore perhaps best summed up by the headteacher of a residential special school who regarded an effective manager of behaviour as '*a very special person*'.

Beyond that, the sheer range of opinion and lack of consensus about effective classroom behaviour management is perhaps particularly telling for one significant group in education: pupils themselves. Their capacity to respond and conform to the variety of approaches outlined by teacher discussion of this issue suggests that secondary pupils, particularly, need very sophisticated skills to relate to the styles and expectations of the teachers they encounter.

## 7.3 CLASSROOM FACTORS IN EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT: THE SURVEY

As part of the inquiry into key factors in effective behaviour management, the NFER survey contained a section which presented a list of 13 statements that could form components of effective management of behaviour at classroom level. These were largely based on the views expressed in the case-study schools. Respondents were asked to select and tick the six statements which they considered the most important.

One-hundred-and-twenty senior managers and 356 teachers completed this part of the questionnaire, and the full results are given in Table 7.2.

Both senior managers and teachers gave the highest ranking response to '*Teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to behaviour*', with about nine out of ten concurring that this statement was a key component in managing behaviour. While the teacher subsample gave the second highest ranking to '*Teacher displays consistency in handling pupils' classroom behaviour*', senior managers focused next most frequently on a curriculum mediation factor, '*Teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to work*'. In the same way, senior managers gave a notably higher ranking to the curriculum mediation factors of '*differentiated curriculum*' and '*first-rate classroom organisation and skills*'. Around half of the senior manager subsample chose these two statements (49 per cent and 56 per cent). In contrast, around a third of teachers (31 per cent) indicated differentiation might be a factor in effective behaviour management and less than half (44 per cent) selected classroom organisation as a key component.

However, one in six teachers rated '*knowing his/her subject very well*' compared with one in ten senior managers. The greater focus on specific behaviour-related aptitudes by the teacher subsample was also reflected in their higher nomination rate for '*anticipating behaviour problems*', although this was selected only by a quarter of teacher respondents (compared with one in six senior managers).

Other major differences related to teachers' greater emphasis on '*clear sense of back-up/support system*' when encountering challenging classroom behaviour (selected by a third of the teacher sample but by only a quarter of the responding senior managers).

Beyond that, other interesting trends from these results emerged from looking at which statements did not receive high ratings. The very low consideration given to '*pupils' home and personal circumstances*' (noted by only one in ten teachers and just three per cent of senior managers) might be worthy of comment. Equally, about one-third of both subsamples did not include '*showing respect for pupils*', or '*acknowledging and rewarding good behaviour in the classroom*' as among their most important factors; while just over half of the whole sample rejected '*adopting a non-confrontational approach/refraining from getting angry*' as a top-ranking component. Within each subsample, about three-quarters gave no top six rating to the statement '*Teacher is aware of concerns/behavioural targets relating to individual pupils*'.

**Table 7.2** **Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of responses identifying components of effective behaviour management**

| Teacher Approach | Senior Manager N = 120 | | Teacher N = 356 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to behaviour | 110 | 92 | 313 | 88 |
| Teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to work | 91 | 76 | 246 | 69 |
| Teacher shows respect for pupils | 80 | 67 | 220 | 62 |
| Teacher displays consistency in handling pupils' classroom behaviour | 78 | 65 | 283 | 80 |
| Teacher makes a point of acknowledging and rewarding good behaviour in the classroom | 73 | 61 | 233 | 65 |
| Teacher has first-rate classroom organisation and skills | 67 | 56 | 157 | 44 |
| Teacher has a clearly differentiated curriculum for the pupils | 59 | 49 | 110 | 31 |
| The teacher adopts a non-confrontational approach/refrains from getting angry | 55 | 46 | 162 | 46 |
| Teacher has a clear sense of a back-up/support system when s/he encounters challenging classroom behaviour | 31 | 26 | 124 | 35 |
| Teacher is aware of concerns and/or behavioural targets relating to individual pupils | 29 | 24 | 99 | 28 |
| Teacher can anticipate problem behaviours | 20 | 17 | 84 | 24 |
| Teacher knows his/her subject very well | 11 | 9 | 53 | 15 |
| Teacher is aware of the pupils' home and personal circumstances | 3 | 3 | 38 | 11 |

*Percentages sum to more than 100 as respondents were permitted up to six choices.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–98.*

These findings can, of course, be no more than a source for speculation. However, within the sample overall, there does seem to be a trend to focus on maintaining and conveying general standards (of classroom control and curriculum mediation) rather than recognising and responding to individual needs and circumstances. For the majority of pupils, such a focus may be effective in managing their behaviour, but it may be less successful for pupils who experience behavioural difficulties. If addressing pupil disaffection is so crucially linked to youngsters' sense of the manageability of curriculum and their own self-esteem/a sense of individual worth, then the evidence here may suggest that mainstream school culture's view of effective behaviour management gives these aspects a rather low prominence.

The analysis further selected a number of variables (including gender, number of years teaching, subject specialism and age of respondent) and attempted to look for statistically significant differences in the way these subsamples responded to the 13 statements.

On the issue of '*The teacher conveys clear expectations with regard to work*', selected by just over two-thirds (69 per cent) of the teacher sample, there was some notable correlation between rating this factor and age/years teaching. Younger teachers (under 35 years) and those with less than ten years' experience were less likely to select this statement than their older and more experienced colleagues. Just over half of these relatively less experienced teachers (57 per cent) affirmed this as a key factor in effective behaviour management (as did those practitioners in the youngest age bracket), compared with three-quarters of teachers (74 per cent) with 11 to 20 years' teaching experience. Teachers with over 20 years' experience rated the statement more than any other subsample, with 80 per cent selecting this as among their top six factors. '*Clear expectations*' was also rated highly by teachers of expressive/practical subjects (such as technology, art, PE) and those teaching maths and science: nominated by about three-quarters (75 and 76 per cent respectively) of both these subject specialist subsamples. In comparison, 69 per cent of humanities teachers and 55 per cent of English and modern languages staff selected this statement.

While just less than two-thirds of the teacher sample as a whole selected '*The teacher shows respect for pupils*', a breakdown by age variables again showed the oldest age band rating this factor more highly than their younger colleagues. Nearly three-quarters of teachers aged over 45 (71 per cent) chose this, compared with just over half of those in the younger age brackets (56 and 57 per cent of the aged 35 and under and aged 36-45 subsamples).

'*Making a point of rewarding good behaviour*' had a significant correlation with gender: three-quarters (74 per cent) of women respondents compared with 52 per cent of males selected this as one of their six key factors. Responses to the issue of '*Teacher knows his/her subject well*' also showed a marked difference between male and female teachers. One-fifth (19 per cent) of the male subsample selected this as one of their top six factors, compared with one in ten (ten per cent) of women staff. This factor also showed different response rates between the subject specialists: a quarter of those teaching expressive/practical subjects (24 per cent) selected this statement, compared with one in ten (ten per cent) of maths/science, English and modern language specialists.

Again, the implications of these results can be speculated about. Certainly, the strong affirmation of differing 'classroom cultures' regarding behaviour management in different subjects begins to emerge, as well as how the age, gender and seniority of staff may significantly shift the emphasis on what constitutes effective behaviour management approaches. Above all, it does perhaps attest to just how adept pupils have to be at adapting their 'pupil styles' to manage teacher behaviours! Equally, a clear message from these data is how the concept of 'consistency' in the management of behaviour might need to take account of these differences, and that any notion of 'whole-school policies' achieving consistency which ignores such variables does so at its peril.

***Factors in effective behaviour management at classroom level: key findings***

- 'Behaviour specialists' (e.g. PRU staff, SENCOs, residential care staff) gave more emphasis to curriculum differentiation and praise and reward as key factors than did their mainstream colleagues. Indeed, some two-thirds of the survey teacher sample did not rate differentiation as among their top six factors for effective management of behaviour.

- The importance of good teacher–pupil relations, with profoundly simple concepts such as respecting, caring for, and just liking young people, was cited as a key factor by a number of interviewees in the case-study schools. However, respect for pupils was rejected by one in three of secondary teachers as a key factor in behaviour management.

- Teacher qualities such as fairness, firmness, openness to new ideas and a sense of humour were rated by the case-study sample.

- Good classroom organisation and planning was the factor cited most frequently by the case-study sample.

- In the survey, older teachers and those with more teaching experience affirmed 'respect for pupils' as a key factor in effective behaviour management.

# CHAPTER 8

# PHILOSOPHIES UNDERPINNING APPROACHES TO BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

## 8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter draws on qualitative data from interviews conducted with a range of personnel in the case-study schools, and examines the philosophies or value-systems underpinning approaches to behaviour management. In the course of the individual interviews with senior managers, pastoral staff, SENCOs, classroom teachers and non-teaching staff, interviewees were asked to '*sum up what they saw as the philosophy behind their school's approach to behaviour management*'; the origins of that philosophy; and the extent to which it was shared by the whole school community. Further, interviewees were asked to talk about their own personal philosophy underpinning behaviour management, from where this had been generated, and how far they felt their own and their school's philosophy merged.

## 8.2 SCHOOL PHILOSOPHIES

Five different emphases emerged from within interviewees' accounts of the philosophy or principle underpinning their school's approach to behaviour management:

**(i)** **Pupils' treatment of others** – This type of emphasis stressed that pupils were encouraged to respect others; phrases like being '*courteous*', '*considerate*', '*tolerant*' and '*cooperative*' were prominent. The creation of a caring and safe community within the school was also mentioned in this respect.

**(ii)** **Learning-related** – This emphasis linked behaviour and learning, specifically referencing a better learning ambience to ensure academic achievement, enjoyment of school, and better job prospects as a purpose and intended outcome of effective behaviour management.

**(iii)** **Self-development of pupils** – This emphasis paid attention to the self-development of pupils; the raising of their self-esteem; the fulfilment of each individual's potential; and the encouragement of pupils to take responsibility for their behaviour.

(iv) **The school's approach to pupils** – This emphasis highlighted how pupils were treated by school staff, interviewees citing giving pupils respect, praise, positive reinforcement and equal opportunities, and allowing them numerous chances to improve their behaviour.

(v) **Practical management of behaviour** – This emphasis focused on the practical side of managing behaviour in the school and included key phrases such as '*clear expectations*' as regards behaviour, a '*firm structure*' and '*a consistent approach*' from either individual staff or the whole school. Rules and support for staff were mentioned, as well as staff working collectively in order to improve pupils' behaviour.

Each of these emphases is discussed in detail overleaf, but from the outset, it must be stressed that interviewees tended to identify elements from a number of these five broad categories as part of the principles behind behaviour management. However, as an overview, the case-study primary schools' philosophies underpinning behaviour management were far more likely to emphasise **treatment of others** than was the case among secondary school interviewees. Interviewees from eight of the 11 primary schools but only four of the 12 secondary schools specified a focus on pupils' behaviour towards others as part their school's philosophy. By contrast, the secondary schools appeared more explicitly to identify a **learning-related** philosophy, being much more likely to link the intent of behaviour management with pupils' learning and being successful in their education. Whilst interviewees from eight of the 12 secondary schools cited this as part of their school's philosophy, interviewees in only three of the 11 primary schools did so. The implications of this possible difference between primary and secondary school principles may be significant for how and if pupils can adjust to a change of behaviour management culture as they transfer at Year 7.

Equally noteworthy is the fact that this mainstream sample's discourse on behaviour management philosophies rarely made use of technical/theoretical terms. Distinctive approaches such as 'behaviourist', 'eco-systemic', 'cognitive', 'psychodynamic' were not in any way part of the interviewees' explications, although the attitudes and intent of these approaches may well be reflected within the ordinary language of the practitioner. This may still suggest just how far removed mainstream practice is from any clear methodology or discipline of behaviour. Where purposes and approaches

are not fully understood or articulated, they may also not be valued. This may indicate that it is not just the provision of techniques for managing behaviour but also a better conceptualisation of the meaning of behaviour which is required in training and professional development.

Each of the five principles or philosophies is now exemplified in some detail.

**Philosophy underpinning behaviour management: (i) Pupils' treatment of others**

As already noted, ensuring pupils had the appropriate attitudes and skills to treat others positively was stressed by interviewees in some eight of the 11 case-study primary schools. '*Tolerating*', '*respecting*' and '*cooperating*' with other pupils were key recurring terminologies, and accounts of the success of this emphasis were referenced. In this context, a number of primary staff noted the capacity of their pupils to relate successfully to peers with specific behaviour difficulties. Indeed, the most inclusive view expressed here (by one primary SENCO) was that, as well as allowing '... *differences to be celebrated*', the presence of children with behavioural problems in school actually had a '*positive effect*' on others '... *because the other children have had to cope and they have learnt to be more tolerant, and that is a lesson in life for everybody*'.

A further aspect of this emphasis was making pupils aware of how their behaviour affected others, and '*consideration*' emerged regularly in practitioner accounts. Associated with this consideration of others was the creation of a secure, warm environment, with several primary and secondary interviewees noting that their philosophy included the school being a '*safe*', '*stable*' and '*happy*' place. Staff acting as role models to encourage pupils' appropriate behaviour towards others was noted as a feature of their school's philosophy in four of the primary case studies, with one school writing in its Information for Staff booklet: '*We need to show our children good positive role models. They love to see us joking, laughing and discussing together. Let us show them how good relationships can be.*'

| ***What is the philosophy underpinning behaviour management in this school?*** | |
|---|---|
| ***TREATMENT OF OTHERS*** | |
| **Respect and tolerance of others** | *A principle that underlies the school is that we must all respect one another, so you should never do anything that hurts another person knowingly, either through words or through actions – that's the underpinning thing* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>[our philosophy is about] *children cooperating to help each other, to take responsibility for each other, and it's about tolerance of each other, but beyond tolerance of each other, a kind of valuing of everybody* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*... the children are more tolerant and understanding than I am. I'm full of admiration for the children here who can be so accepting of someone who may be persistently difficult for them to relate to and they always give them another chance. Always* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*The philosophy I think generally is to try to ... get all the kids to get on with each other* (head of house: secondary).<br><br>*... it's the tolerating of somebody else speaking, the fact that you aren't the centre of attention all the time ... if you can cooperate and tolerate, then you will get something out of* [school] *at every level* (head of year: secondary). |
| **Consideration of others** | *We see the school as a sort of safe haven – whatever's going on outside, the school's a safe haven. But, it can't be a safe haven if the children are acting as individuals and doing what they want to do regardless of other people. So I think the philosophy here is that we ask the children to be considerate* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*I think it's about consideration for others – all the old fashioned things like being polite, respect, it's just a whole ethos in the school* (centre manager: primary). |
| **Staff as role models** | *We try to support one another, and that, I think, is a good role model for the children. They see adults behaving in this caring way, as well as the children being expected to behave in that way* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*... the way that we deal with each other obviously rubs off on the children. There is no hierarchy here* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*There's always laughs going on ... I think that comes across with the children as well: the children see that the teachers are happy* (midday supervisor: primary). |

### Philosophy underpinning behaviour management: (ii) learning-related

The accounts from staff in eight of the secondary case studies but only three of the primary schools emphasised this value system underpinning behaviour management. Their discourse appeared to focus on academic learning, progress and achievement as much as (or even rather more than) stressing any other kind of pupil development. One secondary headteacher noted that the adoption of Assertive Discipline (AD) was

'*integral*' to his school's philosophy of '*pupils behaving well so they could learn and teachers could teach*'. A further implication, voiced occasionally within the 'learning-related' behaviour management emphasis, was that certain children's behaviour should not be allowed to interrupt this academic purpose.

| ***What is the philosophy underpinning behaviour management in this school?*** | |
|---|---|
| ***LEARNING-RELATED*** | |
| | *... everything we do must be related to the effective learning of each child* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*The bottom line is that we want all pupils to make progress ... and the purpose of teachers wanting good behaviour is not then because the pupils then do exactly what they tell them what to do, but it's because the teachers want the children to learn. The reason we want them to behave is because if they don't behave, they can't make progress and they can't do well* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*The emphasis is placed on that by behaving well and using the time at school well, it will benefit them in the long run ... what we are here for is we are trying to encourage them to make the best of their time in education* (teacher: secondary).<br><br>*... the school generally has the belief that it's our job to educate the youngster to the point to which we have to acknowledge that we can do no more with them, or that their overall effect on others is something that can't be tolerated* (headteacher: secondary).<br><br>*What we say to children is that every teacher has a right to teach and every child has a right to learn, so that is our basic philosophy, so you come to school and no one should prevent that from happening* (acting headteacher: primary). |

## Philosophies underpinning behaviour management: (iii) self-development of pupils

This third emphasis stressed the personal development of pupils, and featured among the accounts in almost all of the case-study schools. In what appeared to be a significant development from those philosophies which associated specifically the learning and academic potential of pupils with behaviour management, many accounts stated that pupils' self-development and sense of personal achievement was integral to their school's behaviour management philosophy. Hence, interviewees in a number of the secondary schools often recounted how an emphasis on extracurricular activity was a corollary to their school's approach to behaviour management.

Seven mainstream schools (six primary and one secondary) mentioned the raising of pupils' self-esteem as a component of their approach to behaviour management. Mostly, the use of praise was noted as the means to achieve this, and some interviewees saw self-esteem as the most crucial aspect of learning. This view was also expressed in off-site provision, where self-esteem was closely associated with the ability of children to change and develop.

In response to the question of their school's philosophy, a small number of references were also made to pupils achieving a strong sense of their personal identity: as one primary teacher put it: '... *our thinking* [behind behaviour management] *is to ensure pupils are autonomous, empowered and independent.*'

Examples of a slightly different emphasis were evident in some of the primary and secondary schools, several interviewees noting the principle of developing pupil self-responsibility with regard to behaviour, and the corollary of pupils accepting any 'consequences' if behaviour was not effectively self-managed.

| ***What is the philosophy underpinning behaviour management in this school?*** *SELF-DEVELOPMENT OF PUPILS* | |
|---|---|
| **Helping self-achievement** | *The aim of the school is to develop the unique potential in each child and that's what we try and do* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*If youngsters have something that they are achieving and about which they can be proud, about which they can be affiliated to the institution, then they are rarely going to misbehave. If they are alienated from the institution, if there's nothing in the day-to-day work of the institution where they can achieve any success, then they are going to achieve notoriety, rather than fame. I want them all to be famous. That's* [the school's philosophy] *in a nutshell* (head-teacher: secondary).<br><br>*There's lots going on outside school, children are encouraged to participate in* [extracurricular activities] ... *They are encouraged to find somewhere where they can achieve, where they can do well, where they can build self-esteem* (SENCO: secondary). |
| **Raising self-esteem** | *One of the most important things here is making them feel good about themselves and because they are so good, we praise them a lot. We tell them how thrilled we are with them, what wonderful people they are, how sensible, how grown up* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*We build their self-esteem. We tell them how wonderful they are ... all of those sorts of things are going on all the time – 'Well done', you know; and we say things to them whether or not it's true: 'You are the best school in town; your work is lovely'* (acting headteacher: primary).<br><br>*I think* [our philosophy] *all goes back to self-esteem basically – that children won't learn well unless they feel good about themselves, and good about the situation they're in* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*We use rewards rather than sanctions to get there and to build up the child's self-esteem, because fundamental to being able to change is, I think, that you have to feel that you can do ... so fundamental to what we do is to build up self-esteem and to build up self-confidence and to build skills* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Sense of personal identity** | *We want them to go out of here feeling they know who they are and they have a place in the world* (class teacher: primary).<br><br>*... we want to enable pupils to voice their opinions and celebrate their individuality* (headteacher: secondary). |
| **Self-responsibility** | *I think we would like to see* [our philosophy] *as enabling children to be responsible for their own behaviour, not just controlling them by the use of sanctions* (deputy head: middle).<br><br>*I would say we try to make the children responsible: the children have to take responsibility for what they do and if they don't take responsibility, they have got to be aware of the consequence, just as there is going to be outside* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*I think the philosophy behind our behaviour approaches is that the children take responsibility for their own behaviour ... And we like the children to take ownership of their own behaviour. We try to develop a sense of fairness so that the children understand and accept if they've chosen to break the rules, that they accept, you know, what will happen* (SENCO: primary). |

**Philosophies underpinning behaviour management: (iv) schools' approach to and treatment of pupils**

With the exception of one secondary school, interviewees in all the case-study schools cited the approaches and attitudes of staff to pupils as part of the philosophy underpinning behaviour management. Interviewees in eight of the 11 primary schools particularly noted the importance of being positive, compared with interviewees in five of the 12 secondaries. Similarly, of the seven mainstream schools stressing that '*listening to pupils*' was part of the philosophy and approach to their behaviour management, five were primary. As well as these more specific approaches, eight schools (four primaries and four secondaries) highlighted general principles of respecting, caring for and valuing pupils, and a number of interviewees in both sectors also cited the importance of giving youngsters '*a fresh start*' or, more simply, '*forgiveness*'. '*Dealing with the whole individual*' was noted in two secondaries and one primary school; two primary schools also referred to the importance of '*divorcing behaviour from the person ... when we get cross, we say "I like you, but I don't like what you've just done"*'. Other references to school approaches included '*being fair*', '*having patience*' and '*being calm*'.

| ***What is the philosophy underpinning behaviour management in this school?*** | |
|---|---|
| ***SCHOOLS' APPROACH TO PUPILS*** | |
| **Being positive** | *I think* [the philosophy here] *is accentuating the positive. I really do. They seem to bring out the best in the children by not ignoring the bad parts, but honing in, focusing on the good parts* (classroom assistant: primary).<br><br>*I think it's a belief that people respond better when praised rather than when criticised or treated in a negative way, so it's really just a belief that you get the best out of people by giving them encouragement and positive feedback* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*... our philosophy is to work in a very positive way* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Listening to pupils** | *We give them a voice, listen to their opinions* (acting headteacher: primary).<br><br>*We try and listen to people very actively. We try and hear different people's sides of what's gone wrong when there is a conflict* (headteacher: primary). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Relationships with pupils** | *I think the key thing is children feel valued as people* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*Now, more than ever, with the cane being put aside and corporal punishment being put aside, it's now all about the teacher building up relationships with the child* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*We have a dynamic approach. In other words, a lot of our influence is based on our interaction with the children, our relationships with the children. If you like, it's sometimes described as a therapeutic approach ... the way we deal with the children is the way we influence them* (teacher: residential special school). |
| **Fresh start** | *You wipe the slates clean the next day – once it's dealt with, it's over and done with. At the end of the day, the children need to go home thinking 'I've had a bad day but it's OK; I can come back tomorrow and we'll start again'* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*I think it's a particularly Catholic flavour, because built in to all our behaviour dealings has to be the opportunity for forgiveness... a child must be allowed the chance to see that we are ready to give them a new start, but part of that must be admittance that they were at fault, and that they are willing to ask that it's all put behind them and they start afresh ... The attitude here is that they have not arrived, they are in the process of becoming, and they must be allowed to make mistakes. Now that is our philosophy* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*Our emphasis is on providing a safe environment where children can make mistakes and can talk those through and then go on to succeed* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Caring for pupils** | *A lot of these students have problems at home and they feel neglected and basically they don't trust adults ... and if they can learn to trust adults, we are there, we do care, we are trying to help them, and if that message can come across, then that's half your battle won instantly. I think that is the way we modify behaviour here. I mean that is the ethos of the school: we're there for them* (head of house: secondary).<br><br>*I think that the kids here realise that we actually do have their well-being at heart... I think what the kids do realise, or most of them, is that we do not set them up to fail, that we do actually want to make a success of them. It just does not work for all of them but it is not through lack of trying and I think the kids usually realise that* (head of year: secondary).<br><br>*We, I think, make the children realise we are there for them and the family knows that we are there for them, so that's really the basic philosophy* (headteacher: primary).<br><br>*I really do think that* [the pupils] *need the security of knowing that somebody cares enough to make them do something for their own good* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Dealing with whole individual** | *We see the child as a whole person and they are not just here to receive academic information and knowledge really* (teacher: primary). |

**Philosophies underpinning behaviour management: (v) practical management of behaviour**

In response to the question of school philosophy underpinning behaviour management, a number of responses identified more practical – and pragmatic – principles, citing key features such as consistency, firm structure, clear expectations and staff cooperation. In this context, classroom practitioners' taking responsibility for behaviour was referred to by both sectors – in primary often across the whole school.

As noted elsewhere, '*consistency*' could have different emphases, either individual teachers making the same response to any example of problem behaviour, or the whole school adopting the same approach and applications. Structures, rules and clear expectations tended to be mentioned in association with some reference to the school as a system requiring order, standards and so on. In other words within this emphasis, the unit of reference was not likely to be an individual child but rather the institution itself.

| ***What is the philosophy underpinning behaviour management in this school?*** *PRACTICAL BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT* | |
|---|---|
| **Teacher responsibility** | *The approach is that first of all we expect all our staff ... to manage the bulk of the behaviour of the children in their class* (deputy head: secondary).<br><br>*The pastoral is part of the academic and the academic is very much part of the pastoral ... And we've begun, I think, through the behaviour policy, to get faculty heads to see that their role is not just about delivering the National Curriculum but about delivering it effectively. This means they have to deal with the outcomes, with what goes on in the lessons. And that may well be sanctions but also support* (headteacher: secondary). |
| **Consistency** | *It's you say you are going to do something yesterday, today and tomorrow, it's exactly the same, and if a child has been badly behaved, you do it, you don't do something different tomorrow* (teacher: primary).<br><br>*If you have a consistent policy that everybody is working to, then the students have very little opportunity to deviate from it* (SENCO: secondary).<br><br>*I think most staff would acknowledge that not all their children in their classes are children they like, and there are some they like very much. Maybe if they are not wary of it, the latter get away with murder or get away with more. So, I think* [the principle is] *justice has to be seen to be done* (SENCO: secondary). |
| **Firm structure** | *They've got a firm structure – all the children know exactly how far they can go. They know exactly what happens if they don't follow the practices or what the teacher says. They know exactly where they stand – and so do the staff – and they're happy with that. They seem very happy to work to that sort of rigid structure. They respond to it really well because when you go in a classroom, they're so well behaved, they really are* (classroom assistant: primary).<br><br>*There's quite a firm structure of expectations and if children go over the top, there's a consequence to that action* (headteacher: PRU). |
| **Corporate philosophy** | *Our philosophy is working together, sharing information, staff supporting each other to help support the youngster* (SENCO: secondary). |

## 8.3 PHILOSOPHY INTO PRACTICE: DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOLS

Whilst the philosophies of the case-study schools were often found to contain elements from several of the broad categories detailed above, individual schools' approaches could be very different. Two examples are given to demonstrate these differences.

**SCHOOL A**

School A was a mixed primary school with 370 pupils, and was situated in an area described as a '*socially and economically deprived area*' in a metropolitan LEA. The deputy headteacher summed up the school's philosophy underpinning behaviour management as: '*We expect the children to behave – we expect them to behave, and we do reward positive behaviour – those are the two key words: expectation and positive.*' Further, a teacher interviewee made the comment: '*We see the school as a sort of safe haven – whatever's going on outside, the school's a safe haven. But it can't be a safe haven if the children are acting as individuals and doing what they want to do, regardless of other people, so I think the philosophy is that we ask the children to be considerate.*' This teacher commented that pupils were '*trained*' how to behave and to consider others, and one of the ways of achieving this was through the existence and high profile of rules. The school's code of conduct set out the guidelines for appropriate behaviour and '*if the child chooses not to follow the code of conduct, then there are sanctions, and those sanctions will be carried out*' (deputy head). Indeed a midday supervisor also noted that in the school '*nobody gets away with anything*' and saw the value in the importance attached to the rules in the school: '*I would say we are stronger on our rules than some schools, by the sounds of friends that go to other schools and they say "Sounds a bit strict". It's not strict. It's firm. It's right.*' This interviewee believed that the successful management of behaviour in the school was '*all down to respect and discipline*', and noted the '*nice*' and '*happy*' atmosphere in the school and the '*patience*' and '*friendliness*'. There was a school uniform and the headteacher was said to be '*very strict about ties*': non-uniform days were not allowed.

**SCHOOL B**

School B was a mixed first school with 275 pupils, and served an area of mainly local authority housing in a county LEA. The school had been influenced by the work of Carl Rogers and the headteacher summed up the school philosophy as '*... personal, positive regard. It's accepting people and recognising that no one is perfect ... It's achieving and giving of one's best both for adults and for children. High expectations in all things, always giving of one's best whether that's in the classroom or outside but recognising also it's an aim that we can't possibly always live up to so people will fall off at times but they can get back on.*' Another teacher commented that the philosophy was '*person-centred*' and that the school was keen to develop in its pupils independence, autonomy and empowerment. The headteacher stated that behaviour was always separated from the child: '*However difficult a child may have been, that doesn't stop us loving them. It's like the relationship a mother has with her child – we may not like them all the time but we always love them, so we might not like what they do but that doesn't stop us holding them in regard as a person.*' In the management of behaviour, the onus was put on the child, and when there was a dispute between pupils or an incident of inappropriate behaviour, pupils were required to '*talk out*' whereby they discussed the problem with the other pupils involved and found a solution. The school was keen to celebrate individual differences and as a result of this, there was no school uniform.

Sometimes within the same school, interviewees described the philosophy differently. In one example, the deputy head of a secondary school described his school's principle as being positive and encouraging with pupils:

> *I think it's a belief that people respond better when praised rather than when criticised or treated in a negative way, so it's really just a belief that you get the best out of people by giving them encouragement and positive feedback.*

However, the other three interviewees saw establishing consistency across all teachers in the school as the main component of the school's philosophy: '*I think it's mainly about consistency*' (teacher); '*it really revolves around consistent approaches to rewards and sanctions and dealing with youngsters*' (acting head of year); and '*I think it was to establish something so that there was consistency in the school*' (SENCO, who did also acknowledge that praise and valuing pupils was part of the school philosophy).

In another secondary school, all interviewees described the school's philosophy differently. The deputy head responded to the question by outlining the expectation that all staff should manage the '*bulk of behaviour*' in their classes and the existence of help and back-up for teachers in order for them to achieve this. In contrast, the head of lower school stated that the school was very committed to Assertive Discipline, and a senior teacher noted that, whilst '*a behaviourist approach*' was supposed to be the underlying philosophy, he felt that:

> *... what's really happening, it's much more into dynamics and social learning ... there's much more interactional analysis going on. I think there's much more emphasis on building relationships and looking at functions of behaviour and purposes of behaviour.*

Such differences again point to the possible difficulties pupils may have in relating to their school's approach to behaviour management.

## 8.4 WHO GENERATES SCHOOL BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES?

Interviewees from 22 of the 27 case-study schools were asked where the philosophy underpinning their schools' approach to behaviour management had been generated from. The most common responses invariably focused on very senior staff, and especially the **current headteacher** (cited by interviewees from four primary and five secondary schools). The **previous headteacher** was said to have generated the philosophy in three schools (two primary and one secondary); other senior personnel, like the **deputy head**, were cited by interviewees in two schools. In two schools, there was consensus that '*all the teaching staff*' had developed the philosophy. Thus,

while Chapter 1 has shown that the majority of the staff in the case-study schools had some involvement in the development and review of behaviour policies, the philosophy which underpinned the schools' approaches to behaviour was mostly seen to be generated by one person, and usually the headteacher.

Where the current headteacher was cited, typical comments included: '*I think a lot of it has come from the headteacher*' (teacher: primary); '*I think the head found it from somewhere*' (general assistant: primary); '*I really do feel that we learn things, even though we don't know it, from watching other people ... I do think that's the example the head gives*' (SENCO: secondary). The headteachers themselves in seven case-study schools acknowledged that they had personally generated the philosophy: one secondary headteacher commented that the school's philosophy was her personal belief and explained: '*I do believe that heads are there to lead.*'

A new headteacher could introduce new principles and approaches to behaviour management. In one primary school, for example, the headteacher stated that her school's philosophy was:

> *... a personal thing when I became a head. I really wanted to come here and I really knew the sort of school I wanted and I wanted it to be a place where people actually wanted to be.*

In another primary school, the headteacher noted:

> *We started off with the motto 'care, courtesy and consideration' as soon as I came through the doors, because I was very worried about some of the relationships in the school.*

It had taken two years focusing on team work, team building as well as behaviour management INSET to fully develop the philosophy. All of the interviewees at this school agreed that the headteacher had initially been responsible for the philosophy, though all staff had taken it on board and now worked as a team.

If not changing the school philosophy, a new headteacher could bring renewed impetus. In one secondary school, the new headteacher stated he shared the school's

existing philosophy but had '*reinforced*' and '*strengthened*' it. A teacher colleague believed that while there was a '*grain of it*' in place before this new headteacher came, '*... he has grabbed hold of this now and he's really pushing it*', and had made some amendments: '*I think that has been the underlying thrust to seeing a more positive* [approach], *putting more emphasis on the positive rewards from the scheme.*'

Further highlighting the importance of the school's headteacher in terms of the philosophy underpinning behaviour management, '*the previous headteacher*' was cited in three schools (two primaries and a secondary) as the source of the philosophy. In the secondary school, the previous headteacher was a very strong believer in Assertive Discipline, which was said by staff to still be the philosophy underpinning behaviour management. In one of the primary schools, a teacher commented that her school's philosophy had developed over a number of years, and '*it was the passion of our former head ... it was a kind of openness and caringness for each other*'. In the other primary school, two longstanding teachers stated that the philosophy had been generated by the '*charismatic*' previous headteacher, who had been very keen on positive reinforcement and would not tolerate children being shouted at; however, the new headteacher, while acknowledging that the philosophy was in place before she joined the staff, believed that it was not being implemented and had consequently tried to encourage this.

In six of the nine schools where the headteacher was cited as the source of the school philosophy underpinning behaviour management, some of the interviewees at the school gave other explanations as to the origin of the school philosophy (for example, one secondary teacher commented that his school's philosophy had been generated by the school's OFSTED inspection). In one secondary school, interviewees had highlighted different elements of the school philosophy underpinning behaviour management and, not surprisingly, also cited different people as the source of the philosophy. Those who identified the philosophy as being '*inclusive*' and '*trying to work through problems with pupils*' cited the headteacher as being responsible for the philosophy. In contrast, two interviewees who had stated rather that the school philosophy was an '*integrated whole-school approach*' and the '*pooling of support*' to manage behaviour believed that '*all the staff*' were responsible for the philosophy.

Another member of staff, a head of year who cited this collaborative working as the school's philosophy, believed it came '*... from a very strong pastoral team, I would say, and from the team work that's generated from that strong pastoral team*'.

In two secondary schools, senior personnel in the schools – rather than the headteacher – were said to have been important in the generation of the philosophy. In one school, a teacher commented that it had been developed by the deputy head and senior tutors, who felt there was a need for some kind of policy on behaviour. In the other school, the deputy head was seen as key in the generation of the philosophy: '*... it's the deputy head, who has really been the sort of driving force behind it, and it's so much sort of his own personal philosophy*' (SENCO: secondary). Another member of staff noted that while the deputy head had '*been behind a lot of it*', she also felt that before that there had been ... '*a definite sort of this feeling that the staff wanted something, that we wanted some sort of policy that would work, which it has*'.

In four schools, '*all of the staff*' were said to be responsible for the generation of the schools' philosophy. In two of these, there was not consensus that all staff had been responsible for the philosophy because some interviewees believed that the headteacher alone had generated it. Even in the other two schools, both primaries, where all staff were said to have generated the philosophy, the involvement of the headteacher was acknowledged. A deputy head stated that the philosophy was '*certainly the head's idea of how a school should be run*', but he also felt that '*it's partly come from the staff*' and '*it's filtered*' to the other staff, who otherwise '*would not have gone down that road*'. Another teacher in the school also stated that '*everyone who works here*' had been responsible for the philosophy. In the other primary school, while the contribution of acting headteacher and headteacher to the school philosophy was noted, it was felt by all interviewees that the staff as a whole had generated the philosophy:

> *It's just come from us ... it's all little bits of all of us, what we think schools should be like, and how children should be treated, and it's just grown from that. It's not from one particular source, it's just a little bit of everybody really.*

A teacher at the school also stated:

> *I think it's partly the quality of the people we've got here ... we're willing to move on, we're willing to learn ... we are the sort of people who want the best for these children.*

In one secondary school, there was agreement among school staff that the philosophy was part of the long-established ethos of the school: '*I think it is what* [the school] *is built upon ... This school, I think, has just got a hidden agenda of care*' (SENCO). The philosophy had remained despite new headteachers and new members of staff joining the school; indeed it was said that because of the caring ethos of the school, staff tended to stay long term.

Overall, the key feature of very senior staff, and especially the headteacher, determining a school philosophy in managing behaviour was very apparent, as well as the active involvement of staff in its implementation.

## 8.5 PHILOSOPHY INTO PRACTICE: WHOLE-SCHOOL AGREEMENT?

Interviewees in 21 schools were also asked about the extent to which all those involved with the school, including teachers and support staff, shared the philosophy underpinning behaviour management.

In 13 schools (only two of which were secondary), interviewees stated that **all** teachers in their school did share the philosophy, and in five secondary schools, it was felt the **majority** of teachers did so. In three further secondary schools, there was disagreement amongst interviewees as to whether all teachers shared the school philosophy or not: whilst some interviewees in these schools believed that all teaching staff shared the philosophy, others stated it was shared by only the majority.

In the schools where interviewees stated that the majority but not all teachers shared the school philosophy, there was a broad consensus that it would never be possible to find all teachers agreeing with the school philosophy: '*It's not shared by everybody. I*

*don't think you would ever get it, but the majority of people are behind it'* (teacher: secondary).

Several reasons emerged for this lack of whole-school agreement:

- size of the school;
- perceived encroachment on teachers' individual style; and
- staff's suspicion of the philosophy.

The **size of the school** was uniquely cited as a factor by interviewees in secondary schools. A deputy head noted that, in his school, the philosophy was shared by teachers *'as far as you can in a staff as big as this staff'*, and a SENCO in another school commented: *'I think a school this size, I think there's 90-something staff. You are never going to get everybody pulling in the same direction.'* Indeed, the headteacher of this school, dismissed as *'daft'* the notion that all the teaching staff could share the school philosophy, stating: *'I think if you have got 99 articulate, highly educated people, then you are going to get 99 philosophies and views on behaviour management.'* However, he did believe that:

> *... it's reasonable to say that the staff as a whole are of that frame of mind. They will vary in their specific interpretations of what I have said, but they are positive in the way they deal with young people.*

The encroachment of the school philosophy on **teachers' individual approach** or style was also cited as a reason why not all staff would share a behaviour management philosophy. One issue identified was that staff who felt they already had successful behaviour management techniques were reluctant to adopt the school approach:

> *There are a number of staff who have very good discipline which is not based on the same philosophy as* [the school's]. [These staff] *would not be prepared to compromise what they do for anybody, and, if other people can't manage, then it's their problem* (SENCO: secondary).

However, the possible benefits of individual staff having their own approach were also acknowledged. One headteacher noted that in his school, a member of staff had a *'very individualistic style'* and was extremely successful in his interaction with pupils

experiencing behaviour difficulties: he felt that when devising the school philosophy and approach to behaviour, '*what we've got to make sure we don't lose is the quality of the interpersonal things, the histories and the track records*'.

Notwithstanding this, the less fortunate consequences of different approaches were noted by a number of interviewees. A curriculum manager from one secondary school and two pastoral managers from another commented that at times they had to rectify situations which had blown up in class when teachers had dealt with pupils in a way that was contrary to the school philosophy because '*that isn't their style*'. The curriculum manager noted that in his department, there were some '*weaker*' teachers who wanted '*children hung, drawn and quartered for not bringing a pen*' and felt that '*if I want to be bluntly honest, I think in my particular department I have got staff who need as much help with poor behaviour as the children*'. One of the pastoral managers believed that the reluctance of some teachers to share the philosophy was detrimental to other staff:

> *The actual philosophy that's there is to make everybody's life easier, so if you decide that you are not going to adhere to one bit, it makes someone else's life difficult.*

Some teachers' **mistrust of their school's philosophy** was also cited as a further reason why it might not be shared by all teachers. In one secondary school where Assertive Discipline was said to be the philosophy underpinning behaviour management, the headteacher had found that some teachers were extremely suspicious of it, believing it to be a '*trendy American thing*'. He consequently wanted to make the induction of new staff into AD more thorough. Less dramatically, a number of interviewees acknowledged certain reservations about their school's approach to managing behaviour. Whilst initially claiming they were '*absolutely 100 per cent*' and '*completely*' in accord with the philosophy, some staff in subsequent discussion then qualified that support. Invariably this dissonance was about the interviewees' belief in a need for stricter sanctions:

> *I am very much in tune with the way we approach behaviour in the school ... I just feel that occasionally things could be dealt with a little more severely in the school and though I thoroughly support* [the headteacher] *in everything she*

> *does ... I think there just could be a little more severe sanctions for children sometimes* (deputy head: primary).
>
> *I just feel that in some cases if the child has been given all the options and they actually are disturbing the learning of the other children, all their lessons, with all the help that we have given them, then I think that we should move them elsewhere, even if that child fails elsewhere, because they are doing so much damage to the others ... sometimes I think we are too soft on some kids* (head of year: secondary).

In contrast, as previously stated, there were 13 schools (seven primaries, all the off-site provision but only two secondaries) where interviewees concurred throughout that all teachers shared the school philosophy. A teacher in one primary school stated:

> *One of the beauties of this school now is that we share a common philosophy basically, and that we share things with each other. And the children get that feel as well – that we support each other. I think that is absolutely crucial.*

Another teacher in this school reflected that teachers could now reward or reprimand any child in the school without fear of offending their classteacher, which used to happen before the school developed its current philosophy and approach to behaviour. A headteacher in another primary school commented that in her school, the teachers '*operate as quite a spectacular team of people really*'. Another primary school's deputy head acknowledged that '*not all staff, I'm sure, would have gone down that road*', but, because the teachers had been involved in generating the school philosophy, they were '*ready to accept it overall*'. Elsewhere, a primary teacher noted that '*every teacher in the school has* [the same] *philosophy because you couldn't work in this environment if you didn't*'. Indeed, in one secondary school, the deputy head acknowledged:

> *I think we make it clear that if staff are not happy with the philosophy, or if they behave in a way which is not compatible with the philosophy, then they are not really in the right school.*

Where it was believed there was consensus on the school philosophy, interviewees identified a number of features which perhaps explained why this was the case:

- **strong leadership:** examples cited were the headteacher who described himself as '*quite a strong manager*', and the schools where the headteacher was said to have '*support of the whole staff*';

- **team working and involvement in the formulation of the philosophy:** instances given included the primary school where the Investors in People scheme was found to be '*powerful*' in bringing everyone together; the schools where all staff members were said to '*fit in and gel*' and schools where staff had regular opportunities to come together and share concerns;

- **the careful selection of new staff:** amongst those highlighting this was the primary headteacher who stated that she always recruited new staff with the school philosophy in mind, and the senior management of the residential special school where details of the school's philosophy were sent out to potential job applicants to ensure they were fully aware of, and willing to maintain, the school's approach to managing behaviour: the deputy headteacher acknowledged that '*staff who have not had empathy with the aims of the school, and have not had a particular sort of sympathy towards the child, have not lasted long. It's one of those environments where people who aren't suited to it are very quickly forced out, if you like.*'

The messages from this short overview of consensus on behaviour management principles seem quite clear. Those schools which confirmed the actuality as well as necessity of whole-school consensus were almost invariably small in staff size, generally collegial in approach and quite overt in their ongoing discussion of managing behaviour. Even appointing and retaining staff appeared to include careful consideration of their likely sympathy with school behaviour management principles. The difficulty for secondary schools in matching such criteria of success is immediately apparent and raises questions about how these institutions can overcome basic issues of size, and staffroom cultures which may prohibit consistent views on, and approaches to, managing behaviour.

**Research vignette: Behaviour management philosophies in practice: rhetoric and reality**

The dichotomy between agreeing with the school philosophy and always maintaining it when faced in every lesson by pupils experiencing behaviour problems was raised by both classroom practitioners and school managers. As one teacher stated: '*Sometimes if a kid has given you some cheek, liberalism might take second place to a good telling off.*' Likewise, a SENCO in another secondary school felt that while teachers largely shared her school's philosophy, '*... in moments of serious frustration, people do not*'. The problem was also recognised by a pastoral deputy head who believed that it was necessary that '*you work as much on the teacher as you would on the child*', and, to this end, monthly meetings were held in her school with heads of year and form tutors where they were reminded regularly about how the school expected pupils to be treated. Furthermore, another pastoral deputy head acknowledged that the '*... problem for the staff is that when you're at the coalface ... your philosophy and what you actually feel and what you do don't match up necessarily*', though he did feel that the teachers in his school '*essentially*' accepted and agreed with the philosophy, adding: '*You always get them ranting and raving first of all, but then when you talk about the situation of the child, and about the possibilities, then they will always turn around and change.*' A SENCO cited a similar situation in her school: the numbers of children in the school with special educational needs made for a heavy workload on staff and while they were generally supportive, to some teachers it was '*onerous*'. However, she did feel that '[staff] *have seen visibly that pupils can make progress, and so it has improved staff, made them more positive in their approach*'.

One primary headteacher admitted that despite years of experience as a teacher and adviser, she still sometimes found it difficult to be as positive as the school philosophy required. Another primary school teacher admitted to being '*sceptical*' of her school's philosophy to reward and be positive about appropriate behaviour at first, but on seeing the improvement it made to pupils' behaviour, had gradually been '*convinced by it*', though she still found '*... there are some days when I still don't find it easy ... you wake up one morning, you're feeling grumpy, you're coming to school, you don't feel like being positive at all. On the whole you do your best basically to be positive.*' Two secondary teachers commented that the school philosophy had made them reflect on their own teaching: '*I am quite a disciplinarian and I think perhaps I do need to reward positive behaviour more than I do. I do shout lots at the kids, I know I do. It's just me.*' The other teacher stated that the philosophy encouraged her to '*take stock*' and re-evaluate her practice.

**Research vignette: Principles of behaviour management and support staff**

- ***Midday supervisors***

Those commenting on the degree to which midday supervisors shared the school philosophy revealed some difficulties, initially at least, with their acceptance of it. Midday supervisors' treatment of pupils was sometimes not in line with the school approach to behaviour management: in one primary school, a teacher felt that dinner staff were more comfortable with the sanctions: '*I don't think they're too happy about handling the positive side ... they tend to sort of just want to punish.*' The way in which they treated and spoke to pupils was a particular cause for concern, though interviewees acknowledged the difficulties which lunchtime staff faced: '*I see a supervisor shout at a kid in a quite unacceptable manner, and I think "Oh blimey, they are dealing with that situation completely wrong", but I think it's sheer frustration as well*' (teacher: secondary). Similarly, a headteacher stated that midday supervisors tended to be more '*authoritarian*' but felt that pupils saw them in a '*policing role*' and as '*fair game*', and did not afford them the same respect as the staff who worked with them in their lessons. A head of year believed that midday supervisors had the toughest job in managing behaviour because at lunchtime pupils were hungry and had to queue up, and she believed that, in her school, midday supervisors were in need of training because '*sometimes they themselves without realising it instigate bigger problems, just from the way that they respond to the youngster*'. Indeed, it emerged that in nine schools, there had been training for lunchtime staff. Some schools had actively involved midday supervisors in determining the management of behaviour at lunchtime. In four schools (two primaries, a secondary and a middle school), midday supervisors had devised their own approaches to behaviour at lunchtime. The SENCO in the secondary school believed that this had a positive effect on their philosophy and approach: '*I think they feel ownership, and I guess it must work for them.*' In three schools (two primaries and a middle school), midday supervisors had rewards at their disposal to give children. Furthermore, in two schools, a primary and a secondary, involvement in the Investors in People scheme was identified as useful in encouraging midday supervisors to share the philosophy.

- ***Classroom assistants***

In nine schools (six primaries and three secondaries), interviewees commented specifically on whether classroom assistants shared the school philosophy on behaviour management. Although these findings must be treated cautiously because of the small numbers involved, it emerged that in the primary schools, classroom assistants were said to work closely with staff and have the same approach to behaviour management, whilst in two of the secondary schools, there had been some difficulty as to classroom assistants' role regarding behaviour management. Several interviewees commented that because classroom assistants felt they were not '*in charge*' in the classroom, the behaviour management techniques they employed differed from those used by other staff. A similar problem was cited in the other secondary school, where the deputy head noted that the behaviour policy had recently been modified to take account of this: '*The classroom support assistant may see something going on, and it is obviously not part of their role to discipline the children, but they do need to be part of the overall ethos of the classroom, and they need to be involved in behaviour management, so we have actually modified the behaviour charter to incorporate that.*'

In contrast, in the primary schools, interviewees were very positive about classroom assistants, and felt they fully supported the schools' philosophy and approach to behaviour management. One primary teacher commented that, in her school, classroom assistants '*were very involved and part of the team ... without classroom assistants, we couldn't go on in the way that we do*'. A teacher in another primary school stated that the classroom assistants in her school were '*very aware of the system we work and the positive way of doing things*', and indeed, a classroom assistant at the school felt the philosophy was '*superb*'.

## 8.6 BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT: PERSONAL FACTORS

A final question sought to ascertain the origin of practitioners' behaviour management philosophy. This question was put to interviewees who all carried a reputation as a 'good' manager of classroom behaviour and/or were in roles and positions where they related successfully to troubled youngsters on a daily basis (e.g. pastoral staff and senior staff in 'inclusive' mainstream schools and those working in off-site provision). In response, a few interviewees stated that there was '*nothing, really*' that had influenced their philosophy on behaviour management. However, from 30 other interviewees, all espousing child-centred views, three broad categories of influence were discernible:

- personal experience or contact with behavioural difficulties;
- professional experiences (including mainstream teaching and training); and
- their own upbringing.

**Personal experience or contact with behavioural difficulties**

A number of interviewees stated that personal experience of, or direct contact with, others' behaviour difficulties had impacted on their approaches and philosophy underpinning behaviour management. These experiences included a personal history of behavioural problems (in one case resulting in exclusion); being a parent of a child with special educational needs; witnessing peers at school underachieve; and working in special needs education. It is noteworthy perhaps that the interviewees who stated that personal experience had been influential in shaping their personal philosophies were all in roles where they had regular contact with pupils experiencing behaviour problems: two were SENCOs, two were headteachers of PRUs, one was a pastoral deputy head, two were the headteacher and deputy head of a primary school and four were from the same '*inclusive*' secondary school – the headteacher, head of year, a teacher and an EBD support teacher.

One interviewee had herself been excluded from a grammar school and felt that it was a '*terrible waste of my ability*' and that her school had failed her because it could not manage her behaviour. She had chosen to work in inner-city schools all through her

teaching career. As well as having experienced significant behavioural problems at school, a secondary SENCO recalled how she had also seen many of her peers underachieve. A mainstream secondary teacher expressed a similar viewpoint, stating that his personal philosophy had been influenced by seeing bright friends underachieve at his '*working-class school*' because '*they were put down by the system; they weren't encouraged*'. One head of year stated: '*Having a behaviourally challenged son has made me more sympathetic to parents who come in and say "Look, I don't know why he is like this".*' Similarly, a primary headteacher stated she had a child with a '*real behaviour problem and I handled it extremely badly as a parent*'. The headteacher of an inclusive secondary school had '*quite a strong SN background including teaching "remedial" classes*' and working in a unit attached to a mainstream school for pupils with attendance difficulties, '*so my experience has been trying to bring those young people in, into being part of things*'. This, together with an interest in equal opportunities, had shaped her own personal philosophy and consequently that of her school: '*... it's about all young people having a chance.*' The headteacher of a PRU had a similar background, having taught '*remedial*' classes in a mainstream school. She had valued these pupils and tried to make sure that the rest of the school also valued them. This interviewee recounted an incident when a pupil arrived late one day because her mother had let her stay out late at night, and how this had helped shape her philosophy that youngsters need the security of knowing that someone cares about them enough in order to restrain them from inappropriate activity. Another headteacher of a PRU noted that working in a residential school with a philosophy that children's perceptions of themselves could be changed by the way in which staff related to them had influenced her:

> *I now think we should work with children with behaviour difficulty. We have to really foster achievement and really make that child feel good about themselves to be able to think 'Yes, I can behave'.*

**Mainstream teaching and training experiences**

Sometimes interviewees cited the role-model example of other staff managing behaviour well as influential. A primary headteacher had been particularly inspired by a colleague who had always been very calm when dealing with her class, and one primary deputy head stated she had been influenced by a headteacher who would not

tolerate staff shouting at children. Furthermore, a headteacher believed that she had learnt a lot from teaching in a school in an area of socio-economic deprivation, having previously taught in more affluent areas. A primary teacher stated that the first school she had taught in had been '*very person-centred*', which had consolidated her philosophy. Negative experiences in particular schools could also be influential: teaching practice in a school where '*the behaviour was impeccable but the focus was on the negative*' had inspired one teacher's philosophy to be positive with pupils. '*A very unhappy experience*' in a school, especially because of the headteacher, had shown one headteacher what she did not want her school to be like. Two interviewees, a deputy head in a primary school and a head of lower school in a secondary school, commented that their previous school's behaviour management had been largely sanction-based and they would have liked the opportunity of praise and reward.

Some interviewees noted that their own teacher education/professional development opportunities had impacted on their philosophy. A teacher in a PRU and a deputy headteacher both commented that they had been particularly influenced by courses they had taken. The deputy head had studied for a master's degree in which he had covered aspects of psychology which had informed his opinion of behaviour management and enabled him to identify the key factors in encouraging children to behave well. Psychology, together with philosophy of education, was cited as part of the teacher's PGCE course which had been important in shaping his personal philosophy of behaviour management. '*An overnight conversion*' at university, after hearing a lecturer talk about the underachievement of working-class children and the difference a good teacher could make, prompted one primary teacher to change her career choice from social work to teaching.

**Upbringing**

As well as teaching role models, interviewees' upbringing and their own parents' way of treating youngsters also emerged as a significant influence in shaping philosophies. A secondary deputy head, while noting that there had been '*no blinding light, no vision*', stated that his father had always been very positive with him when he was growing up. A teacher noted that her father had been '*person-centred*' (she had also

subsequently been influenced by her husband, a psychotherapist who had studied Rogerian and Laingian theory). Parents' occupations were also cited: a secondary SENCO stated that her father had been involved in youth work and her mother in nursery education, while a headteacher in a primary school commented that her father was a shop steward, and she had also been influenced by her parents' values: '*My parents taught me that everything was possible but you belonged to a society in which there were rules and expectations and a personal responsibility and a work ethic.*' Her belief in personal responsibility had had a significant impact on practices in her school. '*A fairly formal Christian upbringing*' was also cited as impacting on her value system underpinning behaviour management. A SENCO in another secondary school similarly noted that being a Christian had shaped his philosophy.

Finally, being parents themselves was seen as influencing the personal principles of behaviour management. One primary teacher commented that when she first qualified, she corrected behaviour very differently from her current approach, and it was bringing up her own children which had made her realise the importance of being positive.

Put together, these accounts of the origin of teachers' principles in managing behaviour suggest the great significance of personal contact with youngsters who do not readily 'fit' academic/social norms. The opportunity to encounter teaching staff (or other adults) skilled at relating to young people also features. In other words, for these practitioners, effective behaviour management seems grounded in empathy. Equally, it appears to be contagious: 'caught' from role models and/or life experiences.

It is also perhaps significant that none of the interviewees referred to school INSET as a source of their personal behaviour management principles. This may suggest that both initial training and the continuing professional development of teachers require a considerably greater investment in alternative approaches to developing expertise in behaviour management. Recognising the causes and appreciating the affective experiences underpinning young people's behavioural difficulties seem fundamental components of successful practice. Hence, a better understanding of behaviour

theory, opportunities to engage positively with youngsters who exhibit behavioural difficulties and to encounter skilled practitioners in the field seem some of the ways forward.

***Philosophies underpinning behaviour management: key findings***

- Different emphases emerged in the accounts of the general philosophies or principles underpinning schools' approaches to behaviour management. A number of the case-study primary schools tended to stress the importance of developing interpersonal relations (treatment of others), while, in the case-study secondary schools, responses focused more on linking behaviour management to ensuring pupils' academic achievement.

- Mainstream practitioners did not apply technical/theoretical terms when describing their approaches to managing behaviour. This may indicate it is not just the provision of 'ready-made' techniques but a better conceptualisation of the meaning of behaviour which is required in professional development.

- Lack of consensus about the school philosophy underpinning behaviour management (and also an acknowledgement that not all staff concurred with certain approaches) was noted in the secondary case-study sample but not in the primary case studies.

- For a number of interviewees with a reputation for good practice in this area, the origins of personal principles underpinning behaviour management came from first-hand experience of youngsters who did not readily fit social/academic norms or encounters with other practitioners who related successfully to this pupil group. In sum, these principles were 'caught' from role models and/or life experiences, and this may have implications for professional development and initial training. No interviewee in the case-study schools referred to school INSET as a source of their personal behaviour management principles.

# CONCLUSION

This report has attempted to study the basic systems and principles which might be said to underpin behaviour management in our mainstream schools. Given the major national policy thrust which emphasises school inclusion, there is an important question of how far schools' current everyday structures such as rewards and sanctions, special needs support, pastoral systems and behaviour policies can contribute to the retention of pupils at risk of being excluded (or excluding themselves) from mainstream education. There is no doubt that alternative provision and the adaptation of curriculum opportunities have become a major component in strategies to re-engage disaffected youngsters. However, perhaps less attention has been given to the culture of the school itself, and particularly to the kinds of relationships and social interchanges within which teaching and learning is meant to take place. As 'Pastoral Support Plans' (PSPs) are mooted for use in schools (GB. DfEE, 1999), there is a clear obligation for all teachers to become sensitive to – and enskilled in – addressing the needs of youngsters with behavioural difficulties, and perhaps even reappraise some of their current assumptions and approaches to behaviour management.

The report has raised a number of issues which might be worth consideration, and the conclusion raises three central aspects:

- **Behaviour policies: what is the possibility of school 'consistency' in managing behaviour?**
- **Pastoral systems: can they support individual young people with behaviour difficulties?**
- **The effective manager of behaviour: what makes an individual teacher one of these?**

### *(i) School consistency in managing behaviour*

Evidence from this study suggests that, while the term 'consistency' reverberated through practitioners' accounts of effective behaviour management, there were clear distinctions between an interpretation which suggested this meant treating all pupils the same, and one which meant providing each pupil with consistent support and guidance for any particular behavioural problem. It was invariably the latter interpretation which correlated with an inclusive philosophy (see the cameos in Appendix 1).

On the issue of school behaviour policies, there appeared again to be a notable lack of consistency between schools. Not only did the length and content of written policies vary enormously, but so also did the contribution of various stakeholders such as pupils, parents, governors and even teaching staff. In addition, it appeared that an essential factor in a corporate and consensual approach to behaviour management within a school lay in the degree to which the issue was seen to require an ongoing and overt discourse among staff. The capacity of primary schools and non-mainstream provision to maintain this profile because of the lower numbers of staff involved was very obvious. Equally, these smaller numbers more readily allowed a staff to be able to unanimously adopt a particular approach to behaviour management and, crucially, embrace its underlying philosophy.

A major issue for our secondary schools must therefore be how – or indeed if – such unanimity can be attained when some 50 or more individual teachers are involved. Is, therefore, department-level discourse a more realistic forum for agreeing school approaches to managing behaviour? How far could subject departments replicate the strategies for developing and reviewing behaviour policies apparent in primary and off-site provision at least as one component in whole-school activity in this area? Evidence on written behaviour policies from the survey of secondary schools certainly raised some doubts about the perceived efficacy – and hence the precise function – of this requirement. What was clear from the case-study phase of the project was that consistent and coherent approaches to managing behaviour were not so much achieved by written documents: rather, they were 'living doctrines', derived from a discourse most usually instigated by senior managers, who were personally committed

to certain behaviour management principles and also to ensuring their staff's approach to young people was in keeping with these.

### *(ii) Pastoral systems and behaviour management*

The positive contribution of pastoral systems to the management of behaviour featured in the accounts of many of the secondary case-study school interviewees, where the form tutor role was often cited as a unique, ongoing and stable relationship for pupils throughout their secondary school career. Notwithstanding this, the survey showed there was a marked variability in the amount of time that schools timetabled for form tutors and pastoral middle managers to spend on any pastoral activity. The view that there was insufficient time available for pastoral work was noted in both the case-study and survey responses, and the need for training in the role of form tutor was cited in many case-study interviews. From the survey, the data suggest that greater time for pastoral work appeared to correlate with better attendance figures, but not lower exclusion rates: is this an indication that such systems currently ensure administrative efficiency rather more than enhancing positive pupil behaviour through affective support? Is the low rating for form tutors' involvement in dealing with behaviour incidents involving their charges (noted in Chapter 2) similarly a symptom of a system which currently cannot – or does not – fully utilise pastoral roles as the key supportive adult relationships for youngsters in school?

### *(iii) The effective manager of behaviour*

What makes a teacher skilled in managing pupil behaviour? The research sought to answer this by asking practitioners themselves, and the case-study sample highlighted many different factors, covering: curriculum planning, delivery and teaching style, including differentiation; specific techniques or approaches (e.g. setting clear boundaries, focus on praise and reward); teacher–pupil interrelationships; and teachers' personal qualities (e.g. sense of humour, fairness). This sheer variety of interpretations evident in respondents' accounts suggests that secondary school pupils, particularly, need very sophisticated skills to relate to the styles and expectations of the different teachers they encounter. However, the findings from the secondary

school survey did suggest a trend of mainstream practitioners focusing on maintaining and conveying general standards (of classroom control and curriculum delivery) rather more than recognising and responding to individual needs and circumstances. Thus, factors such as '*a differentiated curriculum*', '*showing respect to pupils*', '*understanding pupils' home and personal circumstances*' got low ratings compared with '*having clear expectations...*' with regard to behaviour and work. Does this suggest that certain parts of mainstream school culture tend to view effective behaviour management as a procedure somehow distinct from pupils' sense of the manageability of the curriculum and their sense of individual worth/self-esteem?

It was noteworthy that, in the case-study sample, those practitioners articulating a principle of empathy with 'problem' pupils often could account for this partly by a past personal contact with youngsters who did not readily 'fit' academic or social norms (including even being such a pupil-type themselves); or by inspiring encounters with other skilled practitioners who related successfully to this pupil group. Like the concept of 'joining up', used in the humane approach to working with horses known as 'horse whispering', this group of interviewees appeared to have techniques which enabled them to recognise and relate successfully to troubled youngsters. In sum, these 'kid whisperers', and the experiences which influenced their approach, may be an important exemplar within the debate about effective behaviour management. Recognising the causes and appreciating the affective experiences underpinning young people's behavioural difficulties seem fundamental components of successful practice. Hence, effective management of behaviour may really require ways of improving teachers' understanding of behaviour theory rather than just off-the-shelf techniques for managing classroom incidents: professional development and initial training might also provide opportunities for teachers to engage positively with young people who do not 'fit' academic or behavioural norms, and to learn from the skilled 'kid whispering' practitioners whose professional knowledge is such a precious commodity within our schools and local authorities. Finally, an important question might be: does the 'inclusive school' correlate with having 'kid whisperers' in its most senior positions?

# REFERENCES


CAFFYN, R.E. (1989). 'Attitudes of British secondary school teachers and pupils to rewards and punishments', *Educational Research*, 3, **31**, 210-20.

DERRINGTON, C., EVANS, C. and LEE, B. (1996). *The Code in Practice: the Impact on Schools and LEAs.* Slough: NFER.

ELTON REPORT, GREAT BRITAIN. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS (1989). *Discipline in Schools.* London: HMSO.

EVANS, R., DOCKING, J., BENTLEY, D. and EVANS, C. (1995). *Special Educational Needs: Review of Policy and Practice in Five Authorities.* London: Roehampton Institute.

GREAT BRITAIN. DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (1994). *The Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs.* London: DfE.

GREAT BRITAIN. DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT (1999). *Social Inclusion: Pupil Support Draft Guidance.* London: DfEE.

GREAT BRITAIN. STATUTES (1997). *Education Act 1997: Chapter 44.* London: HMSO.

HARROP, A. and HOLMES, M. (1993). 'Teachers' perceptions of their pupils' views on rewards and punishments', *Pastoral Care in Education*, **11**, 1, 30-5.

HARROP, A. and WILLIAMS, T. (1992). 'Rewards and punishments in the primary school: pupils' perceptions and teachers' usage', *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 7, 4, 211-15.

KINDER, K., KENDALL, S., DOWNING, D., ATKINSON, M. and HOGARTH, S. (1999). *Raising Behaviour 2: Nil Exclusion? Policy and Practice.* Slough: NFER.

KINDER, K., WAKEFIELD, A. and WILKIN, A. (1996). *Talking Back: Pupil Views on Disaffection.* Slough: NFER.

KINDER, K. and WILKIN, A. (1998). *With All Respect: Reviewing Disaffection Strategies.* Slough: NFER.

LEWIS, A., NEILL, S.R.St.J. and CAMPBELL, R.J. (1996). *The Implementation of the Code of Practice in Primary and Secondary Schools: a National Survey of Perceptions of Special Educational Needs Coordinators.* Coventry: University of Warwick, Institute of Education.

MERRETT, F., WILKINS, J., HOUGHTON, S. and WHELDALL, K. (1988). 'Rules, sanctions and rewards in secondary schools', *Educational Studies*, **14**, 2, 139-49.

MERRETT, F. and TANG, W.M. (1994). 'The attitudes of British primary school pupils to praise, rewards, punishments and reprimands', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, **64**, 91-103.

MILLER, A., FERGUSON, E. and SIMPSON, R. (1998). 'The perceived effectiveness of rewards and sanctions in primary schools: adding in the parental perspective', *Educational Psychology*, **18**, 1, 55-64.

SHARPE, P., WHELDALL, K. and MERRETT, F. (1987). 'The attitudes of British secondary school pupils to praise and reward', *Educational Studies*, **13**, 293-302.

# APPENDIX 1

# THE CAMEOS

## CAMEO ONE: A CASE STUDY PRIMARY SCHOOL

A primary school with six classes, taking pupils mostly from a local authority housing estate where drugs, in particular, are a problem. There has been a large turnover of staff in recent times (*'which I'm not sorry about'*: headteacher), with three newly qualified teachers joining the remaining extremely dedicated staff.

### BEHAVIOUR POLICY AND PRACTICE

**School behaviour policy**

The behaviour policy, based on the Assertive Discipline system, was introduced after the current headteacher came to the school because of the state of children's behaviour and produced noticeable results very quickly, *'within a term the place was different'*. In the five years since then, the policy has been reviewed at least annually, each time involving consultation with pupils and also parents who sign a contract ascribing to the behaviour policy. The policy was revised this year and set out as a four year strategic plan with specified goals and indicators of success. The policy, which focuses on aspects of positive behaviour, is shared by all staff, including SNSAs and the caretaker.

**Rewards**

There is a strong emphasis on rewarding good behaviour. Stickers and certificates are given by the classteachers for positive behaviour and work, and lunchtime supervisors give weekly awards to improvers and those who are consistently well behaved at lunchtimes. More formally, a points system is in operation, whereby those amassing 22 points receive a round of applause in assembly. The points are saved up for bronze, silver and gold awards; pupils receiving three gold awards have their names engraved on a shield.

**Sanctions**

The Assertive Discipline system of ticks against pupils' names who misbehave is used. Ticks are marked on a clipboard not on the blackboard because parents in school to collect their children tended to look to see who had misbehaved. A hierarchy of sanctions corresponds to the number of ticks, so, for example, two ticks would result in the pupil being moved to another table and missing playtime, four ticks would result in them being sent to another class, five ticks would result in them being sent to see the headteacher. Red cards are given for very bad behaviour and pupils fighting or swearing are sent to the headteacher. For every sanction pupils lose a point and, if they achieve fewer than 15 points in a week, parents are contacted to ask them to speak to their child.

**Strategies for behaviour difficulties**

Strategies include the involvement of the educational psychologist and the use of IEPs encompassing behaviour targets. The school works closely with parents over IEPs. Parents are asked to reinforce at home, with either rewards or sanctions, pupils' behaviour at school, a strategy which has been very successful: *'Once school and home are working that closely together, they haven't got a chance really*!' 'Special time', which can include helping in the reception class or playing with lego with a friend, is awarded to statemented pupils who reach their IEP targets. The SENCO uses a reading programme which incorporates behaviour modification e.g. sitting and listening.

**Opportunities to raise behaviour as an issue**

Opportunities include the use of Circle Time, assemblies and also peer mediation which has given pupils the skills to listen to each other, thus helping to resolve conflicts themselves. The way in which the classroom is run, like a *'small community, within a larger community'* reinforces the behaviour the school tries to encourage. Much work has been done with both parents and children on understanding behaviour and special educational needs: *'... we have had to spend a lot of time getting those over to parents and children ... that it's those of you who have problems learning to read, nobody shouts at you and screams at you – they help you. And that is what we are trying to do with the children who have behaviour problems, they need our help and support to try and behave properly.'*

**SUPPORT**

**Main source of LEA support**

Unable to appoint a EBD teacher for this cluster of schools, the LEA allocated the funds for this to the schools themselves. In this school, the money bought an extra lunchtime superviser and more general assistant hours. Valuable support is also received from the school's '*extremely good*' educational psychologist who was involved when the school adopted the Assertive Discipline system and has run a 'Coping with Kids' course for parents. Advice and practical help on attendance issues and lateness has been provided by the EWO. The ideal form of support is felt to be enough money to enable school staff to be skilled up and an outside person who could work on a flexible and responsive basis.

**SPECIAL NEEDS AND TRAINING**

**Special needs**

Behaviour problems are regarded as a special need. Teachers and SENCOs draw up IEPs and the teachers of children with special needs (often with help from the SENCO) modify the school behaviour policy for the individual. The SENCO meets with each class teacher on a termly basis.

**Training**

All new staff have a training session when they arrive at the school. The SENCO herself has attended several training courses on behavioural issues and this training is ongoing through the SENCO network. She also liases with SENCOs from other schools. All general assistants and SNSAs have training on managing difficult behaviour and have attended a one-day counselling course.

**GENERAL APPROACHES**

**School philosophy and significant factors in behaviour management**

Generated by the headteacher and partly stemming from her sense of ineptitude in dealing with her own children's behaviour problems, as well as from her experiences of teaching in a '*dictatorial*' school, the school philosophy underpinning behaviour management is '*children feel valued as people.*' The philosophy is shared by pupils, parents and also all staff, the quality and equality of whose relationships and interaction – '*there's no hierarchy here*' - is said to rub off on the pupils. With the emphasis on support and understanding, the inclusion of pupils with behaviour problems in school is regarded positively and seen as beneficial for the other children, who are encouraged to model good behaviour. A quarter of the headteacher's time is spent with children regarding behaviour issues. The headteacher, in particular, is strongly in favour of integration and addressing special needs in mainstream school, having worked in a school in which children who had previously attended an attached hearing impaired unit were fully integrated into the school. There has been only one temporary exclusion of one day at the school in five years. The head would '*fight tooth and nail*' before excluding but does acknowledge, '*I wouldn't say inclusion at any cost.*'

Significant factors in behaviour management at school level are felt by staff to be parental involvement at every level, as well as consistency and fairness in dealing with children. The personal qualities of the teachers are also considered important: personality, sense of humour, dedication to the job and a willingness to contribute after hours. At classroom level, factors staff regard as important are rewarding good behaviour first, and fairness and sincerity to create a feeling of safety for the children. '*It's genuinely caring for the children as individuals... above all. They are not just a class of children... a lot of it is about the respect, the treating the children with respect, however small, knowing that they have got a mind and they are entitled to talk about how they are feeling.*'

**CAMEO TWO: A CASE STUDY SECONDARY SCHOOL**

This secondary school has 1,800 pupils on roll with 470 on the SEN register. The pupils come from a community which is 79 per cent non-white British and has a high Asian population. It is a socially deprived area with high levels of unemployment (many families are on low incomes) and of illness. The school has a healthy turnover of staff with a balance of different ages and a good level of Asian staffing.

**BEHAVIOUR POLICY AND PRACTICE**

**School behaviour policy**

This has been in existence for about four years and was put together by SMT but with opportunities for staff to put forward ideas through a consultation process. It was developed in such a way as to allow students themselves to have an input through their year and school councils. Although parents had no developmental input, they were invited to make comments on the policy. It is reviewed as part of an ongoing process and is due for a complete overhaul within the next two years so that the school population does not see it as an '*inherited*' policy. A high priority within the policy is recognising achievement and linking behaviour with achievement.

**Rewards**

There is much positive reinforcement where behaviour is concerned, both through the student diaries where information goes home to parents, and also on a one-to-one basis with students in the classroom. A merit system operates in the lower school where pupils receive certificates and lots of encouragement. Student achievement is a major feature of assemblies and good behaviour is celebrated with citizenship awards. There is also a Record of Achievement presentation evening, where year 11 students who have displayed particularly positive behaviour over their five years in school are rewarded.

**Sanctions**

These are deployed very much on an individual basis, also taking into account the student's circumstances and background. They range from verbal reprimands to detentions, to letters home to parents asking them to come into school to discuss the situation, through to very limited use of fixed-term exclusion. The school operates a referral base where students who are disrupting a lesson can be sent for the rest of the lesson. It is staffed by senior teachers who would discuss the student's behaviour with them and supervise their work for the remainder of the lesson. There are also Behaviour Panels for more persistent offenders which can be held fairly informally or at a higher level involving senior staff, parents and sometimes governors.

**Strategies for behavioural difficulties**

Strategies that have been introduced include peer mediation, the use of drama work with particularly challenging pupils to address issues around their behaviour, the use of the referral base as a cooling off strategy, curriculum adjustment (particularly at keystage 4) and input from the Behaviour Support and Tuition Service. All students sign a contract about behavioural expectations when they join the school and these are displayed in all classrooms.

**Opportunities to raise behaviour as an issue/contribution of the pastoral system**

It is standard practice to compliment students on their behaviour. Pastoral opportunities for discussing behaviour include assemblies, peer mediation and school and year councils. Specific curriculum opportunities include PSHE, RE and English. The pastoral system in school is felt to make '*a really strong contribution*' with quick and consistent support for staff from senior management. The headteacher refers to it as '... *the backbone of the school. I think it'd be the foundation for everything else that goes on in the school.*'

**SUPPORT**

**Main source of LEA support**

The main source is the Behaviour Support and Tuition Service. Two full-time staff are based within the school and work with statemented pupils experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. They provide staff training together with supervision for pupils as required.

Other agencies working with the school include the EWS, the EPS, Social Services, the community constable (whose support is thought to be particularly significant with year 11 pupils), Women Against Violence and drugs awareness teams. The ideal role for a support service is felt to be '*working in partnership with the school*'. There is also a feeling that a multi-agency approach is important in order to elicit as much support for pupils as possible.

**SPECIAL NEEDS AND TRAINING**

**Special needs**

Behaviour is seen as a special educational need in the school. The staff of the Behaviour Support and Tuition Service work closely with the SENCO and support staff in the school. The different stages of the Code of Practice would be worked through and staff are involved to varying degrees in the drafting of IEPs for pupils. In spite of fears about extra paperwork, the CoP was felt to be helpful in identifying problems and detailing appropriate support. '*... a lot of the things that have come with the CoP we were doing before anyway, but it has sharpened things up, it's formalised it in a way*' (headteacher).

**Training**

Training on implementing the Code of Practice has been conducted by the SENCO for the whole staff and governors. Each new cohort of NQTs and less experienced teachers is also trained in this. Support for writing IEPs is given by the SENCO. There has been training on issues such as autism, bereavement, drug abuse and child abuse which are all felt to be related to behaviour. In terms of training in behaviour management issues, more is felt to be needed for lunchtime supervisors and classroom assistants.

**GENERAL APPROACHES**

**School philosophy and significant factors in behaviour management**

The school philosophy is based on an underlying commitment to inclusive education, '*... we seek to include everybody regardless of how different or how challenging they are, and that's our starting point*' (headteacher). There is a clear framework of expectations and pupils are expected to achieve, to work and to respect each other. It is an integrated whole-school approach, the values are school-wide and pupils who find this challenging are supported, the school tries never to exclude permanently. It is a '*can do it*' philosophy. This approach was generated by the headteacher through SMT and is shared across the school. The headteacher has a strong special needs background, and has worked with young people with attendance difficulties in a unit in a mainstream school, so her experience has been about '*... bringing those young people in, into being a part of things*'. The inclusive philosophy is matched by that of the other staff interviewed.

Significant factors in behaviour management at school level are felt by staff to be consistency of approach; respect between staff and students; whole-school support for policies and initiatives; working with parents; strong leadership and support from the management hierarchy. At classroom level, factors staff consider important are being conscious of the needs of students; staying non-confrontational; being clear about one's expectations; being positive; being firm but fair; good planning and differentiated and interesting work.

# APPENDIX 2

# BACKGROUND DATA

# BACKGROUND DATA

The project sought to collect information on a number of key issues relating to effective behaviour management in school. Qualitative data were gathered through interviews with a number of staff in 23 case-study schools, three PRUs and a special school. Quantitative data were gathered through questionnaires completed by senior managers and teachers in a survey of 120 secondary schools. Issues which emerged from the qualitative interviews were used to inform the design of the questionnaires in the school survey.

### THE CASE-STUDY SCHOOLS

Qualitative data were collected in the case-study schools through interviews with a variety of school staff (senior managers, pastoral staff, SENCOs, subject teachers and non-teaching staff, including governors) and, in some schools, with pupils. Twenty-three schools, three PRUs and a residential special school (EBD) in 13 LEAs (one county, four metropolitan, five new authorities and three London boroughs) provided the focus for this element of the research. For ease of presentation, the schools were divided into primary and secondary schools. The 11 schools in the primary category comprised seven primary schools, one first school, one infant school, one junior school and one middle school. Twelve secondary schools made up the other category. These institutions were all approached on the recommendation of their LEA, because it was felt that they illustrated effective or interesting practices in the management of behaviour.

The interviews in the 11 primary schools involved:

- 10 headteachers
- 8 deputy heads (one of whom was also the SENCO)
- 5 SENCOs
- 14 teachers (four of whom had additional responsibilities such as keystage coordinator, PSHE coordinator, etc)
- 8 support assistants/midday supervisors

- 1 member of an external agency running an in-school provision
- 1 parent governor
- 23 pupils

(In addition, in two other primary schools, short discussions were conducted with small groups involving parent governors, parents and midday supervisors.)

TOTAL: 70 interviewees

The interviews conducted in the 12 secondary schools involved:

- 4 headteachers
- 9 deputy heads
- 6 heads of school (two upper, one middle, three lower)
- 2 heads of house
- 6 heads of year
- 2 senior teachers (one of whom was running an in-school centre for pupils with behaviour difficulties)
- 3 heads of department (one of whom also chaired a behaviour management committee)
- 9 SENCOs
- 9 teachers (most of whom were also form tutors)
- 4 members of external agencies involved with in-school provision
- 2 support assistants
- 14 pupils

TOTAL: 70 interviewees

The interviews conducted in the three PRUs and the special school involved:

- 4 headteachers/heads of centre
- 2 deputy heads
- 2 teachers
- 7 pupils

TOTAL: 15 interviewees

**THE SURVEY SCHOOLS**

The 150 secondary schools invited to participate in this phase of the project were chosen to be representative of secondary schools in England and Wales. Ninety per

cent of the schools were comprehensive, with just over half of these (52 per cent) teaching pupils up to 16 years of age and just under half (48 per cent) teaching pupils up to 18 years of age (NFER database).

The study was interested to obtain views from different perspectives within schools and thus two questionnaires were designed and piloted. One questionnaire sought the opinions of senior managers and the other those of teaching staff. Examples of both questionnaires can be found in Appendix 2. In each of the 150 survey schools, one senior manager and three other teachers, chosen at random, were asked to complete the questionnaires. Responses were received from 120 senior managers and from 362 other teachers. Full sets of four completed questionnaires were obtained from 72 schools.

In both the senior manager and the teacher questionnaires, as well as personal information about each respondent (age, gender, years teaching, years at the school, current role and responsibility), data were collected on the topics of:

- whole-school behaviour policy and practice; and
- behaviour management in the classroom

In addition to this, the senior manager questionnaire also sought information on:

- the background of the schools
- the schools' pastoral systems;
- the role of LEA Support Services; and
- issues surrounding permanent exclusion.

Information on the majority of these topics is presented in the preceding chapters of this report, while the data relating to issues surrounding permanent exclusion were conveyed in the second report in the Raising Behaviour series, *Nil Exclusion? Policy and Practice* (Kinder *et al.*, 1999). Data relating to the personal details of the respondents will be presented in this appendix.

**Personal details of respondents**

***Age of respondents***

Senior managers and teachers were asked to indicate their age in pre-set ten-year bands, ranging from under 25 to over 55. For ease of presentation, the ages were then banded into the following three categories: (i) under 35; (ii) 36-45; and (iii) over 45.

The spread of ages of senior managers and teachers within the survey sample is shown in Table A.1 below.

**Table A.1 Effective behaviour management in schools: age distribution of senior managers and teachers**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 119 | % | N = 355 | % |
| Under 35 | 4 | 3 | 138 | 39 |
| 36-45 | 40 | 34 | 119 | 33 |
| Over 45 | 75 | 63 | 98 | 28 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

As might be expected, the majority of senior managers were in the older age bracket of over 45. The age distribution of other teachers was much more evenly spread, with a higher proportion of teachers than senior managers under the age of 35.

***Gender of respondents***

Senior manager and teacher respondents were asked to indicate their gender by ticking the appropriate box on the questionnaire. The distribution of male and female respondents is shown in Table A.2 below.

**Table A.2 Effective behaviour management in schools: gender distribution of senior managers and teachers**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 110 | % | N = 324 | % |
| Male | 62 | 56 | 126 | 39 |
| Female | 48 | 44 | 198 | 61 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

### *Number of years teaching*

Both sets of respondents were asked to indicate how many years they had been teaching, and the data on this were then banded into three categories: (i) up to ten years; (ii) 11 to 20 years; and (iii) over 20 years.

**Table A.3 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of senior managers and teachers with different numbers of years teaching**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 113 | % | N = 327 | % |
| Up to ten years | 1 | 1 | 129 | 39 |
| 11 to 20 years | 40 | 35 | 120 | 37 |
| Over 20 years | 72 | 64 | 78 | 24 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

The above table emphasises the differences in length of teaching experience between senior managers and other teachers. While the distribution in each of the three categories was fairly similar for teachers (between one-quarter and almost two-fifths), the distribution for senior managers showed a preponderance of staff (almost two-thirds) with over 20 years of teaching experience.

### *Subject areas*

Senior managers and teachers completing the questionnaire were asked to indicate their subject specialism. This was an open-ended question and more than one response was possible. There were 153 responses from 120 senior managers and 340 responses from 362 teachers. The particular subjects were divided into the following areas of study:

- humanities (history, geography, religious education, classics, Latin, business studies, PSE and careers);
- scientific (maths, sciences and computer studies);
- expressive and practical (art, music, drama, PE, CDT and home economics); and
- communications (English and modern foreign languages).

The distribution of senior managers' and teachers' specialisms within these four areas is shown in Table A.4 below.

**Table A.4 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of subject specialism responses of senior managers and teachers**

| | Senior Management | | Teachers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N = 153 | % | N = 340 | % |
| Humanities | 57 | 37 | 81 | 24 |
| Scientific | 38 | 25 | 98 | 29 |
| Expressive and practical | 27 | 18 | 94 | 27 |
| Communication | 31 | 20 | 67 | 20 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

The above table shows a significant difference between the two categories of staff with respect to the subjects that they teach. There was a tendency for more senior managers to be humanities specialists and fewer to be from the expressive and practical subject areas than was the case for other teachers.

***Current responsibility***

Both sets of respondents were asked to give their current role or responsibility in the school. These responses were then coded with specific reference to curriculum and/or to pastoral responsibilities. The categories and distributions of their responses are given in Table A.5 and Table A.6 below.

**Table A.5 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of responding senior managers with different responsibilities**

| | N = 114 | % |
|---|---|---|
| Headteacher | 30 | 26 |
| Deputy head/senior teacher: pastoral | 22 | 19 |
| Deputy head/senior teacher: curriculum | 10 | 8 |
| Deputy head/senior teacher: others | 39 | 33 |
| Other | 17 | 14 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Clearly, those senior managers who completed this section of the questionnaire had a range of responsibilities; one-quarter were headteachers and three-fifths were either deputy heads or senior teachers with pastoral, curriculum or other school responsibilities.

**Table A.6 Effective behaviour management in schools: number and percentage of responding teachers with different responsibilities**

| | N = 312 | % |
|---|---|---|
| Curriculum management | 137 | 44 |
| Mainscale teachers | 94 | 30 |
| Assistant pastoral managers and pastoral/ curriculum managers | 36 | 11 |
| SEN teachers and SENCOs | 15 | 5 |
| Other | 30 | 10 |

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*
Source: *NFER: Effective Behaviour Management Project, school survey 1997–8.*

Just over two-fifths (44 per cent) of the teachers in the survey sample who responded to this question were involved with curriculum management. Nearly one-third were mainscale teachers while only one in ten had some pastoral responsibilities. Perhaps not surprisingly, this contrasted with the senior managers in the survey sample, nearly one-fifth (19 per cent) of whom indicated they had responsibility for pastoral duties.

**Background information on the survey schools**

The background information on the respondents' schools (requested in the senior manager questionnaire) covered:

- the school's catchment area;
- the number of pupils on the school roll;
- the number of fte teachers;
- the number of pupils: eligible for free school meals, from ethnic minority groups, needing ESL support, with statements of special educational need (as provided on Form 7 for the DfEE in the previous academic year);
- the number of pupils excluded permanently;
- the incidence of authorised and unauthorised absence; and
- the number of pupils excluded for a fixed-term period in the last academic year.

Information on these variables is available in *Raising Behaviour 2: Nil Exclusion? Policy and Practice.*

# APPENDIX 3

# THE QUESTIONNAIRES

*nfer*

All responses will be treated with the utmost confidentiality

Card One
ID 6-11

# EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS: A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

**ABOUT YOURSELF:**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age:** | **Under 25** | | 1 | **Gender (M/F)** | | 12, 13 |
| | **26-35** | | 2 | **No. of Years Teaching** | | 14-15 |
| | **36-45** | | 3 | **No. of Years at this school:** | | 16-17 |
| | **46-55** | | 4 | | | |
| | **Over 55** | | 5 | | | |

**Subject Specialism(s):** 18-19 20-21

**Current Role/Responsibilities:** 22-23 24-26

## 1. The Whole School Behaviour Policy : Written Policy Statements

a) Does your school currently have a written behaviour policy? *(please tick one box)*

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 In preparation ☐ 3 Don't Know ☐ 4 — 27

*if you ticked **no** or **don't know**, please continue with question 2.*
*if you ticked **yes** or **in preparation**:*

b) who was/is involved in devising it? *(please tick as many as apply)*

SMT ☐ Staff ☐ Pupils ☐ Parents ☐ Don't Know ☐ — 28-32

Other: *[please specify]* _____ — 33-34

c) Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your school's written behaviour policy: *(circle one number in each row)*

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All staff subscribe to/back this policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 35 |
| The behaviour policy makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour for **all** pupils in the school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 36 |

## 2. Responsibility for Behaviour Across the School

a) Please indicate who first takes responsibility for dealing with **typical** incidents of problem/challenging behaviour, and who else might then be involved *(please use 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc to indicate any sequence/chain of involvement).*

| **Typical problem behaviour in the class** | | **Typical problem behaviour around the school** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | 37, 38 |
| Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | 39, 40 |
| Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | 41, 42 |
| Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | 43, 44 |
| Individual Subject Teachers | ☐ | Individual Teachers | ☐ | 45, 46 |
| Form Tutors | ☐ | Form Tutors | ☐ | 47, 48 |
| Parent | ☐ | Parent | ☐ | 49, 50 |
| Other: _____ | | Other: _____ | | 51-52,53-54 |

b) **Please give an example of the kind of typical incident of problem/challenging behaviour you have in mind.**

| **In class:** | **Around school:** | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 55-56, 57-58 |

c) Please indicate who first takes responsibility for dealing with **serious** incidents of problem/challenging behaviour, and who else might then be involved *(please use 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc to indicate any sequence/chain of involvement).*

| **Serious misbehaviour in the class** | | **Serious misbehaviour around the school** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | 59, 60 |
| Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | 61, 62 |
| Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | 63, 64 |
| Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | 65, 66 |
| Individual Subject Teachers | ☐ | Individual Teachers | ☐ | 67, 68 |
| Form Tutors | ☐ | Form Tutors | ☐ | 69, 70 |
| Parent | ☐ | Parent | ☐ | 71, 72 |
| Other: _____ | | Other: _____ | | 73-74,75-76 |

Card Two ID 6-11

d) **Please give an example of the kind of serious incident of problem/challenging behaviour you have in mind.**

| **In class:** | **Around school:** | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 12-13 14-15 |

e) **Please feel free to add comments on the effectiveness of these chains of responsibility.** 16-17

_____ 18-19

_____ 20-21

## 3. Behaviour Policy in Practice

Please indicate whether each of the following statements accurately reflects your school's **current practice** for managing pupil behaviour *(circle one number in each row).*

| **In this school ...** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not Sure** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ...teachers have autonomy in dealing with behaviour as they see fit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| ...there are clear behaviour guidelines/discipline procedures to follow of which all staff **and** pupils are made aware | 1 | 2 | 3 | 23 |
| ...there is a particular emphasis on rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 24 |
| ...staff are informed how to be consistent in their dealing with discipline/behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 25 |
| ...there is **insufficient** time for staff to undertake their pastoral responsibilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 26 |
| ...the SEN dept/SENCO have considerable involvement with children experiencing behavioural problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 27 |
| ...Individual Behaviour Programmes (IBPs) and target-setting are used as a way to manage problem behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 28 |
| ... *if yes*: IBPs and target-setting have been effective in managing problem behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 29 |
| ...there are regular reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues - at department level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 30 |
| - at whole school level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
| ...there are **insufficient** sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 32 |
| ...all pupils are expected to conform with school procedures and rules | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33 |
| ...parents have **insufficient** opportunity to be involved in the management of their child's behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 34 |
| ...the LEA Behaviour Support Service makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 35 |
| ...generally, pupil behaviour is managed effectively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 36 |

## 4. Behaviour Management In The Classroom

a) Please study the following components of effective behaviour management at classroom level and then tick the **six** you consider to be the most important.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | the teacher adopts a non-confrontational approach/refrains from getting angry | 37 |
| ☐ | the teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to work | 38 |
| ☐ | the teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to behaviour | 39 |
| ☐ | the teacher shows respect for pupils | 40 |
| ☐ | the teacher can anticipate problem behaviours | 41 |
| ☐ | the teacher has first-rate classroom organisation and skills | 42 |
| ☐ | the teacher displays consistency in handling pupils' classroom behaviour | 43 |
| ☐ | the teacher makes a point of acknowledging and rewarding good behaviour in the classroom | 44 |
| ☐ | the teacher is aware of the pupils' home and personal circumstances | 45 |
| ☐ | the teacher has a clear sense of a back-up/support system when s/he encounters challenging classroom behaviour | 46 |
| ☐ | the teacher has a clearly differentiated curriculum for the pupils | 47 |
| ☐ | the teacher knows his/her subject very well | 48 |
| ☐ | the teacher is aware of concerns and/or behavioural targets relating to individual pupils | 49 |

**b) Please list any other key factors for managing behaviour in the classroom which you consider important:**

50-51
52-53
54-55
56-57
58-59

**Please return in the pre-paid envelope to:**

**Field Research Services**
**NFER**
**The Mere**
**Upton Park**
**Slough SL1 2DQ**

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

nfer

# EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS:

# A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR MANAGERS

We would be grateful if you could complete this questionnaire, which is attempting to collect information and perspectives from a representative sample of secondary schools in England and Wales.

This will inform the final report of a project entitled Effective Behaviour Management in Schools, which has been commissioned by the Council of Local Education Authorities CLEA and aims to look at key issues in this important area. The information you provide will be strictly confidential and no individuals, schools or LEAs will be identified in any publication arising from the research.

As a token of our gratitude for taking part in this survey, your school will receive a complimentary summary of the project's findings.

As well as some background information about your school, the topics covered in this questionnaire, include:

- your school's pastoral system
- whole school behaviour policy and practice
- behaviour management in the classroom
- the role of LEA Support Services
- issues surrounding permanent exclusion

# EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS

**Background Information on the School**

Card One
ID 6-11

a. Which of the following best describes your school's **catchment area**? *(please circle one number only).*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rural | 1 | 12 |
| Small/medium town | 2 | |
| Suburban | 3 | |
| Urban | 4 | |
| Inner city | 5 | |

b. Please state the total **number** of pupils on the school roll **(as at September 1997)**.

*(No. of pupils)* ☐ 13-16

c. Please give the total number of pupils in each of the following categories (as provided on Form 7 for the DfEE).

*(No. of pupils)*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| eligible for free school meals | ☐ | 17-19 |
| from ethnic minority group | ☐ | 20-22 |
| needing ESL support | ☐ | 23-25 |
| with a statement of special educational need | ☐ | 26-28 |
| excluded permanently | ☐ | 29-31 |

d. Please give details of numbers of authorised/unauthorised absence as provided on the 1996/97 return for the DfEE: Schools Performance Tables.

☐ authorised 32-34 ☐ unauthorised 35-37

e. Please give the total number of pupils excluded for a fixed term in the last academic year (1996-97) for each of these categories:

☐ up to one day 38-40 ☐ 6-10 days 41-43

☐ 2-5 days 44-46 ☐ 11-15 days 47-49

f. Please provide the following information as at **September 1997**.

*(No. of teachers)*

No. of individual **full-time** equivalent teachers *(including headteacher)* ☐ 50-51

## Your School's Pastoral System

1. Please indicate which type of Pastoral system currently applies to your school *(tick one box).*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| College/House | ☐ 1 | Head of year and form tutors follow through with their pupils | ☐ 4 | 52 |
| Vertically grouped forms | ☐ 2 | Head of year and form tutors do not follow through but stay within the same year | ☐ 5 | |
| Don't know | ☐ 3 | Form Tutors only follow through with their pupils | ☐ 6 | |

Other: [please specify] _____ 53-54

2. Please indicate the number of contact hours per week between form tutors and forms. ☐ 55-56

3. Could you please indicate the number of non-contact hours per week for those with pastoral responsibilities *(fill in as appropriate).*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Head of Year | ☐ | 57-58 |
| Head of Upper School | ☐ | 59-60 |
| Head of Lower School | ☐ | 61-62 |
| Other (e.g. Head of House) | ☐ | 63-64 |
| _____ | ☐ | 65-66 |
| _____ | ☐ | 67-68 |
| _____ | ☐ | 69-70 |

4. In your opinion, does this type of pastoral system make a significant distinctive contribution to the effective management of behaviour for **all** pupils *(tick one box).*

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 Not Sure ☐ 3 71

5. **Please add any further comment about your answer to question 4.**

_____ 72-73 74-75

_____ 76-77

## The Whole School Behaviour Policy: Written Policy Statements

6. Does your school currently have a written behaviour policy? *(please tick one box)*

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 In Preparation ☐ 3 Don't Know ☐ 4 — 78

*if you ticked **no** or **don't know**, please continue with question 10.*

*if you ticked **yes** or **in preparation**:* — Card Two ID 6-11

7. Who was/is involved in devising it? *(please tick as many as apply)*

SMT ☐ Staff ☐ Pupils ☐ Parents ☐ Don't Know ☐ — 12-16

Other: [please specify] _____ — 17-18

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your school's written behaviour policy *(circle one number in each row).*

| | **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** | **Not Sure** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All staff subscribe to/back this policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 19 |
| The behaviour policy makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 20 |

9. **Please add any further comment on your school's written behaviour policy (or lack of one)**

_____ 21-22

_____ 23-24

_____ 25-26

## Responsibility for Behaviour Across the School

10. Please indicate who first takes responsibility for dealing with **typical** incidents of problem/challenging behaviour, and who else might then be involved *(please use 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc to indicate any sequence/chain of involvement).*

| **Typical problem behaviour in the class** | | **Typical problem behaviour around the school** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | 27, 28 |
| Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | 29, 30 |
| Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | 31, 32 |
| Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | 33, 34 |
| Individual Subject Teachers | ☐ | Individual Teachers | ☐ | 35, 36 |
| Form Tutors | ☐ | Form Tutors | ☐ | 37, 38 |
| Parent | ☐ | Parent | ☐ | 39, 40 |
| Other: _____ | | Other: _____ | | 41-42,43-44 |

11. **Please give an example of the kind of typical incident of problem/challenging behaviour you have in mind.**

| **In class:** | **Around school:** | 45-46,47-48 |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

12. Please indicate who first takes responsibility for dealing with **serious** incidents of problem/challenging behaviour, and who else might then be involved *(please use 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc to indicate any sequence/chain of involvement).*

| **Serious misbehaviour in the class** | | **Serious misbehaviour around the school** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | SMT/Pastoral Deputy | ☐ | 49, 50 |
| Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | Individual Department/HOD | ☐ | 51, 52 |
| Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | Pastoral Staff/Head of Year | ☐ | 53, 54 |
| Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | Special needs staff/SENCO | ☐ | 55, 56 |
| Individual Subject Teachers | ☐ | Individual Teachers | ☐ | 57, 58 |
| Form Tutors | ☐ | Form Tutors | ☐ | 59, 60 |
| Parent | ☐ | Parent | ☐ | 61, 62 |
| Other: _____ | | Other: _____ | | 63-64,65-66 |

13. **Please give an example of the kind of serious incident of problem/challenging behaviour you have in mind.**

| **In class:** | **Around school:** | 67-68,69-70 |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

14. **Please feel free to add comments on the effectiveness of these chains of responsibility.** 71-72

_____ 73-74

_____ 75-76

## Behaviour Policy In Practice

15. Please indicate whether each of the following statements accurately reflects your school's **current practice** for managing pupil behaviour *(circle one number in each row)*.

Card Thre
ID 6-11

| **In this school ...** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not Sure** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ... teachers have autonomy in dealing with behaviour as they see fit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| ... there are clear behaviour guidelines/discipline procedures to follow of which all staff **and** pupils are made aware | 1 | 2 | 3 | 13 |
| ... there is a particular emphasis on rewards and positive reinforcement of good behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
| ... staff are informed how to be consistent in their dealing with discipline/behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
| ... there is **insufficient** time for staff to undertake their pastoral responsibilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
| ... the SEN dept/SENCO have considerable involvement with children experiencing behavioural problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 17 |
| ... Individual Behaviour Programmes (IBPs) and target-setting are used as a way to manage problem behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
| ... *if yes*: IBPs and target-setting have been effective in managing problem behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 19 |
| ... there are regular reviews of the behaviour policy and behavioural issues - at department level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| - at whole school level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 21 |
| ... there are **insufficient** sanctions for dealing with challenging behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| ...all pupils are expected to conform with school procedures & rules | 1 | 2 | 3 | 23 |
| ...parents have **insufficient** opportunity to be involved in the management of their child's behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 24 |
| ... the LEA Behaviour Support Service makes a significant positive contribution to the management of behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 25 |
| ... generally pupil behaviour is managed effectively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 26 |

## Behaviour Management in the Classroom

16. Please study the following components of effective behaviour management at classroom level and tick the **six** you consider to be the most important.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ | the teacher adopts a non-confrontational approach/refrains from getting angry | 27 |
| ☐ | the teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to work | 28 |
| ☐ | the teacher conveys very clear expectations with regard to behaviour | 29 |
| ☐ | the teacher shows respect for pupils | 30 |
| ☐ | the teacher can anticipate problem behaviours | 31 |
| ☐ | the teacher has first-rate classroom organisation and skills | 32 |
| ☐ | the teacher displays consistency in handling pupils' classroom behaviour | 33 |
| ☐ | the teacher makes a point of acknowledging and rewarding good behaviour in the classroom | 34 |
| ☐ | the teacher is aware of the pupils' home and personal circumstances | 35 |
| ☐ | the teacher has a clear sense of a back-up/support system when s/he encounters challenging classroom behaviour | 36 |
| ☐ | the teacher has a clearly differentiated curriculum for the pupils | 37 |
| ☐ | the teacher knows his/her subject very well | 38 |
| ☐ | the teacher is aware of concerns and/or behavioural targets relating to individual pupils | 39 |

17. **Please list any other key factors for managing behaviour in the classroom which you consider important**

40-41

_____ 42-43

_____ 44-45

_____ 46-47

_____ 48-49

50-51

## The Role of the LEA Support Service in Behaviour

18. Please rate how useful you think each of the following LEA Behavioural Support Service activities would be for your school *(please answer even if you do not have any first hand experience of these support strategies).*

| | Very Useful | Quite Useful | Not Useful | Don't Know | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Offering alternative education provision for children with behaviour difficulties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 52, 53 |
| ☐ Supporting/advising individual staff in the management of behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 54, 55 |
| ☐ Providing EBD (Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties) assessment of pupils with behaviour difficulties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 56, 57 |
| ☐ Working alongside pupils with behaviour difficulties in the classroom | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 58, 59 |
| ☐ Working with individual pupils away from the classroom on a regular basis | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 60, 61 |
| ☐ Providing support to the families of pupils with behaviour difficulties | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 62, 63 |
| ☐ Training for non-classroom-based staff (e.g. mid-day supervisors, office staff) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 64, 65 |
| ☐ Training for classroom assistants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 66, 67 |
| ☐ Planning and delivering INSET for teachers on the management of behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 68, 69 |
| ☐ Support for SENCOs re behaviour programmes (IBPs), and contracts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 70, 71 |

**Please tick the 3 support activities which you consider would be the most useful LEA contribution to your school's management of behaviour at the present time.**

**Permanent Exclusion: Some Issues**

19 Please tick which numbered sentence applies to your school.

1 ☐ In our school, we have a policy of non-exclusion (i.e. we do not permanently exclude any pupil). 72

2 ☐ In our behaviour policy, there is an option to permanently exclude.

3 ☐ I don't know whether our school has a policy of non exclusion.

If you ticked answer 1, please comment on the reasons for this policy of non-exclusion and how well it works.

_____ 73-74

_____ 75-76

20. If you ticked answer 2 or 3 above, in your opinion, **should** your school have a policy of on-exclusion *(please tick one box and complete the sentence)*. Card Four ID 6-11

☐ **Yes**, there should be a policy of non-exclusion because 12

_____

_____ 13-14

_____ 15-16

_____ 17-18

☐ **No**, there has to be a behaviour policy which include permanent exclusion because 19

_____

_____ 20-21

_____ 22-23

_____ 24-25

21. Please indicate how helpful each of the following possible ways of reducing permanent exclusion would be in your school.

| | | Very helpful | Quite helpful | Not helpful at all | Not sure | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | greater opportunities for pupils to undertake a vocational curriculum | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 26, 27 |
| ☐ | options for pupils to spend part of their time in off-site provision and part within-school (dual registration) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 28, 29 |
| ☐ | an extended pastoral system with more time for Heads of Year and Form Tutors to engage with their pupils with behaviour problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 30, 31 |
| ☐ | the existence of a within-school unit for troubled and/ or troublesome pupils | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 32, 33 |
| ☐ | more classroom assistants/ learning support staff working alongside behaviourally challenged pupils in lessons | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 34, 35 |
| ☐ | a school counsellor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 36, 37 |
| ☐ | a school-based Behaviour Support worker/ specialist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 38, 39 |
| ☐ | a greater investment of time in PSE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 40, 41 |
| ☐ | training for all staff to ensure more understanding of challenging behaviour | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 42, 43 |
| ☐ | training for all governors in understanding behaviour issues in schools | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 44, 45 |
| ☐ | closer liaison between home and school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 46, 47 |

**Please tick the 3 you consider to be the most helpful**

## ABOUT YOURSELF:

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age:** | **Under 25** | | 1 | **Gender (M/F)** | | 48, 49 |
| | **26-35** | | 2 | **No. of Years Teaching** | | 50, 51 |
| | **36-45** | | 3 | **No. of Years at this school:** | | 52, 53 |
| | **46-55** | | 4 | | | |
| | **Over 55** | | 5 | | | |

**Subject Specialism(s):** 54-55 56-57 58-59

**Current Role/Responsibilities:** 60-61 62-63

We are hoping to follow up some of the responses to this questionnaire. If you would be agreeable for us to contact you again, we would be most grateful if you could please provide the following information:

[This does not affect the confidentiality and anonymity of your responses thus far.]

Name: _____

School: _____

Telephone number: _____

Convenient contact time: _____

Please return in the pre-paid envelope provided to:

Field Research Services
NFER
The Mere
Upton Park
Slough
SL1 2DQ

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

nfer

# Raising Behaviour 3:
## A School View

This report is the third and final publication in the series 'Raising Behaviour' based on the NFER project 'Effective Behaviour Management in Schools'.

As well as outlining school-based strategies specifically addressing behavioural difficulties, the report looks at schools' procedures and principles for managing behaviour such as rewards and sanctions, behaviour polices, the role of Special Needs, and the contribution of the pastoral system in secondary schools.

The study covered practice in over 20 case-study primary and secondary schools, as well as off-site provision. The report includes practitioners' accounts of general principles and personal philosophies regarding managing behaviour. Findings from a survey of over a hundred secondary schools are also presented.

The report is intended as a useful document for schools, LEAs and their support services, providing illustrations and comment on this important area.

ISBN 0 7005 1549 6

£6.50