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Abstract

The focus of this small-scale study has been centred around the Assertive Discipline model, in particular its effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place. A further aim was to investigate the views of teaching staff and pupils at the researcher's school, an 11 to 18 mixed community school in the South Wales Valleys, on misbehaviour.

Discipline is a topic that has generated much literature. This investigation has attempted to review a range of expert opinions and government reports and considered the topic from an historical viewpoint.

The research has taken the form of questionnaires and semi-structured interviews.

The main findings suggest that:

- Assertive Discipline is not considered to be an effective discipline tool, this concurs with some of the evidence from the literature.
- Rewarding the pupil is an effective method of improving and maintaining positive behaviour, but in achieving this some types of rewards are more effective than others.
- The consequences used within the subject school are not considered to be effective.
- The misbehaviours encountered most frequently by staff are of an annoying nature, this concurs with the findings of the literature review.
- Lack of equipment (the pupil not bringing the required equipment to the lesson) is considered to be the most frequently occurring negative behaviour.
- The two main reasons given by pupils for their misbehaviour are lack of interest in the subject and boredom.

The study also suggests that consistency in responding to incidents of poor behaviour was seen as not being achieved and that the misbehaviour of boys is generally considered to be more overt than that of girls. Misbehaviour appears to be planned by about half of the pupils, but despite this the majority are aware of the correlation between their misbehaviour and effort and their academic achievements.
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Chapter 1
Research Statement, Rationale and Research Timetable

Research Statement

General Aim

- The researcher’s intention is to focus on the Assertive Discipline model, in particular its effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place.

- It is also the intention of the researcher to investigate the views of teaching staff and pupils on misbehaviour.

Objectives

- To investigate the effectiveness of the rewards and consequences within the Assertive Discipline model used in the researcher’s school on behaviour, as viewed by the teaching staff.

- To investigate the incidences and types of disruptive behaviour experienced most frequently by teaching staff in the researcher’s school.

- To investigate the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour.
Rationale

There have been many changes in education over the last hundred years. Geen (1998, p30) offers, ‘Changes in the Structure of Society’ and ‘The Development of Newer Teaching Methods’ as reasons for this change. He mentions in particular the 1944 Education Act with reference to ‘equality of opportunity’, the ‘Nuffield projects of the 1960’s’ and the ‘General National Vocational Qualifications of the 1990’s’. In 1986, corporal punishment, traditionally believed to be a good deterrent was made illegal in maintained schools. There has been a decline in the status of the teacher and pupils no longer come to school with a built-in respect for teachers and education. The authoritarian approach based on fear, has become ineffective and does not work with pupils today. Therefore, teachers need to employ alternative strategies when dealing with misbehaviour. As a result of changes in modern society, pupils bring with them many problems, for example some are disaffected, others suffer abuse or neglect. Teachers often have to deal with the behaviour problems resulting from this ‘baggage’. The rest of the class is affected, positively or negatively, by how the teacher responds to individual pupils and time spent dealing with misbehaviour is detrimental to the education of other pupils. However, not all disruptive pupils fall into this category and indeed not all of those who do are disruptive. ‘Up to the 1970’s the view held was that, schools were unlikely to have major effects in the face of home background and social class’ (Watkins and Wagner (1987, p38), (2000, p22)). This was replaced with the view that schools could, and indeed were ‘making a difference’, and one of the areas in which this was happening was discipline (Watkins and Wagner (2000)). This view was endorsed by The Elton Report (1989), ‘Discipline in Schools’ and echoed by
Munn et al (1992). Bennett (1992, p3-4) also shares this opinion saying, 'we became convinced that individual teachers and individual school staffs can make a considerable difference to the behaviour of pupils and to their educational attainments'. In the new style inspections it is required that a comment is made on behaviour and discipline (Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (1994, p22-23)). The recent changes in the policy on exclusions means that schools have to act to reduce these, both have implications for schools and their discipline policies.

As a springboard for this research, I examined some of the issues involved in discipline and behaviour management and the effects of rewards and punishment on behaviour. From my reading it would appear that Foucault (1979), has had a major influence on much of the current thinking about discipline, he sees it as 'subservience', and that all 'order' is the result of an 'externally imposed discipline'. In rejecting this view, Dewey, according to Covaleskie (2002), 'does not think of discipline as a matter of control or a precondition of teaching, but as an integral part of education'. Dewey's (1916/1966, p129) definition of discipline is, 'A person who is trained to consider his actions, to undertake them deliberately, is in so far forth disciplined. Add to this ability a power to endure in an intelligently chosen course in the face of distraction, confusion, and difficulty, and you have the essence of discipline'. Munn et al (1992, p3) when discussing effective discipline say it, 'is generally seen as having 2 distinct, if related, purposes. It is a means to an end, a necessary condition for learning. But it is also an outcome of schooling, socialising pupils into, for example, values of honesty, courtesy and regard for others' appeared to be 'a necessary, if not sufficient, pre-condition of effective learning.'
I found that defining discipline was not as easy as I had expected and those behaviours requiring it are many and are dependant on many factors. It is important for the reader to have an understanding of the meaning of discipline in the context of this study.

According to Geen (1998, p40),

*If a survey is made of educational literature, it is possible to detect the following uses of the term 'discipline':*

(a) Classroom Control
(b) The Means Used to Achieve Required Standards of Behaviour
(c) Discipline as a Means of Self-Discipline
(d) Discipline in the Sense of a Systematic Body of Knowledge.

(Appendix I)

For the purposes of this study it is intended to work on the premiss that, as Geen (1998, p40) says, 'In most situations teachers use discipline in the sense of (a) and (b) which they impose in order to achieve mastery of (c) and (d)'. It will be interesting to discover how the teaching staff of the researcher’s school define discipline.

The school to be investigated, referred to as ‘the school’ in further discussion, is an 11 to 18 mixed community school in the South Wales Valleys. The researcher, who will be referred to as ‘I’ in places, has been a teacher at ‘the school’ for approximately seven years, it has 1493 pupils on roll, 243 of whom are in the sixth form. Approximately 26% of the pupils are entitled to free school meals. According to a recent inspection report (Turford (1998, p2)) *'the area served by the school is economically disadvantaged'* . The catchment area of ‘the school’ has a very high unemployment rate, with a very high proportion of the workforce on long-term employment schemes. The report also says that, *'the school's intake comprises many less able students and few able students'* . As the result of new legislation, since September 2002 ‘the school’ is no longer the designated school, serving specialist needs of all students with physical disabilities from the comprehensive schools in the
area, but continues to cater for 40 such pupils. 'The school' is the designated school for pupils with communication disorders and as such caters for 7 autistic pupils. Recently, the restructuring of the Senior Management Team (SMT) with the creation of assistant heads has created new opportunities for staff to share in the management of 'the school'. Line managers who advise and guide staff within their curriculum areas have also been introduced, along with Deputy Heads of Year (DHOY) to assist Heads of Year (HOY) in their pastoral duties.

It will be necessary to restrict the review of literature to publications written since 1968 as it would be impossible to review all of the literature available on discipline, this issue is not a new one and has been a subject for discussion for many years. Since the publication of The Elton Report (1989) there have been various reports and government legislation concerning discipline. It became the responsibility of governing bodies to make and review a written statement on school discipline and that of head teachers to publish the school’s disciplinary code. In response to the legislation and with reference to concerns about discipline voiced by staff, a new whole-school policy for discipline was introduced into ‘the school’ in 1998. A member of the SMT on returning from a course on discipline presented the idea to the rest of the team. A small committee was formed who visited a school in similar circumstances, (truancy, socially deprived area, lack of employment prospects, etc.) where such a system was already being used. An ‘expert’ discussed the policy with SMT and the Assertive Discipline Code (Appendix II) was launched to staff.

Staff were asked to read the introductory chapters of Lee Canter’s book on Assertive Discipline (1992) and his Secondary Workbook (1992) before attending an In-Service
Education Training (INSET) day. With the help of a behaviour management consultant the staff put together the bones of the code and were invited to attend evening INSET. I believe that pupils need to know exactly what is expected of them, what will happen when they comply and what will happen when they do not. The code sets this out explicitly and it has been incorporated into the school development plan. A working party has been set up consisting of teaching staff and SMT which has made minor adjustments to the code. Staff need to feel that they are genuinely able to contribute to policy formation and that they are involved in the decision making process, when this occurs a successful outcome is more likely. Staff in ‘the school’ have been consulted throughout the development and implementation of the code. The effectiveness of any initiative also relies on the consistency of its implementation. It will be interesting to discover whether consistency exists in ‘the school’.

There are many models of discipline, only a few of these have become well known. From my reading it appears schools generally either develop their own programs or modify commercially available programs to meet the needs of their particular situation, as no one program has all the answers. Assertive Discipline is Canter and Canter’s (1992, p43) classroom behaviour management plan which they state, ‘allows you to clarify the behaviors you expect from students and what they can expect from you in return. ‘The goal of a classroom discipline plan’, they say, ‘is to have a fair and consistent way to establish a safe, orderly, positive classroom environment in which you can teach and students learn’. The teacher is encouraged to have a proactive rather than reactive approach to discipline. It could be argued that the best answer to discipline problems is to prevent them from occurring in the first place, Kounin (1970).
McPhillimy (1997) and Watkins and Wagner (1987 and 2000) would agree with this. Research also points to the fact that effective managers intervene more quickly when disruptions occur and their interventions get results more quickly (Cotton 1990). Emphasis is placed on ‘positive discipline’ which according to Rogers (1995, p46), ‘is about creating the best environment and social climate for teaching and learning, so that correction is given in a way that minimises unnecessary stress, and considers the self-esteem of those being corrected’. Rewards play an important part in creating this environment and pages of the pupils’ personal organisers are devoted to the recording of such rewards in the form of ‘quick notes’ and ‘merits’. Alongside these is also a space for recording areas of concern (Appendix III). The code is clearly displayed in classrooms throughout ‘the school’ and can also be found in the personal organisers already mentioned. This has the added bonus of involving the parents in the discipline process. Special assemblies also take place where pupils are congratulated on their ‘positive’ achievements. In the review of literature, rewards and consequences will be further investigated.

As a point of clarification for the reader, a consequence is defined as, ‘that which naturally follows’ and a sanction as ‘anything which seems to move a person to observe or refrain from given mode of conduct’ (Foreman 1968, p111 and p 428). Within this research it will be understood that these are interchangeable.

In my literature review on discipline I also looked at types of problems encountered and the reasons why pupils misbehave, these issues will be further researched. After reading Elton (1989), Cotton (1990), Wheldall (1992), Rogers (1995), Owen (1998)
and Watkins and Wagner (2000) it is reasonable to assume that most types of misbehaviour teachers encounter are of an annoying nature. Talking out of turn (TOOT) and hindering other children (HOC), 'appear to be the two misbehaviours which teachers generally identify as causing them the most trouble and occurring most often', Wheldall and Merrett (1989), (Elton (1989) and Watkins and Wagner (2000)).

As DHOY and Acting HOY, one of my principal responsibilities is to act as a point of reference within the referral system. Many referrals are for trivial misdemeanors and could be avoided if dealt with correctly by staff. Investigation of the incidences and types of these primary disruptive behaviours (above) experienced most frequently by teaching staff in 'the school' is hoped will be of benefit to myself in this role.Dealing with these is time consuming and allows less time for praise and recognition of pupils' positive achievements which I consider a very important duty. It is also important that all staff are part of the discipline process and see it as part of their job. Watkins (1997, p7) notes that, 'In well disciplined schools teachers handle all or most of the routine discipline problems themselves'. Whether teaching staff see addressing the issue of disruptive behaviour as central to their role as a class teacher will be investigated.

The OHMCI (1993a, par 12) report also found that, 'Research shows that teachers believe boys in general to be more troublesome than girls since, when boys are off-task, they are more overtly disruptive'. In the staff-rooms of 'the school' it is the boys who continually disrupt the lesson and are off-task who are often the topic of conversation and staff-room discussions on disruptive pupils are more often about boys than girls. Wheldall and Merrett (1992, p50) carried out research into behaviour in
primary and secondary schools it was noted that, 'As at the primary level, boys were identified as the most troublesome pupils by the majority of teachers'. I hope to discover whether teaching staff in 'the school' agree with this research. Recently, while investigating the underachievement of boys, I studied the effectiveness of some of the strategies employed by 'the school' to raise achievement. I furthered this research by considering the views of the pastoral staff on these strategies. It was discovered that the ways in which boys and girls are rewarded and disciplined can affect their achievement. Also that many of the strategies used within 'the school' were effective in raising achievement. The most cited was Assertive Discipline with particular reference to the praise culture aspect. As a result of my research I became interested in Assertive Discipline and welcome the opportunity to study it further.

'Seating arrangements can be a particularly influential element in classroom discipline', according to Owen (1998, p25). It was noted in the OHMCI (2001, p26) report that, 'In those lessons where teachers required pupils to sit according to a considered plan, the advantages were evident both for promoting learning and preventing misbehaviour'. It was also noted that, 'Yet in the schools visited it was rare for teachers to take this elementary measure, and very rare indeed for the planning of seating to be a consistent practice across the school'. It will be interesting to discover whether teaching staff in 'the school' use a seating plan in their classes.
It was noted, that amongst the reasons why pupils misbehave the following can be found:

- boredom,
- lack of motivation,
- lack of interest in the subject,
- peer pressure,
- lack of self-discipline,
- low self-esteem,
- ineffective or poor quality teaching and inappropriate curriculum,
- school environment and its ethos ('the way that the students perceive the school, and their behaviour and work within it', (Cowley 2001, p 130)), Office of Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools (OHMCI) (1993a), Department for Education (DfE) (1994), Burden (1995), Chaplain (1995), OHMCI (1996), Porter (2000), Cowley (2001), Kinder et al (1996) ‘The school’ actively promotes the maintenance of a positive ethos, one example of this is the Pacific Institute courses (Appendix IV) for pupils and staff which helps to raise self-esteem. Owen (1998, p12) found that common to all children with behavioural difficulties whom he had taught was one characteristic, ‘low self-esteem’. In my previous research it was concluded that the praise culture has had a positive effect on raising self-esteem and that the effectiveness of the praise depends closely upon the credibility of the praise and the person giving it and on its immediacy. It was interesting to find that, ‘More than any other factor, the sample of 160 pupils’, interviewed by Kinder et al (1996, p6), ‘nominated relations with peers and friends as a cause or stimulus for both truancy and disruption’. It is intended to try to discover if there is any correlation between the reasons mentioned on
the previous page and those obtained in the research. It is hoped that this information will be of benefit to the researcher and ‘the school’ in the reduction in, and prevention of, the occurrences of incidents of misbehaviour.

A questionnaire (Appendix V) will form the main method of data gathering to record the views of thirty-five of the teaching staff in ‘the school’. The effectiveness of the rewards and consequences used in ‘the school’ on behaviour and the incidences and types of disruptive behaviour experienced most frequently will be its main focus. Additional information will be obtained through informal interviews or ‘chats’ in the staff-room, ensuring that staff are aware that I am ‘information gathering’. It is proposed to use an interview (Appendix VI) to investigate the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour, pupils from years 7 and 11 will be chosen to take part, sixteen in total. Year 7 because they have just started a new school and Year 11 because for many it is a turning point in their career and many are disengaged. Eight Year 7 pupils will be chosen from those referred to pastoral staff during their first term, and eight Year 11 pupils will be chosen from those referred during the previous two school terms. Although, not part of the initial objectives, I feel that it will be of interest to attempt to discover whether age affects the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour.

In deciding which research methods will be most suitable several publications were consulted, including Cohen and Manion (1994, chapter 4) and Bell (1999, chapter 8), who offer sound advice to be used when preparing and constructing questionnaires. It is important that questions are unambiguous and unbiased. I will also need to ensure that leading questions are not included. The questionnaires and interview questions will be revised after they have been piloted. This will enable a check for ambiguity to
be made and ensure that the questions will give me the necessary information, thus checking their validity (Bell 1999). I realise that my results may not be a true reflection of the national picture, but hope that they will benefit all concerned, pupils and staff.
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Chapter 2

Literature Review

Historical Background

Discipline in schools has been of concern to teachers, researchers and governments for many years. The Inspectorate report ‘Good Behaviour and discipline in schools’ (HMI 1987, p1) states that, ‘Good behaviour is a necessary condition for effective teaching and learning, to take place, and an important outcome of education which society rightly expects’. The Elton Report (1989) emphasises the importance of a whole-school approach to behaviour management and the relationships between teaching style, classroom management and discipline as areas of school practice that may contribute to a reduction in disruptive behaviour. The OHMCI (1993a, p3) report stresses the importance of having a code of practice regarding behaviour and the OHMCI (1996, p26) report lists the aspects of good practice that, ‘singly and collectively play a part in fostering and maintaining good behaviour and discipline’. In 1997 the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1997) emphasised the need for every school to have a clear discipline policy and advocated the benefits of Assertive Discipline. In the white paper, ‘Building Excellent Schools Together’ (DfEE 1997, p44) it was stated that, ‘we will support local initiatives to tackle behaviour problems and take active steps to spread information on emerging good practice; for example on the benefits which schools have gained from the careful introduction of assertive discipline’. Assertive Discipline was further endorsed by the Circular 10/99,
‘Social Inclusion: Pupil Support’ (DfEE 1999). In 1997 and 1998 legislation was passed in which the governing body’s responsibility to make and review a written statement on school discipline and the responsibility of the head teacher to publish the school’s disciplinary code was clearly stated, Waterman (1998). Circular 10/99, (DfEE 1999, par 1Annex B). also states that ‘each school should have a clear school behaviour policy, hierarchy of sanctions and a linked system of rewards for good behaviour’, it also explains the legal framework for school discipline.
Assertive Discipline

As already mentioned, there is a need for teachers to employ alternative strategies when dealing with misbehaviour. The Canters’ Assertive Discipline is possibly the best known and most widely used model of discipline. It is this model that ‘the school’ has adopted, it is based upon research into the methods that successful teachers were using in dealing with problems of discipline in the classroom. In the first book, published in 1976, the goal was ‘to help teachers learn to “take charge” of the classroom in a firm and positive manner’ (Canter and Canter 1992, introduction p xviii). The goal of the revised text ‘is to teach students to choose responsible behaviour and in so doing raise their self-esteem and increase their academic success’ (Canter and Canter 1992, preface p xiii). Canter and Canter believe that the teacher has the right to teach and the students have the right to learn in, ‘a classroom free from disruptive behaviour – a classroom that both reflects your own behavioural expectations and creates an atmosphere in which student self-esteem can flourish’ (Canter and Canter 1992, p5).

In order for this to happen the teacher must become more assertive. They define this type of teacher as one, ‘who clearly and firmly communicates her expectations to her students, and is prepared to reinforce her words with appropriate actions. She responds to students in a manner that maximizes her potential to get her own needs to teach met, but in no way violates the best interest of the students’. This is in contrast to the teachers who they say are either nonassertive or hostile. ‘A nonassertive response style is one in which the teacher is passive and inconsistent in responding to student behaviour. A hostile response style is one in which the teacher responds to students in a hostile, rigid, authoritarian manner, often at the expense of students’
feelings and self-esteem’ (Canter and Canter 1992, p38). As Rogers (2002, p55) suggests, ‘Assertion is not about winning; it’s about establishing and affirming fair rights and needs’. It will be interesting to discover how the teaching staff define assertive.

Assertive Discipline trains teachers to ‘look for the positive’, or to ‘catch pupils being good’ (Major 1990, Merrett 1993, Madden 1999, Humboldt 2001). ‘The school’ has recently changed the style of its referral forms, they have become ‘good news/bad news’ forms and staff are encouraged to refer pupils for good behaviour, a practice hitherto not used. The concept of ‘looking for the positive’ does not mean that misbehaviour is ignored, when it does happen the teacher communicates disapproval ‘calmly and firmly’ then reminds the pupil of the rule that has been broken. The emphasis is on what the teacher does in dealing with misbehaviour, using the Assertive Discipline model ensures incidents are dealt with in the same way by all teachers and that the pupils know exactly what to expect (Humboldt 2001), hence helping to ensure consistency. The teacher is directed to ignore secondary behaviour, arguing with the teacher for example, and to concentrate on the primary behaviour for which the pupil is being reprimanded. The classroom discipline structure can be easily undermined if one pupil is treated differently from another in response to a similar incident. Owen (1998, p9) states that, ‘children themselves identify fairness, consistency and clearly defined rules as characteristics of a good teacher and an acceptable discipline structure’.

But, Churchward (2001) in discussing the work of Kohlberg asserts that, ‘just as students function at different levels in reading and math, they also function at different levels, or stages, of discipline’. If we agree with this view, should we
therefore be treating all pupils in exactly the same way i.e. equally? It would appear to be not so. This is an important idea that will be investigated in the research.
Effectiveness of Assertive Discipline

The Canters list commendations from fourteen ‘educators’ supporting the effectiveness of the model (Appendix VII) and it has been found to be successful in various schools in this country (Appendix VIII). This is also supported by Geen (1998, p75) who cites Blaengwawr Primary School in Aberman as one of its success stories and by Norman (2001) who states that, ‘many of my colleagues use Assertive Discipline and find success using it’. Major (1990, p64-65) in reference to Canter says that, ‘His model seems to work well for those students who know right from wrong and want to do what they should, but lack the ability to discipline themselves’. He argues that,

some believe he is ill-informed when he suggests that all children can be good if they want to, insensitive when he gives rights only to teachers, naive when he fails to acknowledge a certain amount of movement and rebellion is normal, and has his head in the clouds for not realizing his model only somewhat works at the middle school and is a joke in high schools.

According to Blandford (1998, p102) ‘Assertive Discipline has been effective in schools where the school community has been involved in its implementation and development’. One of its critics is ‘Covaleskie’, according to Kizlik (2003) who states that, ‘His ideas about discipline are quite different from Canter’s. He believes that the very simplicity of assertive discipline is one of its biggest problems’. Churchward (2001) cites ‘Thomas Gordon, creator of Teacher Effectiveness Training’ as one who, ‘ staunchly opposes Lee Canter’s Assertive Discipline concept’. My reading supports Cotton (1990) who found that ‘some research is supportive, but most is inconclusive about the effectiveness of the Assertive Discipline approach’.

After reading Chaplain (1995) and Porter (2000) it is reasonable to suggest that central to this behaviour modification method is the identification of what happens
immediately before and after the behaviour occurs. The answer then is to either change the conditions which appear to trigger the behaviour or provide a reward for the appropriate behaviour.
Rewards and Consequences

As already mentioned Assertive Discipline is based on a system of rewards and consequences. The first two rewards on 'the school's code rely on praise. To make the praise as effective as possible Canter and Canter (1992, p148-150) give the following guidelines, 'Effective praise is personal, must be genuine, is descriptive and specific and is age-appropriate'. The words, 'contingent', 'specific' and 'credible' are mentioned by Askew and William (1995, p18) and echoed by Watkins (1997, p16) who noted that,

*Pupils welcome direct personal praise from their teachers. It is effective when it is;
- spontaneous and credible;
- clearly linked to the pupil's accomplishment;
- personalised to the particular pupil and what they might find difficult.*

(OHMCI (1996), MacGrath (1998), Duke (2000), Kohn (2000), Cowley (2001)). The effectiveness of this type of reward is also governed by the status of the teacher (Fontanna (1985)). Munn et al (1992, p58) assert that, 'The benefit of praising a variety of pupil achievements, and using praise as a reward, seems to be that a good relationship is set up between pupils and teachers', this has a positive effect not only on the pupil receiving the praise, but on the rest of the class as well. According to Norman (2001), 'incorporating the use of praise and other rewards does benefit junior high students, because many never hear any at home. They only hear when they are doing something wrong'. These findings are echoed by Cowley (2001, p64) who states that, 'The use of rewards can be one of the most effective ways of achieving better behaviour in the classroom'. When the code was first introduced into 'the school' I found that the 'quick notes' were very effective with a group of
disruptive Year 8 pupils. At that time these were slips of paper for good work, good effort etc., signed by the teacher that where taken home. The fact that this resulted in a monetary reward for some of the pupils acted as a positive reinforcer. But, it is the researcher’s opinion that this became their goal rather than the desire to improve their work or behaviour. Burden (1995, p146) suggests that, ‘excessive use of rewards may be decreasingly successful in new situations, foster dependence on the teacher, and undermine intrinsic motivation’. He goes on to say that, ‘Research on the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation suggests caution toward giving material rewards for activities that are intrinsically satisfying’. (Intrinsic motivation means something is done because the person likes doing it, extrinsic motivation means something is done in order to get an external reward (Kohn 2000)). Watkins (1997, p16) supports this view he states that, ‘An over emphasis on rewards can interfere with efforts to promote learning for its own sake’. It is important that effort is rewarded as well as academic achievement. It is interesting to note that according to Churchward (2002), ‘rewarding the student’ is one of the techniques that teachers’ listed that backfire in Linda Albert’s book A Teacher’s Guide to Cooperative Discipline of 1989. I intend to pursue the effectiveness of rewards in my research. Covaleskie (2002) believes that children should obey the rules because that is the right thing to do, not because there is some reward associated with obeying, or some punishment for not obeying. I believe that many staff would agree with this view, a point I wish to research.

Rutter et al (1979, p196) state that their findings suggest that, ‘pupils behaved better and achieved more when teachers treated them in ways which emphasised their successes and good potential rather than those which focused on their failings and
shortcomings’. This was supported more recently by the OHMCI (1993a, p11) report which also lists a range of rewards that may be ‘equally effective’ as praise (p 12). In a leaflet, ‘Governing Bodies and Effective Schools’ (OFSTED, 1995), positive reinforcement was listed as one of the eleven factors associated with an effective school. Owen (1998 p5) noted that, ‘The positive reinforcement of acceptable behavioural patterns helps to generate a positive ethos in the school, and indeed one within which various sanctions and forms of punishment will prove significantly more effective, purely because they are used less frequently’.

It should follow then, that if this method of behaviour management is used incidences of misbehaviour will decrease (Owen 1998). According to Humboldt (2001) this would seem to be the case. He says that,

*When systematic attention is given to pupils who behave appropriately,*
- *Your influence with students increases.*
- *The amount of problem behavior decreases.*
- *The classroom environment becomes more positive.*

It can be argued that everyone responds better to positive reinforcement than to negative reinforcement, though, this is not as simple as it may seem at first. If the only way in which a child gains recognition at home is through negative behaviour then this method will be employed in its relationships with other adults. This may lead to what may be termed as attention seeking behaviour. Through positive relationship building the teacher can help the pupils to replace this with a need for positive recognition. It may be difficult at first for these pupils to feel comfortable with this change my reading leads me to the conclusion that this is where private praise may be better than public praise. Some pupils may find public praise embarrassing, or see it as ‘un-cool’ as it does not fit in with their ‘macho image’ (Wheldall et al 1989), Houghton et al (1990),
Wheldall (1992), Owen (1998), Porter (2000), Cowley (2001)). Rutter et al (1979, p124) emphasises that it is the frequency of the public praise that is important, they found that, ‘frequent public praise for good work or behaviour by commending children in assembly or other meetings was also associated with better pupil behaviour’. The frequency will ensure a quick transition from negative attention seeking behaviour to positive attention seeking behaviour. It will also ensure that the pupils are more likely to, as Canter and Canter (1992, p58) say, ‘continue their appropriate behavior in order to receive the recognition they need’.

In the Inspectorate report (HMI (1987, p4)), it was stated that, ‘Where rules and prohibitions proliferate and the emphasis is on sanctions and punishments, rather than on praise and rewards, general standards of behaviour, other things being equal, are usually poorer’. The OHMCI (1993a, par27) report lists a range of sanctions that schools have applied. According to Lund (1996, p42), ‘Punishments do not work, either as means of preventing further inappropriate behaviour (or no one would repeat it after being punished) or as a deterrent (otherwise others would not exhibit that inappropriate behaviour)’. Punishment has been seen to be ineffective because it is reactive, it is used in response to inappropriate behaviour. As stated, it is better to prevent this behaviour occurring in the first place. Within the Assertive Discipline model the pupil has a choice, that is, to discontinue the inappropriate behaviour. Consequences are the ‘natural outcomes’ of choosing to break the rules, ‘It is the inevitability of the consequence, not the severity, that makes it effective’, (Canter and Canter (1992, p47). This was echoed by Rogers (1995), Clarke and Murray (1996) and Porter (2000). Further reading revealed that Cotton (1990), in quoting her own research, alternatively, says that,
punishment has been found to be an effective method of remediating individual misbehavior and therefore improving school order if the punishment is:

- Commensurate with the offense committed
- Perceived by the student as punishment.
- Delivered with support. Students often need encouragement to improve their behavior and assistance in learning how to do so.

It was noted by the pastoral staff, that it was the same pupils who were being placed in the ‘isolation room’ time after time. This was a room in a remote part of ‘the school where a pupil was sent to work in supervised isolation, often though, there were three or four others there at the same time. This obviously was not an effective sanction, i.e. not perceived as punishment. The type of punishment may be reinforcing, Major (1990, p51) asserts that ‘sending students to time-out rooms may provide an opportunity for them to enjoy daydreaming, or avoid having demands placed on them’, (Jessor and Jesser (1997), McPhillimy (1997), Owen (1998), Barnett (2002)). Consequently this room was re-named the ‘study support room’ and its function revised.

It is important that the pupil is made aware that it is the behaviour that is causing the problem and not the student personally, this will ensure that any positive relationship (one of the benefits of praise mentioned earlier) that has been built will not be damaged. As Geen (1998, p55) notes, ‘Teachers should realise that punishment can deter, but it can also make pupils bitter and resentful.’ Punishment may also result in avoidance tactics, the pupil may truant from the lesson or indeed the school itself, it also reinforces the idea that aggression and violence are the best ways to get what you want, (Merrett (1993), OHMCI (1993a), Burden (1995)).
Misbehaviour encountered

As stated, it would seem from my reading that most of the punishment takes place due to behaviour that is irritating and annoying and not truly serious, TOOT and HOC have already been mentioned. Rogers (1995, p33) notes that, ‘A good deal of corrective discipline and management concerns low-level but annoying behaviour – calling out, lateness, not having equipment, task avoidance, talking out of turn, chair leaning’. The OHMCI (1993b, p2) report states that, ‘Yet even those schools judged to be well-run and effective experience difficulties from minor disruption to a greater or lesser degree. The most common feature is the wearing effect of a stream of relatively trivial disruptions that many teachers experience during the course of a week’. The report mentions, ‘calling out in class, time wasting, distracting other children’ and ‘impeding progress and the flow of lessons’.

It is the researcher’s assertion that what one teacher regards as indiscipline may not be the same as another’s and may vary from day to day and class to class (Watkins and Wagner (1987 and 2000), Wheldall and Merrett (1989), Cotton (1990), Glynn (1992), Charlton and David (1993) and Owen (1998)). It is proposed to try to discover the views of teaching staff at ‘the school’ and the types of misbehaviour they encounter.
Reasons for pupils' misbehaviour

Bennet (1992, p6) asserts that, ‘Discipline, and the development of self-discipline, cannot be separated from the total educational experience to which pupils are exposed in schools. Indeed, many aspects of indiscipline arise as direct responses by pupils to the experience of being taught’. Interestingly, Owen (1998, p9) suggests that, ‘Most teachers are less likely to consider their own teaching styles, and the methods they use to reinforce the discipline structure, as causal factors, albeit secondary and subconscious’. When asked by Owen to make a list of possible causal factors for a particularly difficult pupil, junior school teachers highlighted ‘inadequate parenting, social deprivation, relationship difficulties and lack of maturity.’ He goes on to say that, ‘None of the staff, however, mentioned the school itself or their own teaching methods as being likely causal factors in the development of this pupil’s special educational needs’. This is an interesting point and one I would like to investigate.

I believe that pupils learn by example, after reading Smith (1992), Rogers (1995) and Clarke and Murray (1996) it is reasonable to suggest that teachers themselves may provide a poor example, arriving late to lessons or not marking work promptly for instance. Teachers need to model the types of behaviour they expect from pupils, ‘behaviour exhibiting commitment, concern and personal respect’ Smith (1992, p29), (Rutter et al (1979), Tattum (1986), Charlton and David 1993)). The example set by teachers and other adults is one of the three key components of a positive ethos according to the OHMCI (1993a p 24-25) report. In reviewing research the report
also identifies 'the quality of the curriculum offered as a significant determinant of pupil's behaviour', and states that, 'the quality of the teaching and learning in each lesson also has direct effects on behaviour'. Low expectations and negative attitudes on the part of the teacher were cited as possible contributors to poor behaviour, this is echoed by Owen (1998). How staff describe pupils and their abilities warrants further investigation.

Bennett (1992, p6), Vice-chair of the Elton Committee, also noted that their report found that, 'Pupils are less likely to disrupt lessons which they see as interesting, relevant and worthwhile. They are more likely to disrupt those which they see as lifeless, boring or beyond their understanding. The implications for discipline of having an appropriate or adequately resourced curriculum, or one that is poorly presented, are obvious'. This point is echoed more recently by Covaleskie (2002). Of course, it may be reasonable to suggest that some pupils will still disrupt whatever the curriculum. I would agree with McPhillimy (1996, p12) making the work interesting although important is not 'the complete or even main answer'. Other school-based explanations for the causes of misbehaviour are cited by Chaplain (1995, p27) among these are, 'Ineffective teaching earlier in the child's career, poorly resourced school, poorly managed school, and an ineffective pastoral system'. When Major (1990, p22-24) asked 'educators' why 'kids' misbehave he says, 'they say it is because students want attention; see too much violence on television; have low self-concepts; have no supervision at home; are bored; don't know any better; eat too much refined sugar; and because they are exposed to wishy-washy inconsistent administrators'.
He puts forward eight reasons why he believes ‘kids’ misbehave,

‘letter grades, poor eyesight, lack of sleep, hearing problems and hunger, an irrelevant curriculum, many students see the future as looking hopeless, parents have changed, because they are trapped by their reputations, educators have been too timid in reading U.S. Supreme Court rulings, and, finally, because too much emphasis has been placed on what is best for the child and too little on what is best for society.’

Many of these are also mentioned by Burden (1995) and Clarke and Murray (1996).

MacGrath (1998, p11) also noted that,

it can thus be useful to ask why he or she is resorting to disruptive behaviour: for example, habit; lack of alternative skill; preferring to disrupt rather than appear stupid; frustration at not being able to do the work; attempting to gain peer approval because of poor self-esteem; the need to feel ‘powerful’ in some way; desire for attention; for a specific reason,...as a protest against authority.

The OHMCI (2002, par79) report concludes that, ‘Some pupils who misbehave do so because they cannot cope with work in classrooms, with aspects of school organisation or with pressures from their peers’.

Cowley (2001, p77) asserts that, ‘There can be a tendency for teachers to think that misbehaviour is planned or premeditated by their students’. I would agree that whilst it is certainly true in some cases that students make a conscious decision to misbehave, it is my opinion that in reality the majority of poor behaviour stems from very different factors some of which are within the school system. Cowley (2001, p78-85) also mentions boredom, lack of motivation to learn, lack of interest in the subject, ‘Special needs’, peer pressure, lack of self-discipline and the teacher as factors affecting behaviour. It may be interesting to compare these with the findings of Kinder et al (1996). I believe that some pupils do not see the connection between their behaviour and academic success and the amount of effort they make. Burden (1995, p163) under the umbrella of motivational strategies suggests that teachers provide feedback and
rewards for performance, one suggestion is to ‘help students attribute achievement to effort’, it may be reasonable to suggest that he shares my opinion. This connection between behaviour, academic success and effort will be researched.

According to Cotton (1990), Anderson and Prawat (1983) say that ‘These students have what psychologists call an "external locus of control," and do not believe in their own ability to influence events. Nor, oftentimes, do they have the skills to identify inappropriate behavior and move from inappropriate to appropriate behavior’. This is echoed by Burden (1995), and Kinder et al (1996, p3), in commenting on their research noted that, ‘First, it might be suggested that pupils cannot always fully recognise the reasons that underpin their actions’. They continue by saying that,

*It is at least possible that nominating ‘friends’ as an influence upon disaffected behaviour reflects this misregognition or guardedness: as all teachers and parents know, assertions that the locus of control (and hence ‘blame’) is beyond themselves is a fairly typical child response. The fact that there was a low incidence of pupils citing factors within the individual/personality domain could also corroborate this.*

As mentioned earlier pupils consider peer pressure as one of the main causes of truancy and disruption. Others are, ‘relationships with teachers, the content and delivery of the curriculum, family factors, bullying, the classroom context (individual learning support and classroom management) and problems arising from their own personality or learning abilities’, according to Kinder et al (1996, p5). Pupils may perceive the way teachers treat them and the reasons for their behaviour in a very different way than teachers do. I will examine the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour.
Conclusions

Discipline in schools has been of concern to teachers, researchers and governments for many years. There have been many changes resulting in the need and requirement for schools to have a discipline policy. Assertive Discipline is the model that ‘the school’ has adopted, it,

*focuses on praise, rewards, granting responsibility, choices and consequences, and other non abusive techniques. All these are based upon three assumptions:*

1. *All behaviour has a reason.*
2. *What we pay attention to is what we get more of.*
3. *Discipline needs to be fair, firm and consistent.* (Smart, (2002))

The evidence for the effectiveness of Assertive Discipline is inconclusive and as noted by Humboldt (2001), *‘The long term implications of rewarding behavior as suggested by the assertive discipline model are not yet well understood‘*. The researcher feels that it will be interesting to discover the views of the teaching staff on the effectiveness of the rewards and consequences used in ‘the school’. Rogers (1995 p214) points out that,

*No plan or policy for behaviour management can hope to address all the issues raised by human fallibility and disobedience. Yet there has to be a policy, a common framework within which teachers can legitimately and professionally exercise their responsibility of leading and teaching students to own their own behaviour in ways that respect the rights of others.’*

As far as the misbehaviour encountered is concerned, research suggests that this is mainly irritating and minor in nature. The reasons put forward for pupils’ misbehaviour are varied, some concentrate on influences outside the students, whereas others on the students themselves. Porter (2000, p11) has an interesting viewpoint he
says that, *The authoritarian theories emphasise faulty external controls as the cause of student disruptions; the democratic theories say that disruptions occur when students' emotional or relationship needs are not being met*.

Due to the size and complexity of the topic of discipline it has been impossible to review all the literature surrounding it. I consider that which has been reviewed has been of great benefit, thus providing a broader understanding of the topic and suggesting other areas to be researched within this small-scale study.
Chapter 3
Research Design and Methodology

As the title states this study focuses on the Assertive Discipline model. In particular its first aim relates to its' effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place and has three objectives (p1). To this end I have reviewed some of the publications available on discipline written since 1968. The literature review has also focused on the general effectiveness of rewards and consequences, the incidences and types of behaviour experienced by teaching staff and the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour. This has provided the author with the necessary background and starting point for the research design and methodology.

As previously mentioned, 'the school' to be investigated is an 11 to 18 mixed community school in the South Wales Valleys. The method of data gathering of the views of the teaching staff on the effectiveness on behaviour of the rewards and consequences used in 'the school' and the incidences and types of disruptive behaviour experienced most frequently by teaching staff in 'the school' will be through a questionnaire. Additional information from staff being obtained through informal interviews, as previously mentioned. An interview was chosen to check the meaning of answers and further develop issues raised in the questionnaires as I consider this to be the most effective way of trying to clarify the views of the teaching staff, thus increasing validity, reliability and authenticity. It will also provide triangulation of results, that is, 'the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some
aspect of human behaviour' (Cohen and Manion 1994, p233). An interview will be used to investigate the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour.

Selecting the research method is an important part of the planning of any research project. In deciding which method or methods to use I considered the following: questionnaires, interviews, case studies and ethnography. Ethnography was ruled out because of time constraints. The case study method was discarded as inappropriate as it relies too much on data taken from one aspect. It is important to use the appropriate method of data collection, the suitability of the method is governed by time and the availability of the population. As Bell (1999, p101) states, 'Methods are selected because they will provide the data you require to produce a complete piece of research.' I have therefore chosen to use a questionnaire and interviews. Cohen and Manion (1994) and Bell (1999) offer sound advice to be used when preparing and constructing questionnaires and interview schedules. I will use this as a framework for development of the research instrument, bearing in mind the importance of ambiguity and bias. In addition I will need to ensure that leading questions are not included and check for readability. Gray (1996, p47) states that, 'A very useful response format is to offer a continuum which is marked as desired' and that, 'Such formats offer the opportunity for numerical scoring and later comparisons'. I intend to use this format for my questions where appropriate along with open-ended questions for flexibility.

In attempting to address the first objective regarding the views of the teaching staff on the effectiveness of the rewards and consequences it is proposed to take each one of these separately and ask respondents to judge their effectiveness on a five-point scale. I realise that this allows respondents to adopt a middle line, but after discussion with
the two pilot staff, I feel that staff should be allowed to do so in cases where they might be undecided (Evans 1999). According to Bell (1999, p185-186), ‘Scales are devices to discover strength of feeling or attitude.’ She goes on to say that, ‘The most straight-forward attitude scale is probably the Likert.’ Respondents are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with a statement on a five or seven point scale. A table or vertical bar chart might then be used to display the results. This method will be used to discover how true the staff consider the following statements to be:

- As a staff we respond consistently to incidents of poor behaviour.
- All behaviour is a conscious choice on the part of the pupil.
- Pupils should behave without the need for rewards.
- In relation to behaviour, all pupils should be treated in exactly the same way.

Open-ended questions will be used to attempt to discover what staff understand as the meaning of the words ‘assertive’ and ‘discipline’, how they describe the pupils of the school and what they consider to be the reasons why pupils misbehave. According to Cohen and Manion (1994, p277),

Open-ended questions have a number of advantages: they are flexible; they allow the interviewer to probe so that she may go into more depth if she chooses, or to clear up any misunderstandings; they enable the interviewer to test the limits of the respondent’s knowledge; they encourage co-operation and help establish rapport; and they allow the interviewer to make a truer assessment of what the respondent really believes.

There will also be space for the staff to add any comments should they wish to do so. Gray (1996, p48 and p51) comments that, ‘Even if respondents are familiar with it, jargon is frequently found to be unpopular and so could affect the likelihood of full and candid answers’. Despite this, I intend to include this type of question to see if
teaching staff are familiar with the Assertive Discipline phrases, thus checking consistency. I will check their responses during the informal interviews. As a basis for this question I will use a similar question to that used by Gray. Another type of response, suggested by Cohen and Manion (1994, p280) is a ranking response, where, 

'a respondent is required to rank-order a series of words, phrases or statements according to a particular criterion'. I will use this to try to discover which of the rules the teaching staff consider to be the most important, the responses will be compared with those given to the question on which misbehaviours they find most irritating. A simple Yes/No alternative will be used to find out whether staff see addressing the issue of disruptive behaviour as central to their role as a class teacher and whether they use a seating plan for their classes.

There are eighty-seven teaching staff in 'the school', a sample of thirty-five will be chosen to complete the questionnaire, a sample size of thirty is held by many mathematicians to be the minimum to give reliable data, using thirty-five will allow for questionnaires that are not returned. Bell (1999, p14) states that, 'Great care has to be taken to ensure that the sample population is truly representative'. To ensure that the sample is representative of the whole teaching staff of 'the school', those chosen will include staff teaching a variety of subjects, with a variety of length of service and holding a variety of posts within 'the school'. Questionnaires were used by Wheldall and Merrett (1989 and 1992) who carried out research into behaviour in primary and secondary schools and by Evans (1999) in his research into the teachers' attitudes and beliefs about school discipline and how these affect their use of the referral system. According to Wragg (1994, p108) 'Questionnaires allow teachers the time to give a considered reply to questions'. The questionnaire will be piloted with two teaching
staff, one of whom is a statistician, the other has recently completed a Master of Arts in Education (MAEd)

Although not part of the initial objectives, interestingly, according to research, teachers believe boys in general to be more troublesome than girls, questions will be asked that, I hope, will discover whether teaching staff in ‘the school’ agree with this research. In addition, whether they agree that when boys are off-task, they are more overtly disruptive. I will use sublettering to group together these questions, questions on the Assertive Discipline rules and on negative behaviours, Cohen and Manion (1994, p97) suggest that, ‘this is a useful technique’ and ‘also a way of making the questionnaire look smaller than it actually is!’

As stated, according to my reading most types of misbehaviour teachers encounter are of an annoying nature, (TOOT) and HOC, for example, it is intended to discover which negative behaviours teaching staff in ‘the school’ find occur most frequently and which they find the most irritating. A question listing negative behaviours found in the literature search will be included, with a space for staff to add one of their own. Staff will be required to indicate the frequency of occurrence by selecting the appropriate number from a scale, pick out the two that occur most frequently and pick out the two they consider most irritating.

Interviews were used by Kinder et al (1996) in their study of pupil views on disaffection. To make the study more manageable I will restrict the pupils’ data collection to two year groups, Year 7 and Year 11 as explained. It would be more reliable and informative to study the whole school population, but this is not feasible
within the constraints of this research. According to Evans (1968, p45-46), 'The question of the number of subjects to be tested is often raised. If the number is too small, the results are not likely to be reliable, but often the number is decided by circumstances'. He goes on to say that 'if generalizations are to be made on the basis of findings obtained from a small sample of a larger population, care should be taken to see that the small sample matches the larger population in all important respects'.

The gender and academic ability of the sample will be considered to ensure that it is representative of those who have been referred during the periods of time stated. Choosing pupils from Year 11 will have two advantages, I have been their DHOY since the summer term of Year 9 and have also taught many of them for two or three years. This will not be true of the pupils in Year 7, but I will be a familiar face to them as their form classes are in the same building as those of Year 11 and my office and I have taught some of them since September. The fact that the two year groups are housed in the same building will make arranging and conducting the interviews easier.

A 'non-probability, convenience sample' of sixteen pupils in total will be chosen from an approximate two hundred and fifty pupils in each year group, this may seem to the reader to be a small sample, but only a small percentage of each year group will have been referred to the HOY. This type of sample, according to Cohen and Manion (1994, p88), 'despite the disadvantages that arise from their non-representativeness can prove perfectly adequate where researchers do not intend to generalize their findings beyond the sample in question'. The interview questions will be piloted with a pupil similar to those in the sample, this will enable me to check for ambiguity and ensure that the questions will give me the necessary information, thus checking their validity. The interview questions will then be revised. I will also pilot the questions with the colleague mentioned previously who has recently successfully completed a
MAEd. As I propose to compare the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour with that obtained from the review of literature, most of the questions will require a general comment from the pupil. The final question will involve the ticking, by the pupil, of a list of suggested reasons for misbehaviour this will ensure reliability and triangulation of the responses. It must not be forgotten that some of the answers may not be a true reflection of the views of the pupils as some may answer in the way they think that the researcher wants them to answer, and others would not tell the whole truth. Having explained the purpose of the study and the anonymity of the research I hope that the results will be a true reflection of the pupils' views. Bell (1999, p104) tells us to 'Ask yourself whether another researcher using your research instrument would be likely to get the same responses'.

According to Anderson et al (1994, p115), ‘Interviews are a good tool to use when one wishes to know how a person feels about events that have happened or are happening. They are also important in gaining a perspective on how others understand and interpret their reality’. A major advantage of the interview, according to Bell (1999, p135), ‘is its adaptability.’ She continues to say that, ‘A skilful interviewer can follow up ideas, probe responses and investigate motives and feelings, which the questionnaire can never do. The way in which a response is made (the tone of voice, facial expression, hesitation, etc.) can provide information that a written response would conceal’.

Interviews range from fully structured to unstructured, with many variations between these extremes. McNiff et al (1996, p101) state that, ‘A fully structured interview is really the face-to-face delivery of a questionnaire’. They go on to say that ‘An open
interview would have a starting point and an objective but no set agenda of questions. The interviewer would be free to follow where the interviewee led as long as it was within the general framework. It is the latter type of interview, (an open interview), that I propose to employ with the teaching staff. In interviewing the pupils I intend to use a structured or directed approach using a selection of prepared questions, but allow some flexibility for clarification and discussion with the use of open-ended questions.

I feel that it is important to make the pupil feel at ease, but to remain in control of the situation. Explaining the reasons for the research and by beginning the interview with simple, straight-forward questions will, I hope, help to achieve this. Anderson et al (1994, p123) give advice on constructing this type of interview, ‘the interviewer writes down a list of questions and sequences them so that there is a natural flow from one question to another. The wording of these questions should not deviate from interviewee to interviewee’. According to Wragg (1994 p108), ‘semi-structured interview schedules are often preferred by classroom researchers, as they raise key questions, but also allow the observer and teacher to have some natural conversation about events’. He also mentions that, ‘The interviewer is then able to insert probes and prompts as conversation develops’. Munn, et al (1992) used this type of interview when investigating discipline in secondary and primary schools. I propose to use a style somewhere between these. I am aware that I will need to take care how questions are asked to avoid biasing the answers, as noted by Bell (1999, p135) in discussing interviews, ‘It is a highly subjective technique and therefore there is always the danger of bias’. The effect of teacher/pupil relationships will also need to be taken into account as well as the researcher’s status as a deputy year head when conducting
the research (as well as being a possible advantage it could prove to have an adverse effect on the interview). These considerations will also help me to formulate the questionnaires and interview questions. The interviews will take place in the library as I feel that this is a neutral setting.

The first three questions will be designed to discover how long the pupil has been attending ‘the school’, whether they have been with the same peer group in registration and whether there has been continuity of form teacher. Peer group influence on behaviour has been noted in the literature review and the form teacher is often the first port of call when the pupil is experiencing problems. In relation to their misbehaviour the rest of the questions will concentrate on discovering the following:

- its occurrence,
- the types of misbehaviour displayed,
- the reasons given for the occurrence of the misbehaviour
- feelings about misbehaviour/being disciplined/towards teachers.

I do not want to influence or suggest reasons for their misbehaviour, but in order to compare responses with the information gleaned from the literature review, each pupil will be given a list of reasons at the end of the interview and ask to tick any that apply to them.

Having collected the data I will compare my findings with those suggested in my review of literature. Although the sample population may be small and may not represent a true cross-section of the whole school, I feel the study will be of value. The data collected will be both quantitative and qualitative. The data, questionnaire returns and interviews will be analysed and the results presented and discussed.
Chapter 4

Evaluation of Methodology

The research project started favourably, a topic was chosen and availability of literature investigated. Having approached the Head-teacher for permission to carry out the research I approached the HOY for Years 7 and 11 and discussed the topic with them. The HOY 7 appeared doubtful about the feasibility of using Year 7 pupils, but said that she would select two pupils for piloting. The two pilot teachers were chosen and the topic was also discussed with them.

Planning and producing the questionnaires was not as straightforward as I had anticipated and became very time-consuming. The design of the questions for the questionnaire and the interview schedule arose from insights gained in the literature review. The piloting was successful in highlighting ambiguous questions and testing the suitability of the questionnaire and interview schedule. The order of the questions was discussed and some amendments were made to the questionnaire to make it more user-friendly and easier to administer. It was my intention to interview eight pupils from each of Years 7 and 11, but it was decided to restrict the interviews to pupils from Year 11 only. At the piloting stage it became obvious that the Year 7 pupils did not know me well enough to feel confident to answer the questions and their replies could not be guaranteed to be entirely reliable. It will not be possible therefore, to compare the results from the two year groups to discover whether age affects the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour. This was not part of the initial objectives but grew out of the reading for the literature review. Had it been one then it might
have been possible to have made earlier contact with the pupils, possibly visiting them in their primary schools. With time permitting, regular visits during registration time could have begun earlier.

In order to retain the sample size of sixteen eight extra pupils were chosen from Year 11 to be interviewed, six boys and two girls. The pupils in the pilot felt inhibited by the tape recorder so it was decided not to tape record the interviews, but to make written notes of their responses, this meant that the time for transcribing was saved. The interviews were successful and I felt I made the pupils feel at ease by explaining what the research was about and why I was undertaking it, many were impressed (their idea of a mathematics teacher does not include the ability to write essays!). Anonymity and confidentiality were also explained to the pupils, but to them neither was an issue. At this point each of the pupils was offered the chance to decline to be interviewed, only one did so. The Year 11 pupils were keen to participate in the research and I consider that they took the interview seriously thus increasing the reliability of their responses. A sheet containing the above information was signed by each pupil, giving permission to use the replies. In my previous research, the interviews took longer than anticipated as I found difficulty in keeping the interviewee focused. To overcome this problem, I used a more structured approach when interviewing, still allowing pupils to make comments where they wished. Making the interviews more structured also meant that the effect of bias was kept to a minimum. Fifteen interviews were conducted during the two weeks allocated.
This term of the school year is an extremely busy one for both staff and pupils and problems occurred during the collection of the questionnaires. One week had been allocated for their completion by staff; but due to the fact that several departments had coursework deadlines to meet and that there were two other questionnaires being distributed at the same time, it took an extra week for them to be completed and collected. After that time two of the thirty-five teaching staff did not return the completed questionnaire, the rest (94%) were completed successfully with only minor omissions. There were only a few points that needed clarification by means of informal interviews. It was interesting to note that one member of staff, originally not to be included in the research, actually asked if he could complete a questionnaire.

I also found it difficult to adhere to my planned research timetable for other reasons. I had not anticipated that I would be involved in various courses and in transition meetings after school. I was also given extra responsibility within my curriculum area resulting in less time being available for research. The date for the next school inspection was also announced with the resultant increase in workload. Due to the short time-scale involved it was not possible to allow for events such as these in planning the research timetable.

The questionnaires and interviews have produced some valuable information that will be presented and analysed. Despite the small scale of the research the researcher feels that some meaningful conclusions will be made.
Chapter 5

Results and Analysis

Bell (1999, p171, 175) makes the point that, ‘Data collected mean very little until they are analysed and evaluated’ and continues by saying that, ‘The information can be represented in a variety of ways. A simple table, followed by commentary highlighting any items of interest is one option. A vertical bar chart would be another option’.

The researcher’s intention was to focus on the Assertive Discipline model, in particular its effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place and to investigate teaching staff’s and pupils’ views on misbehaviour. In order to achieve this three objectives were set (p1). During the literature review the researcher became interested in other areas of enquiry that have also formed part of the research. In analysing and evaluating the results it is proposed to look at each of the objectives (p1) in turn and then consider the other ‘areas of enquiry’. A questionnaire and interviews were chosen as the method of investigation, thirty-three questionnaires were completed by staff and fifteen pupils interviewed.
Teaching Experience

In order to gauge the teaching experience of the sample the average and dispersion of the numbers of years teaching will be calculated. "The range is not a particularly good measure of dispersion", according to Bell (1999, p178), "as it can be influenced by one high and/or one low value and takes no account of the numbers of responses in the middle of the group". She states that, "The interquartile range gives a more accurate picture and reduces the importance of the extreme ends of the range". It is proposed to use this as the measure of dispersion of the sample.

Median = 22 years
Mean = 18.03 years
Interquartile range = 19 years

The median gives a more realistic picture as it is not influenced by the extreme values at either end of the range, therefore the average teaching experience of the sample is twenty-two years with a dispersion of nineteen years.
The reader is also invited to consider Table 1 from which it can be calculated that approximately 70% of the sample have been teaching for ten years or more. It would be fair to conclude therefore, that the sample has a considerable amount of teaching experience. The replies to the remainder of the questions in the introduction to the questionnaire indicate that the sample teach across the whole range of subjects and have experience in all areas of management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years teaching</th>
<th>0-9yrs</th>
<th>10-19yrs</th>
<th>20-29yrs</th>
<th>30 yrs +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Teaching Experience

n = 33
Effectiveness of Assertive Discipline

The responses from questions relating to effectiveness, two from the staff questionnaire and one of the pupils' interview questions, have been analysed in assessing the effectiveness of Assertive Discipline in 'the school'.

Staff Questionnaire

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, circle the effectiveness of the ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE CODE. (1 is very ineffective, 5 is very effective)

Figure 1: Effectiveness of Assertive Discipline

Figure 1 indicates that 15% of the sample rated the effectiveness as 4 or 5, 45% as 1 or 2 and 40% took a neutral stance. This would suggest that they do not consider it to be an effective discipline tool and contradicts the findings of Canter and Canter (1992), Geen (1998) and Blandford (1998), but agrees with the findings of Emmer and Aussiker (1987). The researcher finds it interesting to compare this finding with that
of Nash (2002). In his study of rewards in ‘the school’ he found that, ‘Some staff and SMT firmly believe that although Assertive Positive Discipline is relatively new to the school, it has been very successful’, I will return to this point later.

Staff Questionnaire

4. In the last five years has behaviour in our school: Improved / Remained about the same / Deteriorated?

Interestingly, only one respondent did not indicate that behaviour had deteriorated, overwhelmingly the view was that it had (approximately 94% of those surveyed). One member of staff who has taught in ‘the school’ for one year could not answer the question, the two who have taught for three and four years respectively, when interviewed said that they had noticed a deterioration since they had joined the school. This supports the researcher’s suggestion that Assertive Discipline is not considered to be an effective discipline tool and concurs with the evidence of those that say that the Assertive Discipline model is not effective (p22).

Although, not one of the initial objectives the researcher thought it to be of value to discover the views of the pupils on this same question (Appendix VI, Question 9). There was a mixed response, almost half (46%) of the pupils interviewed said that behaviour had improved whereas 27% said it had deteriorated and 27% said that it was about the same. One pupil commented that, ‘There are more problem kids in the school than before’. Another said that, ‘the things people have done to misbehave have gotten worse’. It was discovered that, 27% of the sample felt that their individual
behaviour had improved. Further probing elicited the general feeling that in their lessons behaviour had improved, but the consensus was that behaviour around the school had deteriorated. The researcher was interested to try to find out if this is a general trend. It was noted by inspectors that ‘The proportion of schools with unsatisfactory behaviour (one in 12) was slightly higher in 1999/2000 than in previous years’, OHMCI (2001), and according to OHMCI (2002), had remained the same for 2000/2001.
Effectiveness of rewards and consequences

One question on the staff questionnaire relates to the effectiveness of rewards and consequences, before analysing the responses it might be useful here to remind the reader of the rewards and later the consequences of the Assertive Discipline Code used in 'the school'.

Rewards

1. Praise from the teacher.
2. Praise from senior members of staff.
3. Letter sent home via pupil.
4. Letter sent home by mail.
5. Merit Certificates.

Staff were asked (Appendix V, Question 10), in considering each reward and consequence separately, to judge its' effectiveness in terms of improving and maintaining positive behaviour on a five-point scale. (1 is very ineffective, 5 is very effective). There were a few omissions, when interviewed the reason put forward was that the reward or consequence had not been used so comment on it's effectiveness could not be made, in calculating the percentage replies this has been taken into account. To give an overall first impression of the opinion of staff the results in this section will be grouped together under the following headings, very ineffective/ineffective (1/2), neither (3) and effective/very effective (4/5).
Comparing the percentage of staff rating each reward on each level of the scale produces the graph in Figure 2. In general it can be seen that a higher percentage of respondents rated rewards effective or very effective, (4/5) than ineffective or very ineffective (1/2). The findings of Cowley (2001) and Owen (1998) indicate that this is what could be expected. Of those taking the neutral position the comment often made was, ‘it depends on the key stage’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mean Ratings of Rewards

The mean has been calculated for each reward (Table 2), which also indicates that staff consider rewards 1, 2 and 4 to be effective, though not as effective as one might have thought from figure 3, and are undecided on the effectiveness of rewards 3 and 5.
Effectiveness of Rewards

Figure 3: Effectiveness of Rewards

Taking each reward separately produces a clearer picture and allows a more detailed analysis of the opinions of the staff to be made. Figure 3 suggests that a high percentage of staff (more than 60%) consider rewards 1 and 2, (both involving praise) to be effective or very effective. It appears that the findings of Watkins (1997) and Cowley (2001) are supported by these results. Given the opportunity for further study, it would be of interest to the researcher to try to discover whether the 9% who consider praise to be very ineffective have followed the guidelines of Canter and Canter (1992, p148-150). **Reward 3** (letter via pupil) is considered to be effective or very effective by only 45% of the staff, with 35% remaining neutral. This is an interesting result which conflicts with the researcher’s experience as a DHOY, pupils who are given ‘good news’ referrals (p20) are keen to take them home, there is always the possibility of a further reward at home, albeit material. **Reward 4** (a mailed letter) was also considered to be effective or very effective by a high percentage of staff (more than 60%). The results also suggest that the staff were almost equally divided in their opinion towards the effectiveness of **reward 5** (merit certificates). These
certificates, bronze, silver and gold are awarded twice per year during an assembly when positive achievements are recognised, they are gained by pupils who have received a certain number of merits in their personal organisers. A minority, (3%) consider these to be very effective.

During follow-up interviews it was suggested that the effectiveness of this type of reward is reduced because of the proportion of pupils who loose their personal organisers, this is supported by the findings of Cowley (2001). The fact that this type of reward is not ‘immediate’ was also a factor mentioned, this train of thought is supported by Rutter et al (1979, p190) who noted that, ‘rewards which are long delayed tend to be rather inefficient,’ and echoed by Wheldall et al (1989). The point that this type of reward is given to ‘only a few pupils’ was also raised as a possible factor in its effectiveness.

Staff were asked to give an example of any other reward that they had found to be effective (Appendix V, Question 11). In response to this question, to which there were twenty replies, about a third suggested ‘sweets, biscuits, cans of drink and tea/coffee’. One comment made agreed with an issue raised earlier regarding ‘quick notes’.

‘However these have to be given with care. They can be the focus of a lesson’.

(HOY, 23 years, Design and Technology-Engineering, Male)

On interviewing the member of staff it was discovered that the pupils had become more interested in when they were going to have their coffee than in the subject itself,
this supports the findings of Burden (1995) and Watkins (1997). Other rewards suggested include ‘early dinner passes, good referrals, phone call home and five minutes free time/activity at the end of the lesson’. One comment made was that,

‘Good referrals are often desired by students – especially those who feel they have a stack of bad ones in their file!"

(Teacher, 7 years, English, Male).

These examples of tangible rewards might be considered as bribery, but Canter and Canter (1992, p67-70) are clear in the justification of their use and do not consider them as such. They argue that ‘a bribe is given in anticipation of a behaviour’, whereas ‘a reward is given as a result’ of it and ‘a bribe is given to entice someone to do something’ whereas ‘a reward is given in recognition of a behaviour’. Their final argument is that, ‘bribery is defined as giving an individual something of value to perform an unethical and illegal act’. This is countered with the statement, ‘We do not believe that behaving in a positive manner is illegal or immoral’. Staff were keen to make the point, when interviewed, that the tangible rewards, sweets, biscuits, and so on, were given only if the desired outcome, for example

‘if targets are achieved”

(Second in Department, 32 years, English, Male)

‘after a week’s hard work’

(Teacher, 5 years, Business Studies, Female)
'at the end of the lesson following good work/behaviour'

(Teacher, 25 years Mathematics, Male)

had been achieved.

It is the researcher’s opinion that rewarding the pupil is an effective method of improving and maintaining positive behaviour, but in achieving this some types of rewards are more effective than others, it may be reasonable to suggest that the sample agree with this opinion. Returning to a comparison made earlier with the findings of Nash (2002) it appears then that the rewards component of the Assertive Discipline model continues to be successful. If the researcher is correct in her assumption that staff in ‘the school’ do not now consider this model an effective discipline tool then the problem must lie elsewhere.
Consequences

As a reminder to the reader:

Consequences

1. Refocus.
2. Warning and reminder.
3. Isolation within classroom.
4. Remain behind after class to discuss the problem with the teacher.
5. Removal to another class.
6. Severe clause.

Figure 4: Effectiveness of Consequences

To give an overall first impression the results have been grouped together. Comparing the percentage of staff rating each consequence on each level of the scale produces the graph in Figure 4. The graph appears to suggest that there is a difference of opinion on the overall effectiveness of consequences. It is interesting to note the percentage
taking the neutral response, particularly with consequence 3 (isolation within the classroom) and the high rating of consequence 5 (removal to another classroom).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Mean Ratings of Consequences n = 33

The mean (Table 3) suggests that with the exception of consequence 5, staff are undecided about the effectiveness of the consequences.

Considering each consequence separately produces a clearer picture and allows a more detailed analysis of the opinions of the staff to be made. Figure 5 suggests that a
similar percentage of staff, (approximately 40%) consider consequences 1, (refocus) and 2, (warning and reminder) to be either very ineffective or ineffective, or neither effective or ineffective. Less than 20% rate each one as effective. Consequence 3, (isolation within classroom) is rated as effective by 26%, ineffective by 13%and very ineffective by 6%. The remaining 55% appear to be undecided. Consequence 4, (remain behind at end of lesson) is rated as effective by just over 40% of staff, but 33% are undecided. Not one member of staff considers consequences 1, 3 or 4 to be very effective. Only one, consequence 5 is rated by a high percentage of staff (more than 60%) as effective or very effective, a minority, (6%) are undecided. The researcher is not surprised to find that the removal of the pupil to another classroom is effective in maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place. A small percentage, (13%) are undecided about the severe clause (consequence 6). The rest are almost evenly divided, 26% rate it as very ineffective, 19% as ineffective, 23% as effective and 19% as very effective.

It may be fair to suggest therefore that in general the consequences are not considered to be effective. This finding concur with the findings of HMI (1987), Merrett (1993), OHMCI (1993a), Burden (1995), Lund (1996) and Geen (1998). It appears then that the researcher has found a possible reason for the contradiction to the findings of Nash (2002) mentioned earlier.

Comparing the effectiveness of the rewards and consequences as viewed by the staff of ‘the school’ it is the researcher’s opinion that the results broadly confirm and support Cowley (2001, p57) in his view that, ‘We all respond better to encouragement than to punishment’.
In reference to a particular form of punishment the researcher asked (Appendix VI, Question 8) the pupils how many times they had been kept in detention since September of this academic year. More than half (53%) remarked that they had not been given detention during that period, 13% had had one detention, with 20% having had two. One pupil (7%) could not remember exactly how many times he had been in detention, possibly once or twice. It might appear from these results that detention had indeed been an effective punishment. A point to be considered is that there may have been a reduction for other reasons. Interestingly, one pupil (7%) had been given detention more than twenty times. It agreement with Lund (1996) and Owen (1998) it could be suggested that this punishment is ineffective with this pupil. It is the researcher’s opinion that the evidence is inconclusive and would benefit further investigation at a later date.
Incidences and types of disruptive behaviour

One question on the staff questionnaire relates to the incidences and types of disruptive behaviour.

Staff Questionnaire

14. Below is a list of negative behaviours. Indicate the frequency with which they occur in your lessons by putting a number in each box.
(1 = never, 2 = once per day, 3 = once per lesson, 4 = 2 to 4 times per lesson, 5 = more often)

The behaviours were listed (Appendix V, Question 14) and a space provided for respondents to add a negative behaviour if they wished. Three suggestions were:

'Refusal to follow instruction'.

(Teacher, 28 years, Textiles, Female),

'Low level interruption e. g. speaking to each other when you try to introduce the lesson'.

(Teacher, 28 years, History/Information Technology (IT), Male)

'Throwing items and refusing to clean up'.

(Head of Department (HOD), 30 years, Art, Male).

Two sub-questions were asked in order to try to discover those occurring most frequently and that were most annoying. The responses to the three parts of the question will be analysed in the following order:

1. Consideration of the frequency rating of each negative behaviour listed.
2. Comparison by rank order of negative behaviours.

3. Comparison of the mean ratings of each of the negative behaviours.

4. Comparison of most frequent and most irritating negative behaviours

1. Consideration of the frequency rating of each negative behaviour listed

![Negative Behaviours](image)

Figure 6: Incidences of Negative Behaviours

For the purpose of drawing the graph (Figure 6) abbreviations have been used (Appendix IX). The results suggest that 'lack of equipment' (LOE, which refers to the pupil not bringing the required equipment to the lesson, as stated in the personal organiser) has the highest rating, 39% rate it as 4 (2 to 4 times per lesson), with 33% rating it at 5 (more often), indicating that it is this misbehaviour that staff consider occurs most often. 'TOOT' is fourth, rated as 4 by 21% and rated as 5 by 15%. 'HOC' is joint sixth, rated as 4 by 21% and rated as 5 by 9%. It is interesting to note
that ‘pupils swearing at each other in conversation’ (PS) appears to be a particular problem, over half (55%) of the respondents indicated that they experience it once per lesson.

2. Comparison by rank order of negative behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Behaviour</th>
<th>Rated 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equipment</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair leaning</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task avoidance</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils shouting out or interrupting</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary behaviour</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking out of turn</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering other children</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-dreaming</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils being rude or argumentative</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils swearing at each other in conversation</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Rank order of Negative Behaviours

Using a rating of 5 as the criterion, the behaviour can be ranked as seen in table 4. ‘Lack of equipment’ is at the top of the list as previously found.
3. **Comparison of the mean ratings of each of the negative behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Behaviour</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils shouting out or interrupting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils swearing at each other in conversation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering other children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair leaning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary behaviour</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils being rude or argumentative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking out of turn</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-dreaming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task avoidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Mean Ratings of Negative Behaviours  

Investigating the mean of each behaviour rating gives a slightly different picture. It can be seen from Table 5 that, *lack of equipment remains* the highest rated, (2 to 4 times per lesson) but with *pupils shouting out or interrupting* also in the top position. All other behaviours occurring once per lesson.

These misbehaviours are indeed of an annoying nature and this finding concurs with those of the literature review in suggesting that it is this type of misbehavior that is encountered by teachers most frequently. From the list, staff were asked to pick out the two misbehaviours that they considered occur most frequently and the two they find most irritating. The responses supported the previous findings, except *that task avoidance* was ranked joint second as most frequently occurring negative behaviour.

The views of Wheldall and Merrett (1989) are not supported by these findings, they highlighted TOOT and HOC as the two misbehaviours which teachers generally
identify as causing them the most trouble and occurring most often.

4. **Comparison of most frequent and most irritating negative behaviours**
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Figure 7: Comparison of Most Frequent and Most Irritating Behaviours  \( n = 33 \)

An interesting comparison can be made between the most frequently occurring negative behaviours and the most irritating to staff, (Figure 7). ‘Secondary behaviour’ (SB) and ‘pupils being rude or argumentative’ (PR/B) although low on the most frequently occurring list, rank third and fourth respectively on the most irritating. ‘Lack of equipment’ (LOE) and ‘pupils shouting out or interrupting’ (PS/I) ranked first and second respectively on both lists. From my reading I had expected a wider variety of the results.

Staff were also asked comment on the reason for their choice of the two most irritating
negative behaviours (Appendix V Question 14b). These can be categorized into four broad areas,

- preventing the lesson from beginning,
- impeding the flow of the lesson,
- affecting the pupil’s own/other pupils’ education,
- indicating lack of respect.

Comments made include:

‘Lack of equipment – disruption to beginning of lesson to ensure everyone has equipment’. ‘Secondary behaviour-slow sdown progress of whole group’.

(HOD, 23 years, Mathematics, Female)

‘Lateness and task avoidance because it disrupts the pace of the lesson and results in individuals being at different levels of work/learning’.

(DHOY, 7 years, Physical Education, Male)

‘Pupils shouting out – interrupts thought/teaching. Day-dreaming – Difficult to explain to pupils that they are off task but not badly behaved’.

(Teacher, 31 years, French/Spanish, Female)

‘Pupils being rude or argumentative–because I give them respect and expect the same in return. Secondary behaviour because it is annoying when they don’t take responsibility for their own behaviour’.

(HOD, 8 years, Religious Education (RE)/Careers, Female)
The reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour

To investigate the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour fifteen Year eleven pupils were interviewed. The first three questions were designed to discover how long the pupil had been attending ‘the school’, whether they had been with the same peer group in registration and whether there had been continuity of form teacher. Peer group influence on behaviour has been noted in the literature review and the form teacher is often the first port of call when the pupil is experiencing problems. In relation to their misbehaviour the rest of the questions concentrated on five areas (p40). I did not want to suggest reasons for their misbehaviour, but in order to compare their reasons with the information gleaned from the literature review, each pupil was given a list of reasons at the end of the interview and ask to tick any that applied to them.

All fifteen pupils have been in ‘the school’ since starting in Year 7 and 80% had been in the same registration group during that period. At first this might seem to indicate that the form tutor was not a steadying influence, as I had thought, but my initial suggestion were confirmed when it was found that 67% had had four or more form tutors, the other 33% had had two.
1. Its' occurrence

The majority (87%) of the pupils, (all except two), said that they do not misbehave in their favourite lesson (Appendix VI, Question 6a).
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Figure 8: Percentage who misbehave in their least favourite subject

When asked the same question about their least favourite subject (Appendix VI, Question 7a), one pupil did not want to answer this question, only one pupil answered 'no', 43% of the pupils said 'Yes' and 50% said 'sometimes' (Figure 8). The researcher was not surprised at these results, in her experience pupils have more motivation to succeed and remain focused and on task in their favourite subjects. The reasons given for the answers to both these questions will be discussed later. The pupils were also asked whether they misbehaved in all lessons or only one or two (Appendix VI, Question 11).
From the results (Figure 9), it would appear that the majority (86%) misbehave in only one or two lessons, the remaining 14% (two pupils) misbehave in either one, or three or four lessons, one pupil commented, 'the lessons I think I can get away with misbehaving I will'. OHMCI (2001) indicates that this is what could be expected, they found that, 'A common feature noted in all the schools inspected was that the same pupils' behaviour varied significantly from lesson to lesson'.
Two questions were asked to try to discover the types of misbehaviour displayed by the pupils. The reasons why the behaviour occurred and how the pupils felt will be considered later.

Pupil Interview Questions

12. Think of a lesson where you have misbehaved, describe what happened.

13. Is this behaviour typical of you or do you misbehave in other ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness/Arguing with staff</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing with friends/Winding up friends</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform/Jewellery</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining in with others misbehaving</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouting out</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to work</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing off</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Negative Behaviours Used By Pupils  

Combining the responses produces the ranked order in Table 6. At the top of the pupils’ list of negative behaviours is **rudeness to staff and arguing with them**, and is employed by 60% of the pupils interviewed. In comparison this behaviour was regarded as of low incidence by the staff, it may be reasonable to suggest that the discrepancy may be due to the size of the sample.
3. The reasons for the occurrence of the misbehaviour

After considering the responses, which were very similar, to questions (Appendix VI, Questions 6a and 7a) discussed earlier, it may be reasonable to suggest that pupils do not misbehave in their favourite lesson. Possibly because they get on with teacher or the teacher treats them like an adult, or they enjoy the subject and want to do it further. Of the pupils who answered yes or sometimes to question 7a, the following were the reasons given for their misbehaviour:

Those who suggested more than one reason for their misbehaviour were asked to indicate the main reason, results are shown in Figure 10. For the majority, (60%) a dislike for the teacher or the way the teacher treats them was given as the main reason. 13% said that it was a non-examination subject and made comments such as, ‘it is a waste of an hour’. 13% said they were bored, 7% (one pupil) indicated peer influence, ‘the boys wind me up’ and 7%(one pupil) gave the main reason as, ‘I find it
The pupils were asked to think of a lesson where they have misbehaved and asked to give a reason for the misbehaviour occurring (Appendix VI, Question 12a). 40% said there was no reason really for the misbehaviour. The main reason given by the remainder was again, a dislike for the teacher or the way the teacher treats them (20%). The pupils were asked to give other reasons for their misbehaviour (Appendix VI, Question 14). Pupils who had not done so previously indicated a dislike for the teacher or the way the teacher treats them, or boredom, others indicated for attention (13%) and stress (7%).

At the end of the interview the pupils were asked to consider a list of reasons for misbehaviour and to tick any that applied to them (Appendix VI, Question 19).

Figure 11: Reasons For Misbehaviour

For the purpose of drawing the graph (Figure 11) abbreviations have been used
The results suggest a rank order of reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested in the subject</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was bored</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles/methods</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates misbehave so I do the same</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy winding up the teachers</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitudes on the part of the teacher</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers arrive late to lessons</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration at not being able to do the work</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to disrupt rather than look stupid</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Reasons For Misbehaviour

Table 7 shows the ten top reasons ticked in answer to Question 19 (Appendix VI). It suggests that the majority of pupils (80%) put lack of interest in the subject at the top of their list of reasons for misbehaviour. Boredom is ranked second with 60%. Peer pressure and Teaching styles/methods ranks third both with 53%. Just under half (47%) ranked both enjoy winding up teachers and negative attitudes on the part of the teacher as fifth. 40% ranked either teachers arriving late, poor teaching, or frustration at not bring able to do the work as seventh and 27% ranked prefer to disrupt than look stupid as tenth.

There were several reasons that were not ticked by any of the pupils, these can be grouped under the headings of feeling safe/belonging and physical. Only one box which made reference to parental/family influence was ticked and this was by one pupil. These results broadly confirm and support the findings of Major (1990), Bennet (1992), OHMCI (1993a), Chaplain (1995), Kinder et al (1996), Clarke and Murray
(1996), MacGrath (1998), Porter (2000) and Cowley (2001). It is interesting to note that peer pressure is not as high up the list as was suggested by the findings of Kinder et al (1996).

It is the researcher’s opinion that it is reasonable to suggest that the pupils are able to recognise the reasons that, underpin their actions which again appears to contradict the findings of Kinder et al (1996). Even those who indicated ‘peer influence’ as a reason for their misbehaviour indicated that they were aware that they ‘joined in’ out of choice. It must be said though that the pupil who commented that the boys wound her up was aware that they were doing this, but at the time was not able to do anything about it.

When the reasons for misbehaviour listed in Question 19 (Appendix VI) were categorised under the headings of ‘internal locus of control’ and ‘external locus of control’ it was discovered that 73% of the first category type reasons were ticked and 88% of the second. The higher percentage ticked for ‘external locus of control’ reasons might indicate an agreement with Anderson and Prawat (1983), Burden (1995) and Kinder et al (1996). However, it is the researcher’s opinion that the difference might not be considered large enough to be of significance, given the opportunity I would like to explore this issue further, along with a comparison of the reasons for misbehaviour given by boys and girls.
4. Feelings about misbehaviour/being disciplined/towards teachers

Five questions from the Pupil Interview Questions relating to emotions have been analysed to try to elicit the feelings of the pupils about their misbehaviour and how they are disciplined.

Pupil Interview Question

12. Think of a lesson where you have misbehaved...
   b How did you feel?

![Feelings of Pupils about Misbehaviour](image)

Figure 12: Feelings Of Pupils About Misbehaviour

Figure 12 suggests that a small majority, (26%) said that they felt angry or annoyed, the anger was predominately directed towards the teacher. Approximately the same number, (20%) said they did not know or felt the same as usual, individual pupils expressed a range of emotions as can be seen from the chart (7% represents one pupil).
Pupil Interview Question

15. How do you feel when you are/have been told off for misbehaving?

Figure 13: Feelings Of Pupils About Being Disciplined

Figure 13 suggests that a small majority, (34%) said 'okay' or 'it doesn't bother me', one of these pupils commented, 'I don't take much notice unless the teacher is looking out for me or helping me to overcome the problem'. 13% said that they felt like laughing or were fed-up or didn't care. Only one pupil said that he did not like being told off, another said that he was 'gutted' that he 'got caught'.

---
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5. Feelings towards teachers

Pupil Interview Question

16. In general, how do you behave towards teachers?

The majority (67%), felt that they behaved appropriately towards staff.

Comments made include,

'I treat teachers with respect and expect them to do the same', 'ok to most of them', 'most of them I respect but others I don’t', 'I like teachers because a lot of them try to help me', 'Pretty good most of the time'. The remainder (33%) take their cue from the behaviour of the teachers towards them.

Comments made include

'all depends how the teacher acts towards me', 'Alright If they talk to me alright I talk to them alright and vice versa', 'I behave to the teachers who like me but I tend to misbehave for the ones who don’t', 'I sometimes behave rude to them but that’s only when they annoy me', 'I behave different to different teachers if they are strict I wont misbehave but otherwise I would'.
Pupil Interview Question

17. In general, how do teachers behave towards you?

13% of the pupils felt that their teachers did not treat them well. One comment made was, ‘In general I think I am targeted for other peoples mistakes and that I’m blamed automatically because of my previous misbehaviour’. The majority (60%) of the pupils expressed the view that most of their teachers treated them well and only some of them did not. Comments made include, ‘Some will have a joke but some will just be shouting as soon as I get through the door’ and ‘Some are tidy and ok but some of them ignorant and real sarcastic’. However, only 27% felt that their teachers treated them well.

It appears from these results that the positive aspect of the Assertive Discipline model is experienced only to a lesser degree by the sample of pupils interviewed. It may be reasonable to suggest that the relationships between these pupils and at least some of their teachers are not conducive to good behaviour. This might be a possible contributory factor in the apparent deterioration in behaviour in ‘the school’. As noted by the inspectors report: Department of Education and Science (1987, p3), Education Observed 5 Good behaviour and discipline in schools, ‘good relationships with mutual respect between teachers and pupils’ is one of the factors most often associated with good behaviour’.
The pupils were also asked the question (Appendix VI, Question 4) whether they enjoyed coming to school.

![Pie chart showing pupil percentage relating to enjoyment of school]

**Figure 14: Pupil Percentage Relating To Enjoyment Of School**

Figure 14: Pupil Percentage Relating To Enjoyment Of School

The responses to this question can be seen in Figure 14, only 27% said 'yes'. Comments made included, 'I see all my friends and we have a good time', 'I enjoy coming to school to socialise with friends and to do what is asked of me to have a good start in life e.g. GCSE'. 33% said they enjoyed it 'sometimes' or 'don’t mind'. Comments made included, 'don’t like certain lessons, if its raining or maybe bored', 'most of the time is fun sometime is boring', 'It depends on what lessons I am attending and what teachers I’ve got'. The remainder (40%) indicated 'no'. Comments made included, 'Boring', 'Enjoy subjects but don’t know, teachers treat you like kids not like adults like they should', 'its too long and teachers shout at me for no reason sometimes because I have a bad record'. A common reason expressed for not enjoying school is **lessons are boring**. But again, the responses highlight the poor relationship between the pupils and their teachers. It would appear, at least from
the point of view of the pupil, that the behaviour models they are shown are not those advocated by Smith (1992). Or as Tattum (1986, p 60) suggests, 'Teachers must give respect if they want to receive it, they must expect success if they want pupils to achieve it, and they must present good models in their own behaviour if they want to influence pupil behaviour positively'. It will be interesting to compare these views with the views of the staff later in this study.
Other areas of interest

There were several areas of investigation that the researcher thought would be interesting to consider which were suggested by the review of literature. A number of questions were added to the questionnaires and interview schedule with this in mind.

Definition of discipline

The researcher discovered several different definitions of the word discipline and thought it interesting to try to discover whether the staff agreed with any of them.

Staff Questionnaire

1. What do you understand as the meaning of the word ‘discipline’?

For the purpose of analysis, the responses to this question have been grouped into six broad categories, Keeping order, Self-control, Obedience/Follow rules, Control, Ethos of what is/is not acceptable and Punishment.
The results (Figure 15) suggest that 60% agree with Foucault (1979) when he says that discipline is 'externally imposed'. 33% agree with Dewey's (2002) idea of self-discipline, of whom 11% agree with Munn's (1992) idea of 'socialising pupils'. It is the researcher's opinion that discipline encompasses all of these as suggested by Geen (1998).
Consistency

Four questions of the staff questionnaire were included to try to discover whether consistency exists in ‘the school’.

Respondents were asked how true they thought the statement, ‘As a staff we respond consistently to incidents of poor behaviour’ was. (Appendix VI, Question 12a).

![Consistency Chart]

Figure 16: Consistency

The majority of the staff (64%) (Figure 16) indicated that they thought this statement was, not true or not true at all. The problem of consistency in ‘the school’ was also highlighted by Nash (2002). In his closing comments he notes that, ‘Pupils...have commented that it’ (referring to Assertive Discipline), ‘has not been consistently used by all staff’. The results suggest that there still appears to be a problem in this area.
Lack of consistency was highlighted by OHMCI (2001) which stated that, *'When schools did not have a high level of consistency of practice, teacher’s application of disciplinary processes was erratic and, at worst, quirky'.*

**Staff Questionnaire**

5. **In general, do you refer to the Assertive Discipline rules when dealing with misbehaviour?**

The majority of the respondents, (82%) answered *'Yes',* to this question, but this leaves 18% who answered *'No'.* The responses to this question suggest that there is a higher threshold of consistency than the researcher had first thought, it is the researcher’s opinion that to be really effective Assertive Discipline needs to be consistently applied by all staff, all of the time.

The respondents were asked to rank the Assertive Discipline Code’s rules in order of importance, 1 being the most important (Appendix V, **Question 9**). All except 4 put 1 (88%) as number 1 and all except 5 put 5 (93%) as number 5. This suggests that the majority are in agreement about which rules used in ‘the school’ code they regard as the most important and the least important. There was a variety of responses for the ranking of the other three rules.

After analysing the responses to this question as suggested by Cohen and Manion (1994, p 280) ‘ranked data can be analysed by adding up the rank of each response across the respondents thus resulting in an overall rank order of alternatives’, the following order was obtained:
1. Follow the instructions of all members of staff, immediately.

2. Keep on task. Don't disturb others. If you want help, ask.

3. Arrive on time and bring the correct equipment.

4. No teasing, bad language or violent behaviour.

5. Keep our school tidy, free of litter and free of damage.

This is the same as that of 'the school' (Appendix II) except that two and three are interchanged. When asked which if any the respondents would like to see removed and why, (Appendix V, Question 9a) the majority (94%) said no. This seems to imply that staff, on the whole, are happy with the rules, this is what one would expect as they were involved in their formation. Consistency of their use therefore should follow.

Comments were made on the enforcement of the rules, examples of two are:

'they are all essential but if a) is complied with the rest are unnecessary'

(HOD, 14 years, Business Studies, Female)

'The rules are fine enforcement and follow through are the problem.'

(Teacher, 25 years, Mathematics, Male)

Only two of the staff wanted to remove any, both chose the fifth one for the following reasons,

'Keep our school tidy, free of litter and free of damage - it's not working big time!'

Teacher, 28 years Textiles, female)

'it is more general then the others'.

(Head of School, 30 years, English/Careers, Female)
Staff Questionnaire

9b Which, if any, rule would you like added and why?

There were several extra rules suggested (Appendix XI) in response to this question falling under the broad headings of respect, violent behaviour, uniform, work, corridor behaviour and a tariff system for sanctions.

Staff Questionnaire

13 On average, how often do you use the following behaviour management strategies? Indicate the frequency by putting a number in each box.
(1 = never, 2 = once per day, 3 = once per lesson, 4 = 2 to 4 times per lesson, 5 = more often).

This question was not answered uniformly, one member of staff simply ticked all the boxes except one and said that he does not keep a tally - the box not ticked was avoiding negative comments, he also added a box for 'sense of humour'. His sheet has therefore been taken out of the analysis for this question. Three respondents, on interview, indicated that they needed a category between never and once per day, but agreed to once per day when pressed.
Avoiding negative comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour Management Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulating</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity praise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioning name while continuing to teach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The look</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving in</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refocusing an argument</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical proximity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive repetition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken record</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding negative comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Use Of Behaviour Management Strategies

The mean use has been calculated for each of the strategies. It can be seen from Table 8, that there appears to be a lack of consistency in the use of the behaviour management strategies recommended by Canter and Canter (1992). On interview it became apparent that some staff were unfamiliar with the meaning of some of the phrases, as explained, these were included to check for consistency.
Addressing the issue of discipline

Staff questionnaire

3. Do you see addressing the issue of disruptive behaviour as central to your role as a class teacher?

Just over two thirds (69%) of the sample see addressing the issue of disruptive behaviour as central to their role as a class teacher. One member of staff did not answer the question and was not available for interview. One member of staff who said no, commented that:

'However, all staff have a duty to instill good behaviour, providing it is seen to be done from the top'.

(HOY, 23 years, Design and Technology-Engineering, Male)

It may be reasonable to suggest that the remaining 31% rely on other staff when dealing with discipline problems. Staff in 'the school' are encouraged to deal with behaviour problems within their departments, with referral to HOD in the first instance. This procedure was considered helpful by OHMCI (2001) in stating that, 'This encouraged teachers to look first at what could be done within the subject to promote better behaviour, rather than to refer problems immediately to pastoral staff'. There appears to be inconsistency here again.
Gender issue

Staff were asked to give their opinion on the misbehaviour of boys in comparison to that of girls (Appendix V, Question 6).

In their assessment of whether the misbehaviour of boys' is more troublesome than that of girls', the sample were split almost down the middle. Approximately half (52%) is of the opinion that boys behaviour is more troublesome and approximately half (45%) is of the opinion that it is about the same, 3% (one member of staff) considers it to be less troublesome. These findings do not agree with those of Wheldall and Merrett (1992) or with the 1993 OHMCI report.

When asked to consider the overt nature of the misbehaviour, just under two thirds (61%) of the sample find that the misbehaviour of boys’ is more overt than that of girls’. Just over one third (36%) find that it is about the same type of misbehaviour that is encountered regardless of gender, this does agree with the findings of the above report. Comments made

‘Younger boys are worse compared to younger girls’.

(Teacher, 5 years, Business Studies and Leisure, Female)

‘Although I think that girls are getting worse than they used to be’.

(HOD, 30 years, Art, Male)

One member of staff (3%) considers the behaviour of boys to be less overt than that of girls.
Assign seats

Staff Questionnaire

7. In general, do you assign students to specific areas or seats in the classroom?

One member of staff said that he was unable to answer this question as it was not applicable in his subject of Physical Education. One member of staff said that it depended on the class, but when pressed said that in general ‘Yes’. This meant that just over two thirds of the sample (69%), generally assign students to specific areas or seats in the classroom and 31% do not. It is interesting to compare this finding with that of the OHMCI (2001) report that found it a rare measure. Recently the idea of adopting this as a whole-school policy was discussed by the assertive discipline working party. On interview it was discovered that some members of staff use ‘boy/girl’ seating. According to Wheldall (1992) in a study of two classes in a junior school, it was concluded that, ‘mixed-sex seating produces the highest on-task levels. Similarly, disruptive behaviour in both classes was at its lowest when boys and girls sat together’. This has been found to be true in the researcher’s experience of her classes.
Meaning of Assertive

A question was included in the staff questionnaire to try to discover what meaning the staff attached to the word 'assertive'.

Staff Questionnaire

1. What do you understand as the meaning of the word 'assertive'?

Positive was a word used in 40% of the replies to this question along with confident by 12% and proactive by 12%. The definitions were very much the same as that suggested by Canter and Canter (1992).

Comments made included,

'to behave with authority, firmness and fairness'

(Teacher, 5 years, RE, Male)

'show by tone of voice you mean what you say'

(HOD 23 years Mathematics Female)

'to be positive, forthright, absolutely clear and confident'

(Teacher, 5 years, Business Studies and Leisure, Female)
Treat the same way

Staff were asked whether they thought that in relation to behaviour, all pupils should be treated in the same way, (Appendix V, Question 12d).

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to the question: Pupils Should Be Treated In The Same Way]

Figure 17: Pupils Should Be In Treated The Same Way  

One member of staff who indicated 2/3 was not available for interview. Figure 17 indicates that 68% agreed that the statement was true or completely true, suggesting that approximately one third disagree that all pupils should be treated the same way. This suggests that the majority agree with Owen (1998) and the minority agree with Churchward (2001). Given the opportunity I would like to investigate the reasons for their answers.
Behave without the need for rewards

Respondents were asked whether pupils should behave without the need for rewards (Appendix V, Question 12c).

Figure 18: Pupils Should Behave Without The Need For Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 32

One member of staff indicated 3/4 and was not available for interview. The results (Figure 18) suggest that 78% agree that the statement was **true** or **completely true**. This agrees with Covaleskie (2002) and although it agrees with my view, the percentage was not as high as I had expected.
Teacher's reasons for pupil' misbehaviour

Staff Questionnaire

15. What do you consider to be the reasons why pupils misbehave?

The results have been grouped together under several headings and a graph (Figure 19) drawn of the nine with the highest percentage of the staff indicating them as reasons.

It appears that Poor parenting is considered to be the reason for pupils’ misbehaviour by 40% of the staff, The Elton report (1989) illustrates that parents play a crucial role in shaping the attitudes that produce good behaviour. The second highest is, they feel that they can get away with it, which was indicated by 36% of the staff. The reader is invited to consider the graph for the percentages for other reasons given. It is interesting to note that these results are not what one might expect after reading Owen (1998).

Figure 19: Reasons For Misbehaviour

n = 33
If a comparison is made between these and the reasons offered by the pupils (p75) it appears that the researcher's assertion that, 'Pupils may perceive the way teachers treat them and the reasons for their behaviour in a very different way than teachers do' may be correct. For example, Lack of interest, Bored, and Peer pressure were ranked fourth, fifth and ninth with 21%, 15% and 12% by the staff, compared with first, second and fourth with 80%, 60% and 53% respectively on the pupils' list.
Describe pupils

Staff Questionnaire

8. How would you describe our pupils to a teacher from another school?

Approximately 73% of the staff emphasised the positive qualities of the majority of the pupils of ‘the school’, with comments like:

‘The vast majority are open, honest and street-wise. They may not be the best academically, but deserve our support’.

(Curriculum Coordinator, 22 years, Technology and Engineering, Male)

‘Kind, genuine, but lively!’

(DHOY, 4 years, Mathematics, Male)

‘Mostly friendly, chatty but quick to answer back’

(HOD, 23 years, Mathematics, Female)

‘Generally well behaved and respectful’.

(DHOY, 7 years, Physical Education, Male)

‘Lots of nice kids with a hard core of troublesome ones’.

(Curriculum Coordinator, 29 years, Physical Education, Male)
24% considered the majority to be ‘confrontational’, ‘argumentative’, ‘lacking in discipline’, ‘ill-mannered’ and display negative attitudes such as, ‘lack of respect for authority’. One respondent did not wish to make a comment on this question.

When a comparison is made with the responses from the pupils interviews (p 80) it may be reasonable to suggest that a correlation may be apparent, this is another are which I would like to investigate further.
Behaviour is a conscious choice

12b By putting a number, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 in the box please indicate how true you think the following statements are. (1 is not at all true, 5 is completely true)
All behaviour is a conscious choice on the part of the pupil.
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Figure 20: Behaviour Is A Conscious Choice  

The results (Figure 20) suggests that approximately half (49%) consider this statement to be true or completely true, almost a quarter (24%), not true or not true at all and 27% remain neutral. This supports the view of Cowley (2001).

Although, not one of the initial objectives the researcher thought it interesting to discover the views of the pupils on this same issue, (Appendix VI, Question 10). The results were almost split down the middle with slightly more than half indicating ‘Yes’ (53%). The second part of the question asked how they were going to achieve this and did it work/happen? Answers included, ‘talking’, ‘winding up other pupils’ and
Connection

In reply to Question 5 (Appendix VI) all the pupils indicated that they wanted either 'good qualifications', a 'good job' or both.

Pupil Questionnaire

18. Does your behaviour and the amount of effort you make have any effect on your academic success?

The majority 80% acknowledged that it did and suggested that when they are misbehaving they are not learning and do not get as much work done. Two pupils felt that there was no effect and one suggested that sometimes it had an effect. This result conflicts with my beliefs stated earlier, and the indications of Burden (1995). Another point that must be considered is the degree to which age affects the responses to this question.

The data presented has been both qualitative and quantitative and has led the researcher to a number of possible conclusions.
Chapter 6

Conclusions and Recommendations

Before attempting to suggest possible conclusions and recommendations it would be useful to remind the reader of the aims of this research project.

General Aim

- The researcher’s intention is to focus on the Assertive Discipline model, in particular its effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place.

- It is also the intention of the researcher to investigate views of teaching staff and pupils on misbehaviour.

Objectives

- To investigate the effectiveness of the rewards and consequences within the Assertive Discipline model used in the researcher’s school on behaviour, as viewed by the teaching staff.

- To investigate the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour.

- To investigate the incidences and types of disruptive behaviour experienced most frequently by teaching staff in the researcher’s school.
Conclusions

The researcher is aware of the limitations of this small-scale study and takes note of the point made by Bell (1999, p172) that, ‘care has to be taken not to claim more for results than is warranted, and equal care has to be taken not to attempt generalizations based on insufficient data’, but feels that some tentative conclusions can be made.

- Assertive Discipline is not effective as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place as since its introduction behaviour in ‘the school’ has deteriorated.

- From the responses of the pupils it was concluded that as the pupils had matured so the behaviour in their classes had improved whereas the general behaviour in ‘the school’ had deteriorated.

- Rewarding the pupil is an effective method of improving and maintaining positive behaviour, but in achieving this some types of rewards are more effective than others.

- The consequences used within ‘the school’ are not considered to be effective.

- The misbehaviours encountered by staff in ‘the school’ are generally of an annoying nature. Lack of equipment (referring to the pupil not bringing the required equipment to the lesson) is considered to be the most frequently occurring of these.

- The two main reasons given by pupils for their misbehaviour are lack of interest in the subject and boredom.

- Consistency in responding to incidents of poor behaviour was seen as not being
achieved.

- The misbehaviour of boys is generally considered to be more overt than that of girls.
- Misbehaviour appears to be planned by about half of the pupils, but despite this the majority are aware of the correlation between their misbehaviour and effort and their academic achievements.
Recommendations

- The consequences and their consistent implementation need to be reviewed.
- The importance of having the correct equipment needs to be stressed to pupils and their parents.
- Lack of interest and boredom needs to be addressed within departments.
- Lack of consistency appears to be a major problem, regular re-launching to staff is necessary along with inset for new staff.
- Inset for staff on dealing with negative behaviour and more staff/pupils involved in the Pacific Institute course.
- Seating plans for all subjects, where appropriate.

It has been noted that there is scope for more research to be done on several fronts. There are questions that this study has brought to my attention, and that perhaps, later I can pursue, among these are:

- A comparison of reasons for misbehaviour given by boys/girls or by age.
- How effective seating plans are in decreasing misbehaviour.
- Private/public praise?

I would like to conclude with the following quotes from Major (1990, p10-11) as they seem to sum up my feelings on this topic.

*Discipline is the most important subject we teach, because without it, all of us will have to live in a society not fit for anyone—not even for those who can’t or won’t subject themselves to even a limited degree of conformity.*

*It takes effort to discover why people do what they do, and it takes time to discuss with someone what behaviour is in their own best interests; but if we can remember that discipline is the most important subject we teach and that a lot of people will be affected by how we teach it, perhaps we will make that time.*
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Appendices

Appendix I

Clarification of the meaning of discipline

(a) Classroom Control
The teacher, an authority figure, imposes certain standards of behaviour, e.g. stable quietness, apparent attentiveness and purposiveness, orderliness and tidiness. Thus a teacher who is able to achieve such behaviour is said to have 'good discipline'.

(b) The Means Used to Achieve Required Standards of Behaviour
e.g. W. J. Gangly, writing in the Encyclopaedia of Education, defines it as "all techniques a teacher uses to increase the proportion of school-appropriate behaviours", e.g. suggestions about seating arrangements, the structure and content of lessons, the use of aids, the teacher's means of conflict resolution, etc. In this sense 'discipline' consists of all the techniques utilised to achieve the type of behaviour required in meaning (a) above.

(c) Discipline as a Means of Self-Discipline
i.e. the pupil is trained to control his emotions, appetites etc. in accordance with reason. Thus a person may be referred to as a well disciplined individual. R. C. Berry (Practical School Discipline) writes: 'Discipline is a training in self-control and self-direction.' This is, of course, an important educational aim.

(d) Discipline in the Sense of a Systematic Body of Knowledge.
e.g. classics, drama, music, Welsh. Hence, we call academic subjects 'disciplines'. In this sense the word may be related to the Latin 'disco' (learn) and 'discipulus' (pupil). An important aim of education is to have pupils master these 'disciplines'.

Geen (1998 p40)
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Assertive Discipline Code of Conduct

Rules

1. Follow the instructions of all members of staff, immediately.
2. Arrive on time and bring the correct equipment.
3. Keep on task. Don’t disturb others. If you want help, ask.
4. No teasing, bad language or violent behaviour.
5. Keep our school tidy, free of litter and free of damage.

Rewards

1. Praise from the teacher.
2. Praise from senior members of staff.
3. Letter sent home via pupil.
4. Letter sent home by mail.
5. Merit Certificates.

Consequences

1. Refocus.
2. Warning and reminder.
3. Isolation within classroom.
4. Remain behind after class to discuss the problem with the teacher.
5. Removal to another class.
6. Severe clause.
Appendix IV

Pacific Institute Courses

This is an investment in excellence programme designed to enhance the participants life in a positive way. It shows us how we can remove self-erected barriers to personal growth and development and become self-directed. Using self-image psychology, personal effectiveness and productivity can be increased. It helps us to have a clear positive picture of ourselves, our potential, attitudes, environment and goals. Self esteem is raised.
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As part of my dissertation for an MAEd, I am focussing on the **Assertive Discipline** model, in particular its effectiveness as a method of creating and maintaining an environment where teaching and learning can take place. I am investigating the effectiveness of **rewards** and **consequences** within this discipline model and the incidences and types of **disruptive behaviour** experienced most frequently by teachers. **Please** would you take a few minutes to answer the following questions, as **honest** as possible

- All answers will remain **confidential**.
- Please add any comments you would like to make.

- **Thank you.**
Questionnaire

Please put a tick in one box unless otherwise directed.

1. What do you understand as the meaning of the words 'assertive' and 'discipline'?

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, circle the effectiveness of the ASSERTIVE DISCIPLINE CODE.
   (1 is very ineffective, 5 is very effective)  1  2  3  4  5
   Please explain your decision.

3. Do you see addressing the issue of disruptive behaviour as central to your role as a class teacher? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. In the last five years has behaviour in our school:
   ☐ Improved  ☐ Remained about the same  ☐ Deteriorated?
   Comment: ____________________________________________________________

5. In general, do you refer to the Assertive Discipline rules when dealing with misbehaviour? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. In general do you find the misbehaviour of boys to be:
   a) more troublesome than girls \(\square\) more troublesome than girls \(\square\)
   less troublesome than girls \(\square\)
   b) more overt than girls \(\square\)
   less overt than girls \(\square\)
   about the same as girls \(\square\)

7. In general, do you assign students to specific areas or seats in the classroom?
   \(\square\) Yes \(\square\) No

8. How would you describe our pupils to a teacher from another school?

9. Put the following in order of importance, 1 being the most important.
   a) Follow the instructions of all members of staff, immediately.
   b) Arrive on time and bring the correct equipment.
   c) Keep on task. Don’t disturb others. If you want help, ask.
   d) No teasing, bad language or violent behaviour.
   e) Keep our school tidy, free of litter and free of damage.

9a) Which, if any, of the above rules would you like to see removed and why?

9b) Which, if any, rule would you like added and why?
10. On a scale of 1 to 5, how effective do you think the following are in terms of improving and maintaining positive behaviour, (1 is very ineffective, 5 is very effective). Circle one number for each statement.

a) Praise from the teacher.  
1 2 3 4 5  
b) Praise from senior members of staff.  
1 2 3 4 5  
c) Letter sent home via pupil.  
1 2 3 4 5  
d) Letter sent home by mail.  
1 2 3 4 5  
e) Merit Certificates.  
1 2 3 4 5  
f) Refocus.  
1 2 3 4 5  
g) Warning and reminder.  
1 2 3 4 5  
h) Reseat.  
1 2 3 4 5  
i) Remain behind to discuss the problem.  
1 2 3 4 5  
j) Removal to another class.  
1 2 3 4 5  
k) Severe clause.  
1 2 3 4 5  

11. Give an example of any other reward that you have found to be effective.

12. By putting a number, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 in the box please indicate how true you think the following statements are. (1 is not at all true, 5 is completely true)

a) As a staff we respond consistently to incidents of poor behaviour.  

b) All behaviour is a conscious choice on the part of the pupil.  

c) Pupils should behave without the need for rewards.  

d) In relation to behaviour, all pupils should be treated in exactly the same way.

13. On average, how often do you use the following behaviour management strategies? Indicate the frequency by putting a number in each box.

(1 = never, 2 = once per day, 3 = once per lesson, 4 = 2 to 4 times per lesson, 5 = more often). Moving out  The look  Refocusing an argument  
Circulating  Scanning  Physical proximity  
Proximity Praise  Moving in  Positive repetition  
Giving a choice  Time-out  Broken record  
Mention name while continuing to teach  Avoiding negative comments
14. Below is a list of negative behaviours. Indicate the frequency with which they occur in your lessons by putting a number in each box.
(1 = never, 2 = once per day, 3 = once per lesson, 4 = 2 to 4 times per lesson, 5 = more).

- Pupils shouting out or interrupting
- Pupils swearing at each other in conversation
- Hindering other children
- Lack of equipment
- Chair leaning
- Secondary behaviour (denial, arguing, answering back)
- Other (please specify)

14a) From the above, pick out the 2 that occur most frequently.

14b) From the above pick out the 2 that you consider to be the most irritating and why.

15. What do you consider to be the reasons why pupils misbehave?

16. Add any further comments:

Thank you for taking the time to answer this questionnaire.

(smaller than actual size)
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Pupils – Interview Questions

For my Master’s degree I am researching the reasons pupils give for their misbehaviour. My tutor at the University will read the research.

It would help me in this research if you would answer some questions.

All answers will remain confidential, you will not be identified in the research
Pupils – Interview Questions

1) How long have you attended this school?

2) Have you been in the same registration group since you started at this school?

3) How many form tutors have you had at this school?

4) Do you enjoy coming to school?
   a) If yes why, if not, why not?

5) What do you hope to get out of school/lessons?

6) What is your favourite subject and why?
   a) Do you misbehave in this lesson, if yes why, if no why not?

7) What is your least favourite subject and why?
   a) Do you misbehave in this lesson, if yes why, if not why not?

8) Since last September, how many times have you been kept in detention?

9) In general, in the last five years has behaviour in school improved, remained about
   the same or deteriorated/got worse?
   a) If improved/deteriorated, in what way?

10) Have you ever decided before you go into a lesson that you are going to
    misbehave?
    a) If yes, how were you going to achieve this and did it work/happen?

11) Do you misbehave in all lessons or only one or two?

12) Think of a lesson where you have misbehaved, describe what happened.
    a) Why did you misbehave in this lesson?
b) How did you feel?

13) Is this type of misbehaviour typical of you or do you misbehave in other ways?

14) Can you give other reasons why you misbehave?

15) How do you feel when you are/have been told off for misbehaving?

16) In general, how do you behave towards teachers?

17) In general, how do teachers behave towards you?

18) Does your behaviour and the amount of effort you make have any effect on your academic success?

a) If yes, in what way?
19) Here is a list of reasons for misbehaviour given by pupils of your age, please would you tick any that apply to you. Ask if there are any you do not understand. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>(\text{Tick box})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can’t help it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy winding up the teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much violence on television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment/buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching styles/methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had family problems at the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being silly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates misbehave so I do the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future looks hopeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested in the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s don’t expect me to do well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food additives/colourings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates expect me to misbehave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain classmates’ approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitudes on the part of the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, no-one at home to tell me what to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to disrupt rather than look stupid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration at not being able to do the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods teachers’ use to reinforce discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason to want to behave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor eyesight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents let me do what I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know any better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeless lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was dared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers arrive late to lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always misbehave in this lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work is too hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was born that way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was bored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel safe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work is too easy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Do not feel as if I 'belong'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was tired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some of the comments on Assertive Discipline

- I feel Assertive Discipline techniques should be mandatory. They work and are multi-disciplinary.

- I just feel that kids are much happier when they know what’s expected of them – when they don’t have to guess what a teacher’s reaction to their behaviour will be. There’s security in being able to predict your environment. That’s one of the biggest advantages of Assertive discipline.

- Assertive Discipline is a widely used method of establishing a positive school climate. With consistent follow up, staffs are able to maintain the momentum of the initial success and establish an atmosphere conducive to learning.

- This program is fantastic. Within weeks after its implementation, my staff was amazed and delighted with the positive changes in our children’s behaviour.

Canter and Canter (1992 p  )
Appendix VIII

- Bebington High School in the Wirral, Merseyside, was one of the first to introduce this system. More than a year later, Rob Burns, the head-teacher, says the ethos of the school has had positive consequences for examination results. (Williams 1993).

- The once-troubled White Hart Lane comprehensive in Tottenham uses a similar although more limited approach, with assembly becoming an informal prize-giving for children who turn up every day. Those who do so receive a pen a key ring and a coin holder; and if they do not miss a day during the year they are presented with a mug. In the first year of the scheme nine mugs were handed out. Last summer, 57 were given. The scheme has improved exam results, and has resulted in better discipline and more parents wanting to send their children there. (Williams 1993).

- Great Yarmouth High School uses a whole school positive response to pupil rewards and discipline, it recognises that both the staff and the pupils in a school have both rights and responsibilities. It recognises that improvements have been made in many areas at the school:
  - the amount of time spent on task in the classroom.
  - the atmosphere in the classroom.
  - staff/student relationships.
  - staff and student self esteem.
  - the general ethos of the school.
  - the image of the school in the community.
  - The system has contributed to the following measurable outcomes since it started:
    - an improvement in Key Stage 3 test results.
    - an increase in the number of pupils gaining 5 or more GCSE's at a C or above.
    - an improvement in attendance. (GYHS 2002)

- My classroom management plan was based on the Assertive Disciple model. I found this system to be effective in most cases. (Barnett 2002)

- When Roy Shannon helped introduce assertive discipline to the Liverpool school where he's been assistant head, there were pupils who boasted they'd never change. But the new approach has led to a dramatic improvement in achievement. (Rodda 2003)

- Steel G (2001) in a study of a system of positive discipline and the effect it has had on behaviour and performance in the classroom concluded that ‘Positive Disc does work’ “the implementation of a Positive Disc system has had a positive impact on the teaching and learning in the subject school” “in terms of addressing the raising of pupil engagement in lessons and their motivation to learn and succeed, it would be fair to say that in the main this has happened” “the statistics say that pupil behaviour has not necessarily improved” (unpublished research module MAEd 2001)
Punishment to Control the Actions of Students

The one part of the plan that didn't work was the severe clause or the fifth consequence, referral to the principal's office. For many, this was nice because there wasn't any pressure that the teacher would call on them, they couldn't get in trouble, and it gave them extra time to complete their classwork/homework. Due to this, I quickly learned that it was best to discipline in the classroom, not the principal's office. When I consistently monitored classroom activities and gave students feedback regarding their behavior, the plan worked.
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Pupils shouting out or interrupting, (PS/I)

Pupils swearing at each other in conversation, (PS)

Hindering other children, (HOC)

Lack of equipment, (LOE)

Chair leaning, (ChL)

Secondary behaviour (denial, arguing, answering back), (SB)

Pupils being rude or argumentative, (PR/A)

Talking out of turn, (TOOT)

Lateness, (L)

Day dreaming, (DD)

Task avoidance (TA).
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I can’t help it behave
B. I enjoy winding up the teachers

C. Too much violence on television
D. School environment/buildings curriculum
E. Teaching styles/methods better
F. I had family problems at the time

G. I enjoy being silly

H. I wanted attention

I. Classmates misbehave so I do the same
J. The future looks hopeless

K. I am not interested in the subject
L. Teacher’s don’t expect me to do well in this lesson
M. Food additives/colourings

U. No reason to want to
V. Poor eyesight
W. My parents let me do what I want
X. Inappropriate

Y. I don’t know any
Z. Lifeless lesson

AA. I was dared

AB. Poor teaching
AC. Hearing problems
AD. Hunger

AE. Teachers arrive late to lessons
AF. I always misbehave

AG. The work is too hard
N. Classmates expect me to misbehave

O. To gain classmates’ approval

P. Negative attitudes on the part of the teacher

Q. In general, no-one at home to tell me what to do

R. I prefer to disrupt rather than look stupid

S. Frustration at not being able to do the work ‘belong’

T. The methods teachers’ use to reinforce discipline

AH. I was born that way

AI. I was bored

AJ. I do not feel safe

AK. The work is too easy

AL. Bullying

AM. I do not feel as if I

AN. I was tired
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Extra rules

*Treat all others with the respect you expect yourself*

(Key Stage 3 Coordinator for ICT, 5 years, IT/Business Studies, Female)

‘Be respectful towards all members of staff and classmates at all times’

(Second in Department, 7 years, English, Male)

‘Violent behaviour should not be exhibited at anytime throughout the school day’

(Teacher, 13 years, Health and Social Care, Female)

‘No bullying of any kind – I think the word bully needs to be used’

(Teacher, 28 years, Textiles, Female)

‘No mobile phones

Remove coats etc immediately’

(HOY, 23 years, Design and Technology-Engineering, Male)

‘Always give of your best – or words to that effect. To promote the image that its ok
to work hard – not uncool’

(Teacher, 25 years, History/Geography, Female)

‘Don’t interrupt. Work quietly. Concentrate.’

(Teacher, 28 years, History/IT, Male)
'Complete homework (especially on time)'

(Duke of Edinburgh Coordinator, 25 years, Mathematics/Vocational Studies, Female)

'Corridor behaviour – walk sensibly between lessons and keep to the left (right).'

(HOD, 23 years, Mathematics, Female)

'A tariff could possibly create an impression of fairness. If you do this ....this will occur (as sure as night follows day) Inconsistency leads to problems'

(Teacher, 25 years, RE, Male)