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ABSTRACT

This thesis is the result of four years' part-time study by a practising teacher. It represents an attempt to identify ways of dealing successfully with disruptive secondary school pupils.

A review of related literature, and some evidence adduced from previous research, provided the basis for a questionnaire. This was then used in six Essex comprehensive schools to ascertain teachers' opinions on:

a) determinants of disruptive behaviour;

b) effectiveness of methods used to deal with such behaviour.

Respondents were identified according to sex, school and experience.

Sub-sections of the questionnaire were cross tabulated and submitted to $\chi^2$ tests of significance which revealed a trend suggesting that female teachers differ from male teachers in some of their opinions related to disruptive behaviour in schools. The survey also indicated that it is the upper-age range which causes most disturbance.

The two methods found to be currently held to be most effective were withdrawal units and behaviour modification. The former was investigated via a case study approach which compared two types of administration policy, and the effect of an on-site withdrawal unit on two disruptive pupils. Behaviour modification was evaluated experimentally to examine whether

a) it is practicable for class teachers

b) if the technique is effective with upper-secondary pupils.
Experimental and observational investigation revealed that in respect of this study behaviour modification was:

a) difficult for the teacher to apply in the normal classroom situation following accepted research criteria, although it was found to be more practicable in less formal circumstances within an on-site withdrawal unit.

b) a qualified success with this age group in that the improvements in behaviour as a result of this approach were found to be unenduring.

It was concluded that, in respect of upper-secondary school disruptive pupils, rather than attempt to deal with the child in the normal classroom, it is preferable to withdraw the problem pupil to an on-site unit, where the application of procedures to deal with disruption can be more successfully applied to the benefit of both the child and the school. The thesis concludes with a suggested model for dealing with seriously disruptive pupils.
The writer wishes to express his sincere thanks to the following people:
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CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The nature of the problem

Defining deviant behaviour in children is bedevilled with problems because it involves technical difficulties of assessment; of value judgments; and the dangers inherent in 'labelling'. In this study 'deviant' will be used synonymously with 'disruptive' because it refers to those explicit behaviours which interfere with the teaching process and/or upsets the normal running of the school. The arguments to justify this definition are discussed fully later in this chapter (vide sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4).

It is evident to educationists, from the many articles and criticisms in the press and elsewhere, that much public concern has been directed towards what is purported to be an increase in disruptive behaviour in schools. Whether this concern is reflected, or promoted by the mass media is difficult to discern, but certainly in recent years we have been faced with published accounts regularly implying that teachers are facing disruptive behaviour in increasing incidence e.g. in the popular press, Daily Express, 23.3.79., Daily Mail, 17.5.79., and in professional
Most of the problems of disruptive behaviour reported appear to occur in secondary education (Lowenstein, 1975, p.14) and it is this area to which the present study is directed. However, it must be emphasised that such behaviour is not reputed to be increasing in secondary education alone. But there are a number of reasons why it is essential that further investigations are directed at secondary education specifically.

Primary children are generally less intractable than secondary pupils, partly due to their physical immaturity and also because it is only in relatively exceptional circumstances that the primary pupil becomes such a regular intolerable nuisance where those that teach him do not feel in control of the situation. By contrast, in the secondary school the pupil has grown physically sufficient to intimidate some teachers, and matured to the extent of knowing the limitations of teachers' power and expertise to control misbehaviour. It is not surprising, therefore, that stress caused to teachers in secondary schools features frequently in studies of behaviour problems e.g. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978), Lawrence, Steed and Young (1977).

Many investigations have been made of disruptive behaviour in school e.g. Power et al. (1967,1972) and Lowenstein (1975), but further studies are important because teachers are clearly still looking at researchers for constructive suggestions on methods of handling disruptive pupils. But there remains the controversial question of who should initiate such studies.

In the past a greater proportion of all educational research has been undertaken by professional researchers. This situation has resulted in the suggestion that teachers do not respond readily to the recommendations given; and the counter accusation that professional researchers do not always respond to what teachers really want. This situation
is not helped by the fact that much of the material produced by professional researchers is so difficult and time-consuming, for the busy classroom teacher to comprehend. Hence, as pointed out by Jon Nixon (1980), there is a need to involve teachers in research. Then teachers, rather than the 'academic research community', should be defining at least some of the research problems.

Such a situation is more difficult to realise than at first sight appears. For example, the following are suggested as the supportive needs of teachers in research:

1. Conditions within schools to allow collaborative work.
2. In-service courses aimed at educating (as opposed to training) in approaches to the study of schooling.
3. Practical support e.g. typing, tape recording, duplicating, release from school to attend conferences and disseminate work.
4. Co-operative attitude of headteachers, senior staff etc.
5. Funds to support research.

From the following study it will become clear that many of these needs have not been met; one could even put forward a case that forces exist to discourage and even subvert the involvement of teachers in research. In Chapters 3 and 4 of this work it will be seen that some headteachers certainly discouraged attempted approaches to question their teaching staff. Even a relatively simple request for computer time was denied by the L.E.A., thus leaving the choice of facing the expense privately, or alternatively relying on the goodwill of someone willing to make an illicit 'borrowing' of the computer time required.

Undoubtedly, the biggest restriction on the involvement of the class teacher in research is the need for
time within the working week to study, and to reflect. But even the simple task of visiting other schools to discuss questionnaires, problems etc., creates an unacceptable burden for those teachers who have to 'stand-in' for an absent colleague. Thus, even if a headteacher were favourably disposed to encourage teacher-research, he would be faced with the unenviable dilemma of deciding if participation places an unfair burden on other teaching staff. He will be even less likely to look favourably on research which may show his school in a less attractive light than he would prefer.

Traditionally, secondment from schools has been the way that teachers have been able to gain new knowledge and take an active part in research. However, apart from the fact that the opportunities for secondment are always at a premium, the very fact that the teacher is released from the school can reduce the value of his subsequent research because it is no longer related daily to the classroom situation. What is clearly required, and as will emerge from this study, is the need for teachers to be given a part-secondment which allows them to carry out investigations whilst maintaining some daily contact with the classroom, and at the same time eliminating the creation of additional burdens for other teaching staff. It must be recognised that appropriate supervisory guidance would be crucial to this ideal, but it is suggested that collaboration between a University lecturer and a classroom teacher would benefit both parties greater than a supervisor/student situation.

This study attempts to overcome at least some of the foregoing criticisms of current educational research by presenting the results of an investigation undertaken by a practising classroom teacher. It is claimed that, because this work is undertaken by a teacher fully employed in classroom teaching, the writer is constantly aware of the extra commitment entailed for the classroom teacher trying to implement educational research of a complex and sensitive nature.
The preliminary aim is to establish the views of the teachers in six comprehensives of the incidence and considered causes of disruptive behaviour and discipline problems in their schools. Their opinions are also sought on the effectiveness of various methods used in an attempt to solve such problems. Some of these causes and the methods used in an attempt to overcome them are investigated in depth through case studies related to the administrative policies of the head and classroom experiment for the purpose of evaluation and concluding recommendations.

The Home Office criminal statistics for 1973 for England and Wales give some indication of the problem in general faced by society in respect of young people. For example, in 1973 there were 54,365 males under 14 years of age arrested on indictable charges of all kinds, compared with 52,307 in 1972, an increase of almost 4%.

The 1979 criminal statistics (Home Office, 1979) give an even wider and more relevant description of problem behaviour outside the school. Incidence of known offending by juveniles (aged 16 and under) examined over the period 1969 to 1979 was highest for males aged 14 and under 17. The peak age of offending is aged 15 years for males. For females the picture was broadly similar. The annual rate of increase of offences by males aged 14 and under 17 for the period 1965-1974 was 7% a year, although there has been some levelling off during the period 1975-1979.

For females, although the rates of known offending were much lower than for males, their rates of increase were much higher. For example, the average annual rate of increase over the period 1965-1979 for female juniors (aged 10 and under 14) was about 6%, compared to male juniors who showed an annual rate of increase of about 4%.

The Home Office statistics can be summed up in the following way:

a) With respect to children of school age, it is the 14-16 age group which commit the greatest number of indictable offences, with the peak
age of offending for males aged 15.

b) There has been an unhealthy annual increase in the total number of offences committed by young people

c) Offences committed by females are fewer by comparison with males, but in the junior age group the annual rate of increase is greater than for males.

Of course, the increases in the numbers per head of population found guilty of offences does not necessarily imply increases in the proportion of individuals being dealt with over the years. The increases may reflect the same proportion of individuals being dealt with more often than a higher proportion of known offenders within the population.

It is unfortunate, for this work, that the Home Office statistics identify only incidence of offences rather than show the proportion of individuals committing them. However, this trend of increase in the number of offences by young people has caused such concern as to influence the police in enlarging their pastoral activities by providing a Juvenile Bureau which has been referred to as 'the secret Social Service' (Vennell, 1980, p.10).

The kind of pastoral activity embarked upon by the police was in operation in three of the schools examined in the survey detailed in Chapter 4 of this study. The main emphasis of this pastoral work involves exposure of pupils to uniformed personnel in the classroom, where discussions take place in a relatively informal atmosphere on a wide range of topics related to law and order. Whilst the scheme has overtones of being a public relations exercise for the police, there are positive beneficial side-effects for the school, not least of which is that it helps to instil in pupils an understanding of the need for rules.

Measurement of the effectiveness of this scheme in the schools investigated must of necessity be subjective,
but teaching staff and the police personnel seem convinced that the programme is worthwhile. However, one police constable interviewed during the current investigation commented that he did not feel teaching staff were as committed to the success of the programme as the police, and he accused some teachers of using police visits as 'free' time rather than for participating in the work.

It has been suggested that statistics such as those of the Home Office quoted earlier can be improved by dealing more effectively with children at school (Lowenstein, 1975), or in a school providing a special environment (Shields, 1962). However, such success can only be anticipated if there exists a commitment of teachers to make it successful.

The Department of Education and Science (D.E.S.), in collaboration with the Association of Education Committees and other interested parties, carried out a survey by questionnaire in 1973 on indiscipline in schools, and amongst their findings concluded that there has been no significant increase in misbehaviour. However, the National Association of Schoolmasters (N.A.S.), in their report 'The Retreat from Authority' (undated, p.22), question these findings on the grounds that, in many cases the enquiry went no further than the education offices, and in those cases where it did penetrate to the level of the schools it stopped at the head teacher's desk.

This criticism by the N.A.S. seems justified in that any survey which examines behaviour problems in schools should include direct consultation with teachers who are actively faced with them. However, during this investigation there was clear evidence, similar to the experience the N.A.S., claim they encountered, that headteachers deliberately attempted to prevent contact being made with teachers (vide Chapters 3.2 and 4.2).

1.2 Problems of definition

The authors of the Pack Report (1977) on truancy
and indiscipline in Scottish schools stated that 'Discipline can perhaps best be described as the maintenance of an orderly system that creates the conditions in which learning may take place, and that allows the aims and objectives of the school to be achieved' (para. 3.1).

The National Union of Teachers (N.U.T.) (1976, p.5) also took this broad view when they referred to school discipline as 'the pattern of relationships adopted by the teacher in order to establish and maintain authority needed by him in carrying out his work as a teacher'.

Morrison (1977, p.100) takes a narrower view defining discipline as 'corrective measures used when violations of group rules of behaviour occur', similarly, Ausubel (1968, p.459) referred to discipline as 'the imposition of external standards and controls on individual conduct'.

The N.A.S. (Lowenstein, 1975, p.10) defines disruptive behaviour as 'any behaviour short of physical violence which interferes with the teaching process and/or upset the normal running of the school'. Their exemption of physical violence from their definition occurs because in their survey, physical violence was differentiated from disruptive behaviour and given its own several separate definitions.

It will be observed that the foregoing definitions are to a large extent particularly suited for administrative purposes. In other words, they are concerned with the effect that disruptive behaviour has on the teaching situation, as opposed to the cause of such aberration. Whilst definitions such as these are useful in discussing general aspects of disruptive behaviour, when one tries to be more specific in applying them to individuals who are disruptive, they cannot be used without further careful amplification.

One of the difficulties of applying generalisations in research of the kind detailed in this thesis is
the problems associated with 'labelling' theory. People frequently refer to children who deviate from the norm as 'maladjusted', but for a variety of reasons this kind of label is unsatisfactory, because it assumes that there are two clear conditions, maladjusted and well adjusted. Psychologists generally agree that people do not fall into clear categories and invariably we are dealing with a state of continuous distribution. Between the two extremes lie varying degrees of adjustment and maladjustment, thus making it unwise in many cases to cast a person into either category.

However, the Warnock Report (D.E.S. 1978, p.44) stated that 'the term maladjusted remains a serviceable form of description and should be retained'. The report considered that the implication of this term (namely that behaviour can sometimes be meaningfully considered only in relation to the circumstances in which it occurs) is an advantage rather than a disadvantage, but there still remains a substantive case for recognising the problems incurred when labelling children.

Labelling theorists attempt to explain the way our behaviour is adapted in response to the label which other people give us. When children are stereotyped by others they come to see themselves in the light of the label applied. This can be beneficial to the personal adjustment of the child if positively applied (e.g. when the child perceives others labelling him as 'gets on well with others' and 'tries hard to please') but can also contribute to maladaptation if the label is persistently negative.

The foregoing theory owes much to the work of Becker (1963). He argued that deviance arises where some people are labelled by social groups and they then have difficulty in behaving in a way which is inconsistent with the label since the expectations of those who give them the label prevent them from acting otherwise. In this way the public labelling becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.
Hargreaves and his colleagues (1975, pp. 5-6) say, 'The paradox is that the social reaction which was intended to control, punish or eliminate the deviant act has come to shape, stabilize and exacerbate the deviance'.

Attribution theory, particularly with reference to learned helplessness on the part of slow-learning children, is related here to the foregoing criticisms of labelling theorists. We tend to attribute to other people responsibility for their actions, and consequently, we infer that their successes or failures have to do with events internal to them. Sometimes these inferences have validity and serve as bases for prediction of their behaviour in new situations; sometimes, however, there are selective distortions (Hilgard, Atkinson and Hilgard, 1971). Jones et al. (1968) have demonstrated that there is some substance to the old adage 'first impressions are of greatest importance'; they found that we tend to 'label' people in respect of ability based on early impressions, and then assume that later fluctuations compared with the early assessment is the result of changes in motivation rather than improvement or reduction in ability. Thus ability is attributed as enduring, and motivation as temporary and fluctuating.

The foregoing could have important implications for the child with learning difficulties, which is frequently a feature associated with behaviour problems. If the argument put forward by Jones et al. (1968) has foundation, and we do not make objective assessment of children's ability, it is likely that some of them will not be able to perceive themselves as being capable of success on their own efforts (internal locus of control). Alternatively, we could say that such children will perceive success as external to themselves and, therefore, beyond their control (external locus of control). This could be a source of problems of alienation from school experienced by some children, the implication of which are discussed more fully later in this work.
Stott (1978) has pointed out the grave dangers of mislabelling children. Suppose, for example, a child was showing behaviour problems in one situation but not in another? Do we consider him 'maladjusted sometimes'? Assume further that a child, living at home with parents who are in conflict with each other, is showing behaviour problems both at home and in school. Assume then that the behaviour disappears when he moves to live with his grandparents. Do we now consider him a 'cured maladjusted'? Or was he never really maladjusted?

Even among teachers there is a difference and change of opinion as to what kinds of behaviour are considered maladjusted. For example, Wickman (1928) found that masturbation was rated by teachers as the third most serious behaviour problem in children out of their list of fifty behaviours. Replication of the Wickman study by Sack and Sack (1974), and in this country by Whitehead and Williams (1976), show that teachers no longer regard masturbation as a serious problem, ranking it 39th and 46th respectively.

From the foregoing, it would seem that we must recognise that even between a few individuals we will find differences of opinion as to what behaviour is considered maladjusted or unacceptable and what is not. Some teachers for example, would consider calling out in class by pupils as bad behaviour or disruptive. On the other hand another teacher would consider this completely acceptable and a desirable indication of interest. As Wall (1973, p.3) says 'one man's maladjustment is another's aberration of behaviour'.

The Open University (1976) suggests that a useful way to look at the problem of defining maladjustment is to examine the term under three headings: administrative action; situational and transient problems; and social demands.

a) Administrative action

If an administrative decision has to be made which
means that a child must be educated in some establishment other than in the normal school or classroom, it necessarily follows that the decision taken must be based on some clear opinion of what maladjusted is. But, as already indicated, such a clear and acceptable analysis is difficult to find.

Some of the previously described definitions are unsuitable because they are concerned with discipline as opposed to behaviour subject to control (e.g. Pack Report, 1977, N.U.T., 1976, Morrison, 1977 and Ausubel, 1968). The N.A.S. suggestion (Lowenstein, 1975) discussed earlier has merits in that it is concerned with the behaviour, but The Open University (1976, p.22) says that the nearest we have appeared to get to a workable definition, from an administrative point of view, is that given in the Underwood Report (Ministry of Education, 1955). 'A child may be regarded as maladjusted who is developing in ways that have a bad effect on himself or his fellows and cannot without help be remedied by his parents, teachers and adults in ordinary contact with him'.

It will be observed that this definition relies heavily on opinion, albeit informed opinion, to put into practice, and this leaves education authorities to make different arrangements according to their own sense of priorities.

Essex County Council, in a letter to the writer, say that for them, maladjusted pupils are defined by the Special Schools handicapped pupils regulation 1959 (Statutory Instrument 1959 No: SNO 365) as 'pupils who show evidence of emotional instability or psychological disturbance and require a special educational treatment in order to effect their personal, social or educational readjustment'.

Essex County Council also say that the method of assessment for maladjustment used by them (and probably most other authorities) follows the recommendations in D.E.S. Circular 2/75 (March, 1975). Even here we find that whilst
the circular includes sections on discovery and diagnosis and assessment, it is not specific in the methods which should be applied.

Sections 7-9 of the circular (Discovery) relies heavily on the teacher's expertise.

'All teachers of young children need to be able, as a result of their training and experience, to detect as well as help children who show deviations from the wide range of normality' (p.3).

The extent to which teachers have this ability must be debatable, and the responses to the surveys detailed later in this work (vide Chapters 3 and 4) indicated that some of the respondents were clearly concerned that they did not have this ability.

'Teachers need to be on the alert ........ throughout the child's school career to see whether he requires special help. They should always be able to turn for advice to an educational psychologist .....' (p.3).

The writer's survey showed that a great majority of the teachers in the sample were not confident in the effectiveness of calling-in an educational psychologist. The reason for this view is perhaps aptly demonstrated by Clegg and Megson (1968) who quote critical examples of cases which illustrate lack of support for schools by some local authorities and educational psychologists.

During investigations for the case studies detailed in Chapter 5 of this work similar criticisms of lack of sufficient support by an educational psychologist were put forward. In one situation exampled, a pupil was causing considerable disruption and stress to teaching staff. During the first year of this pupil's secondary education, eight teachers stated that the pupil was maladjusted, and they requested specific guidance from an educational psychologist. However, it took nine months before this pupil was eventually
seen, and exactly four years (near to the end of his secondary schooling) until he was diagnosed as maladjusted and transferred to a special school. During the intervening period of time it is alleged that no advice or guidance was given to teaching staff by the educational psychologist. In fact, one senior member of staff who had more contact with the pupil than any other teacher over the period of four years never once met the psychologist, in spite of efforts to do so.

Sections 10-16 of the D.E.S. Circular are concerned with diagnosis and assessment. These are to be carried out by the educational psychologist (although the methods to be used are not defined), and based on his assessment, an eventual decision is made.

From the foregoing it will have been seen that the pattern for assessment of the potentially maladjusted child is one of initial recognition by teachers, referral to the educational psychologist for diagnosis and assessment leading to an administrative decision.

The flaws in the method would seem that, in not recommending specific methods of screening, it assumes that teachers have the ability to make a contribution. Secondly, there is the criticism made by teachers that the time taken between recognition and decision-taking is often too long, and accompanied by alleged insufficient support from the educational psychologist.

**b) Situational and transient problems**

Mitchell and Shepherd (1966) reported on an enquiry carried out among a random sample of children attending local authority schools in Buckinghamshire, and this report offers an ideal example of the situational and transient problems of using the term maladjustment. The report revealed that deviant behaviour at home was significantly associated with lack of academic success and also with the manifestation of behavioural disorders in school. There were, however, many children who exhibited disorders
of behaviour only in one place, either at home or only at school. This led Mitchell and Shepherd to emphasise that because individuals picked out by parents as showing behavioural disorders are not necessarily those identified by teachers, screening should involve studying the child in both the home and the school. Michael Rutter (1975) also drew attention to the problem of transience and situation-specificity and several other criteria which are indicators of abnormality. Judgment of abnormality of an individual, Rutter maintains, should be made on a combination of several criteria and not just one.

If a child's problems can be seen to be situational in the way demonstrated by Mitchell and Shepherd, it does pose difficulties when making related administrative decisions because one must question which is to blame for the condition, the child or the situation? Similarly, the child's problem can be transient; the maladjusted child of today can be perfectly happy and settled at some later date. Hence, the unwillingness of those who have to make administrative decisions which may not be necessary, or may even be adverse to the possibility of improvement. However, in the meantime the schools have the problem of containing and dealing with such a pupil and are ill-equipped to do so as a generalisation for reasons suggested earlier, which in summary are:

1. Many teachers feel they do not have the expertise to deal with the more serious of the behaviour problems they have to face.

2. The facilities necessary for teachers to familiarise themselves with the skills needed to handle behaviour problems are not freely available.

3. Programmes for dealing with seriously disruptive pupils within the normal school make considerable demand on teaching time; this additional demand has to be met by existing teaching staff because resources necessary for implementing such programmes are in short supply.
4. The schools' psychological service is not seen as effective in providing teachers with the guidance required.

c) Social demands

Probably the major stumbling block to the precise use of the term maladjusted lies in the fact that decisions of what constitutes maladjusted are to a large extent based on value judgments and these may be influenced by the demands of society.

For previously explained reasons, what may be interpreted as maladjustment by one person, can be completely acceptable to another. The use of abusive language in the classroom may be considered as unacceptable by the teacher, but in the child's home such language may be the norm.

Assessment need not be based on value judgment because various screening instruments of known reliability and validity have been devised (several of these are reviewed in Chazan, 1976). But it is not apparent from this investigation that precise methods of assessment are laid down incorporating the use of these, although this does not imply that they are not being used because it will be seen in Chapter 5 that they are.

1.3 Incidence of maladjustment

The problems of definition using the term maladjustment are perhaps further underlined if we examine some of the figures purporting to indicate the incidence of maladjustment.

The Ministry of Education (1946) estimated that 1% of the school population were maladjusted and needed special educational treatment. Dennis Stott (1964) argued that between 11 and 15% of boys and 8% of girls in Britain were maladjusted. Does this mean that during the intervening seventeen years we have experienced an explosion in
maladjustment? But in a letter to the writer, Essex County Council say that they have some 550 pupils ascertained as maladjusted in a total school population of about 265,000. This represents 0.2% or 1 in 500 pupils. Does this mean that Essex has a proportion of maladjusted children radically lower than other parts of Britain, or is one or more of the estimates incorrect?

The reason for the difference brings us back to the problems of definitions of maladjustment. Essex County Council and the Ministry of Education are stating their case on the aforementioned administrative action. Their figures relate to the number of pupils who have been administratively defined as maladjusted and are being educated outside normal classes. Stott, on the other hand, is referring to a wider view of maladjustment which would include not only children catered for in special educational institutions but also those in the normal school.

1.4 Operational definition

In the foregoing the writer has put forward some of the problems of the use of the term maladjusted in relation to behavioural problems under investigation, and it will have been noted that the term is most usefully employed when referring to pupils after assessment. As this work is concerned mainly with pupils within the school and often prior to reaching the assessment stage, it is not necessarily appropriate to use the term maladjusted in relation to all disruptive behaviour.

Within this work the writer will use the term 'disruptive pupil' in the sense implied by the aforementioned N.A.S. definition of a pupil who interferes with the teaching process and/or upsets the normal running of the school. Herein, unlike the N.A.S., the writer is concerned with identifying the pupil, rather than differentiating between violent and non-violent behaviour. It is also meant to include those pupils who are continuously disruptive rather than those who are subject to infrequent outburst. Disruptive behaviour in this context means non-normative,
non-transient disturbance; more serious than adolescent silliness. The term is used operationally in this work in an attempt to quantify the factors considered relevant by teachers in their involvement with continuously disruptive pupils.

1.5 Summary and conclusions

Keeping order in schools has always been a multifaceted problem and this has become even more important, and perhaps more difficult, with changing societal values and expectations.

It is difficult to discern if incidence of disruptive behaviour is increasing, but there is no lack of acknowledgment that it does exist and that it is a source of stress to teachers. This stress can communicate itself to pupils, thus promoting further discipline problems.

Many teachers do not feel that they are adequately prepared to deal with disruptive pupils, nor do they consider that the support given by the schools' psychological service is effective. Criticisms are also raised in relation to current educational research which is not always seen as reflecting the needs of the class teacher.

The answer to many of the questions and problems raised in this section could very well be found with teachers, although it is acknowledged that, for various reasons, they are sometimes inhibited about formal research. This work draws heavily on the opinions of the class teachers in relation to disruptive behaviour in schools, and then extends those opinions through analysis of administrative procedures, and the application of experimental techniques related to behaviour modification.

Throughout this study it will be demonstrated that worthwhile constructive research can be carried out by a teacher whilst employed full-time in the classroom. It is further expected that having used this approach the final
conclusions and recommendations will be all the more relevant to teachers.

The following chapter sets the scene for the remainder of this work by examining the current state of research. The research was used for the extraction of major factors to be used later in a questionnaire. This questionnaire, among other things, compares the opinions of teachers with current research.
CHAPTER 2.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The relationship between poor school attainment and the presence of behavioural disorders in the school setting has been discussed in several studies, including Burt (1937) and Stott (1958). Further investigation by Mitchell and Shephard (1966) (vide Chapter 1, Section 1.2 (b) ) indicates that the reverse and complementary situation also exists; a relationship between behaviour disorders at home and school conduct.

However, it is difficult to establish conclusive evidence which confirms any causal relationship. Burt and Howard (1952) found that maladjustment, defined as discussed earlier in terms of referral for psychological investigation, was correlated among other factors with the child's exposure to too high a standard of work, or contact with an uncongenial teacher. Pearson (1952) on the other hand, suggested that emotional strains rooted in the home were often the cause of poor performance and lack of concentration at school.

Wall (1973) emphasises that whilst the major origins of problem behaviour lie outside the classroom, and
to this extent outside the teacher's control, this does not mean that the school can escape some responsibility for its pupil's difficulties, or evade the attempt to compensate for, or set right, what has gone wrong. Rutter et al. (1979) suggest that their studies show (but do not conclusively prove) that some schools can be seen as a causal factor, and in spite of home background can influence behavioural outcomes.

Michael Rutter and his colleagues are not alone in the view that the school makes an impact on behaviour over and above that of the home and neighbourhood. Heal (1978) concluded from a review of related studies that, with the exception of one study (West and Farrington, 1973), research had shown that secondary schools can have an influence on adolescent behaviour. Teachers themselves readily admit that they contribute to the level of disruption by the methods they use to control pupils (Lawrence, Steed and Young, 1977).

From the foregoing it can be seen that two main points emerge. Firstly, that school behavioural outcomes are the result of influences outside the school's control. Secondly, that schools themselves must also bear some responsibility for behavioural outcomes because they are effective in changing behaviour for both the better and the worst; the school itself can be seen to be causal to problem behaviour. There is no conclusive evidence to support either argument but research indicates that there is a causal relationship between problem behaviour and factors in both home and school.

In this chapter there will be an explicit focus on these two main sources of problems, and principles underlying various methods used to change behaviour. It is appropriate that we examine the factors both within and outside the immediate control of the school which influence outcomes if we are to understand why it is that some children come to school with problems already established, whilst others appear to find something about the school situation which influences their behaviour adversely.
In examining the ways the school can influence behavioural outcomes, one is of necessity limited in the number of aspects which can be assessed; either through lack of space or due to the scarcity of relevant research findings. However, space has been given to the methods which are currently recognised as important; punishment, behaviour modification, special withdrawal units, and the application of these methods to secondary education to which this thesis is directed.

2.2. Behavioural influences outside the school

a) Early childhood and home background

It can be concluded from studies of maternal deprivation by Bowlby (1946) and others (reviewed in Bowlby, 1951) that disorders of conduct have been found to occur in children with serious disturbances in their early family life. Eighteen of the forty-four thieves investigated by Bowlby were found to have suffered prolonged separation from their mothers during the first five years or at critical or sensitive periods of their lives.

John Bowlby (1953) expressed the view that maternal care is crucial for the development of the mental health of the child. And Melanie Klein (1960) spoke of the significance of the mother as a good and dependable object, with whom the child could identify (bond formation).

However, Rutter (1972), in an extensive review of the literature in the field of maternal deprivation, modified Bowlby's view by stressing that, while the development of attachments in early childhood is the most crucial variable in preventing later antisocial behaviour, the bond does not need to be the biological mother, or a female, or even an adult, but there must be a consistent caretaker. This latter aspect is examined again in the case studies described in Chapter 5 of this work.

This is not to say that it makes no difference in terms of individual psychological development with whom the
child forms the bonds, because although we still know relatively little about the factors influencing psychosexual development, it is evident that early experiences are important. It may well be that youngsters who have developed bonds with adults of only one sex are at a disadvantage later with heterosexual relationships and in the development of sex-appropriate attitudes and behaviour (Biller, 1971). It is probable, for optimal development, that bonds need to be formed with people of both sexes.

Douglas, Ross and Simpson (1968) provide interesting evidence related to the effect of broken homes on children's behaviour and delinquency. They found that homes that are broken by divorce or separation could be seen to be associated with delinquency. But in the case of homes broken by the death of one of the parents the association was found to be statistically insignificant.

The quality of family relationships is also strongly associated with the nature of the child's psychological development (West, 1969 and Rutter, 1971). 'Where warmth in the family is lacking, the child is more likely to develop deviant behaviour, particularly of an antisocial type' (Rutter, 1972, p.16).

Becker, (1964), in a detailed review of past research, shows some of the consequences of different child-rearing practices (that is the whole attitude of parents to a child and how he is brought up) on future development of the child. From Becker's review it can be concluded that it is the extremes of discipline technique, i.e. over-permissive or over-restrictive, that can adversely affect the future development of the child and his attitude to teachers and parents.

Over-permissive attitudes mean that the child is over-indulged by the parents and is not subjected to control. This type of handling is anxiety-provoking and makes it difficult for the child to learn self-control and restraint.
It is seen as contributing to delinquency, non-compliance and maximal aggression. Over-restrictive or authoritarian attitudes result in the child seeing personal relationships only in terms of the ruler and the ruled. Since the parent is all-powerful in the relationship, the child represses his anger and frustration and later in life he takes 'revenge' for the repression by challenging authority figures such as teachers, and his own parents, who no longer have the same physical and emotional control.

There is a strong tendency for adolescents to identify with their own parents, and Wright (1962) found that secondary modern school children rated their parents as nearer their ideals than they were themselves. Teachers, on the other hand, were further from the ideal self than the children thought they themselves were. Similar conclusions were drawn from surveys in the United States by Bealer et al. (1968).

Teachers do not always seem to recognise that children see them in this light. Thus, Evans (1965, p.55) warns "... it is a bad mistake for teachers to think that school influences are all important in children's lives. If home and school are ever in opposition, home influences are more likely to triumph over school ones."

The writer's experience in secondary education suggests that teachers do appear to consider that what takes place in schools is of overall importance. Too often it seems that the credit-worthy process of organising a structured homework programme, or stressing constant revision towards tests or examinations, fails to take into account the need for pupils to get away from the learning situation. For many children, a modest two hours per evening of homework and revision means that little time is left after meals to get out in the fresh air to play or relax. This opportunity for change and relaxation are considered essential for satisfactory personal development of the child.

In this context, there have been periodic studies
to investigate the incidence of emotional disorders among children in the school e.g. McFie (1934), Cummings (1944) and Stott (1958). A common finding of the foregoing is that they all imply that problem behaviour in school is a reflection of emotional disturbance, and this emotional disturbance will also be reflected in the child's life outside the school. But the latter is not necessarily so. Schonell (1952) for example, found in his study of children in both the school and the home environment that some children present a dual form of personality in respect of home and school. This does not seem surprising, but one still finds teachers expressing disbelief when parents of children who are disruptive in school say that they are no trouble at home. When the parents are experiencing difficulty with the child at home, we 'write this off' as their problem if we are experiencing no problems in school, but when it is the school alone that is experiencing difficulty with the child it is too easy to disbelieve that something may be wrong within the school.

West (1967, p.58) says that low educational attainment is the prominent characteristic of delinquent behaviour. But he claims that in most cases this does not arise from lack of intelligence, but may be due to lack of opportunity. He maintains that 'dirty and uncouth children from poor-class homes are unpopular with teachers, do not get much encouragement from their parents to do well in school and often play truant.'

Sutherland and Cressey (1960) list six types of home and family relationships which it is claimed are associated with problem behaviour. These are families where:

(1) immoral, alcoholic or criminal members exist;
(2) one or both parents are absent;
(3) parental control is lacking;
(4) uncongenial home conditions, such as favouritism, over-severity, neglect etc., prevail;
(5) racial or religious differences exist;
(6) severe economic pressures are apparent.

A similar line is followed by Cavan (1957) who says that children cannot get adequate personality training where parents themselves experience personal and emotional difficulties, or where the parents' own cultural defects prevent them from resisting pressures from a deviant culture.

Bernstein (1961, 1962, 1965, 1971 and 1973) has put forward a theory which suggests that social relationships affect language and thus educational attainment. Simply put, Bernstein's theory holds that working-class children only have access to a 'restricted code' of language whilst middle-class children has access to both the 'restricted code' and an 'elaborated code'.

This relationship need not necessarily obtain, but Bernstein suggests that the social structure of our society as it is makes it so. The socialisation of the working-class child is different from the socialisation of the middle-class child. The form this socialisation takes acts differently upon the speech registers of the different classes, and consequently hinder the educational opportunities of the working-class child.

Implicit in Bernstein's theory is the fact that mother-child communication in the control of the child, is also fundamental to socialisation, and the middle-class mother is more likely to use verbal control than the working-class mother.

The educational implications of Bernstein's theory are important. The language of the school is generally held to be that of the elaborated code; thus, in the case of the working-class child, there is a greater possibility of culture-clash between the home and the school environment. Further, if language is fundamental to socialisation, and middle-class mothers do differ from working-class mothers in the way they control children, it necessarily follows
that the working-class child is less likely to be controlled by verbal methods. Finally, if one accepts West's view that low educational attainment is a contributor to poor school behaviour, and Bernstein's theory that the restricted code of working-class children reduces the opportunity of such children, working-class children can be seen as disadvantaged compared to middle-class children in school.

The foregoing may be an indicator of the reasons why Davie et al. (1972) found that some working-class children had difficulties acclimatising to school, which results in alienation; and further, that even by ten years of age, some working-class children are still showing hostility towards teachers or, worse still, withdrawal and a 'writing off' of adult standards. The implications of alienation from school are examined in more detail later in this chapter when we look at the influence of the school on behaviour, and further consideration is given in the case studies investigated in Chapter 5 of this work.

b) Personality differences

A precise definition of personality is difficult if not impossible to find. For example, Allport (1937) though now dated, offers as comprehensive a definition as anyone. He found about fifty different usages of the term, although he summarised it as the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought. In other words, personality is the complicated arrangement of internal forces that mould the way in which an individual goes about being the person he is.

We are less concerned here with establishing a precise definition and more concerned with recognising the considered effect of personality on behaviour (this will be seen to be of particular importance in Chapter 5 of this work where studies of three disruptive boys are dealt with). Even in this context it is necessary to restrict coverage to those areas which are considered of major concern, this
section must inevitably, therefore, confine itself to two immediately relevant aspects, sex differences and the major theories related to personality.

Consideration of the influence of sex of the individual on behaviour is appropriate because the evidence on this aspect is often conflicting and widely disputed. Study of the various personality theories is essential for an understanding of the main determinants of behaviour, and the forms that treatment may take to modify it.

(1) Sex differences
The findings on sex differences are somewhat contradictory in relation to the effect of maternal deprivation and no differences have been found in many studies (Vernon, et al. 1965). In other studies where differences have been found in children (and in sub-human primates), the male is usually more vulnerable to the adverse effects of separation experiences (Sackett, 1968 and Stacy et al. 1970). Rutter (1970) maintains that there is some evidence to suggest that this might apply to other forms of deprivation.

The differences between the sexes in relation to disruptive behaviour in schools has been part of an extensive survey by the N.A.S. (Lowenstein, 1975). Their figures show clearly that in secondary education, boys are more inclined to indulge in violent and disruptive behaviour than girls. In a smaller study by the writer (Whitcomb, 1979a) it was found that teachers considered there was no difference between the sexes with regard to disruptive behaviour. This finding was re-affirmed in the larger survey detailed in Chapter 4 of this study.

(ii) Personality theories
Some theorists emphasise the inherent aspects of personality, whilst others stress the importance of the effect of the environment on the development of the individual. These two approaches are not completely divorced and neither can be ignored. But they each have considerable influence on the method of treatment used to modify behaviour.
For these reasons the following section attempts to give a balanced coverage to both of these major approaches to investigation of personality.

Freud (1910) referred to the internal forces that mould the way in which an individual goes about being the person he is as 'psychical provinces' or 'agencies' (p.140). He maintained that these agencies of the mind could be divided into three main areas, the 'id', 'ego' and 'super-ego'. Personality, in Freudian terms, is held to be a reflection of the balance or equilibrium between the id, ego and super-ego.

The id, which is inborn and contains everything inherited such as instincts and unconscious, seeks satisfaction at any cost in obeying the 'pleasure principle'. The ego develops later in life and calculates the consequences of behaviour aimed at satisfying the id, and thus obeys the 'reality principle'. The super-ego develops out of the ego's experience with social reality and rules laid down by parents. The super-ego is synonymous with conscience; it observes the ego and gives it orders; threatens it with punishment by producing guilt feelings.

If we accept the Freudian view of personality, the educational implications are profound, because it implies that 'bad behaviour' at school deserves not punishment but understanding because poor behaviour is seen as the result of a cause which requires treatment rather than punishment. In other words we would argue for psychotherapy rather than behaviour modification and to tackle the underlying causes rather than the florid presenting symptoms. This was the very stand taken by A.S. Neill(1962) at Summerhill. Discipline for Neill was essentially self-discipline, and he felt that adults should have no right to the obedience of children, or try to obtain their obedience through punishment.

Erikson (1963), proposed a way of looking at the stages of child to adult development. He describes a progression of eight 'psychosocial' stages in which the child
experiences a widening range of human relationships as he grows up, and has specific problems to solve at these stages. How well the child solves his problems at any one of these stages may influence the type of person he will become later and how well he will be able to cope with new situations as they arise.

Essential to Erikson's psychosocial stages of development is the identification of the child with significant people in his environment e.g. mother, father, brother, sister etc. If the child experiences difficulty or confusion in these separate identifications, the child experiences what Erikson (1968) calls 'rôle diffusion'; conflict of self-identity. This rôle diffusion, unless outgrown, may result in serious personality disturbance.

Rôle diffusion is a familiar characteristic of early adolescence, when the youth is still trying to 'find himself'. At this stage in development, the adolescent is experimenting with a variety of subjective experiences and at times can be both dependent and independent, loyal and defiant, daring and timid. He must satisfactorily master these divergent trends to achieve true identity (himself).

As with Freudian theory, we can see that Erikson's view of personality also leads one to conclude that deviations from the norm of behaviour, especially in the case of children, requires understanding and treatment rather than punishment.

Eysenck has also developed a theory of personality, a fairly recent exposition of which can be found in Eysenck, (1967). The basis of his theory lies in his claim that personality variance can be accounted for between the
extremes of the dimensions extraversion (E) and neuroticism (N). 1

extraversion (E): the extravert is fond of excitement; is sociable and lively, while the introvert is quiet and retiring.

neuroticism (N): the neurotic is anxious, worrying, moody and unstable

(Open University, 1976)

Eysenck's personality dimensions are thought to be linked with psychological factors in the nervous system. Neuroticism is positively related to the excitability of the nervous system. The neurotic is quick to respond to stimuli, is excitable, is easily conditioned and will be more susceptible to neurotic disorders related to anxiety. Extraversion is negatively related to conditioning. Extraverts are slow to condition, and lose their conditioning easily; they are sociable and lively.

This does not imply that an individual falls clearly in one category or the other; normal people score around the mean for both extraversion and neuroticism, which means that the majority of people do have some of both neurotic and extravert traits (an enduring personality characteristic which influences behaviour).

An important point about Eysenck's theory is that it is testable and scientific compared with Freudian theory which is difficult to put to the test (Eysenck, 1953). One

1. A third factor, psychoticism (P), was added later (Eysenck and Eysenck 1968) but as yet there is less evidence for the validity of the P scale than there is of the E and N scales.

Psychoticism (P): solitary, cruel, inhumane, insensitive, sensation seeking (the factor important in the development of psychotic mental disorders).
of the implications of Eysenck's personality theory for education is that, if personality differences reflect conditionability on the one hand, and varying degrees of anxiety on the other, we must recognise that no single method of teaching or discipline can be expected to be effective overall.

These theories have been used for illustration because they show two different approaches -- psychoanalytic and factor-analytic, but there are many others which are either theories in their own right or variations of those already outlined. (e.g. Isaacs, 1930; Murray, 1938; Cattell, 1957 and Guilford, 1959). What is important for this work is that irrespective of weaknesses or failings of the various personality theories, one major point comes clearly through them all. The personality of the child is dynamic, each is idiosyncratic; personality affects the way we think, perceive, learn and behave.

As teachers we must be aware of personality differences and recognise the individuality of the child. We should not expect all children to respond in a similar way to the same stimuli, therefore, we cannot expect uniform behaviour from our pupils and need to respect the fact that varying environments (and perhaps hereditary factors) will have influenced their differing characteristics. Hence the need that 'unequals should be treated unequally' (R.S. Peters, 1970, pp.133 and 139).

From the foregoing it can be seen that there exists a constellation of features outside of the school which influence behaviour. However, although the association between these factors and aberration of behaviour in school are sometimes strong, they cannot themselves alone be seen as directly causal, and the majority of children from 'disadvantaged' backgrounds succeed in spite of adverse circumstances. The likelihood of failure -- in learning, in general emotional and personality development -- does, however, increase roughly proportionately to the number of adverse factors in the individual's life (Wall, 1973).
Examination of these theories will also be apparent to be of further importance in Chapter 6 of this investigation (vide 6.1), where it will be seen that they have an important contribution to make to the choice of techniques to be used in relieving behaviour problems.

2.3. Behavioural influences within the school

a) The school as a contributory factor to disruptive behaviour

Ayerst (1967) put forward a case purporting that the big school is impersonal and bewildering, particularly to younger children. Similarly, Banks (1968) maintained that the large school is an unfriendly place for teacher and pupil alike. King (1969) suggested that whilst a big school enjoys economies of scale as it grows, after a certain point the organisation is too vast either for efficient organisation or personal comfort,

Although the foregoing can be seen as possible factors contributing to disruptive behaviour in schools, a direct link between the size of school and disruptive behaviour cannot be claimed with confidence, and Rutter et al. (1979) claim that their recent research shows that size of school does not have an adverse effect on behavioural (or academic) outcomes, although Rutter's investigation was related to a fairly narrow range of size.

The N.A.S. (Lowenstein, 1975) say that their survey showed that teachers attribute behaviour problems at least partly to the size of schools. The writer's own investigation, discussed later in this work, differed from this view in that the respondents (teachers) to a questionnaire did not consider size of the school as contributing to disruptive behaviour. The views on school size appear to contradict each other.

Views on whether schools contribute to behaviour problems are less contradictory and there is sufficient evidence to indicate that schools make at least some
contribution. For example, in 1952, Burt and Howard stated that the evidence from their studies pointed to the child's school as being the main, if not the sole, cause of maladjustment. The authenticity of Burt and Howard's work has been questioned, but subsequent research has drawn similar conclusions, and Hargreaves (1967) concluded from an investigation of social relations amongst fourth-year pupils and their teachers that schools themselves actively help to produce delinquency by progressively dividing pupils into subcultural groups.

Further consideration of the personality theories reviewed earlier shows that a variety of factors can be seen as contributing to behaviour abnormalities in the individual. If these difficulties are not satisfactorily solved, then they can lead to more serious or even permanent disorders. For example, in appreciation of the Freudian approach applied to education, if we punish the child for misbehaviour in school, we may create in the pupil alienation from school, especially if the child perceives the punishment as unjust or over-severe. Alienation to school can of course arise from a variety of reasons other than the administration of punishment.

According to Seeman (1959), an alienated pupil is, one who perceives that he can do little, if anything, to influence his future in school, and can see little relevance in the work required of him there. In a study of alienation from school (among 244 upper-school pupils in a Sheffield comprehensive, Cohen, 1974) found that alienation from school was significantly associated with self-esteem. Children placed in lower-ability streams and sets were more strongly alienated from school than their fellow pupils in higher-ability groups.

Jackson (1965) claims that the alienated pupil is unable to maintain a favourable self-concept because his interactions with others in a variety of settings do not reward him or permit him to achieve social recognition and thus maintain a favourable self-image.
A familiar characteristic of the disruptive pupil is that where he fails to gain recognition and a favourable self-image he tends to withdraw from the particular activity, and may strive to devalue its worth. Covington and Beery (1976) argue that the teaching and learning atmosphere of many schools encourages children to feel worthy only if they can perform better than others. But, as we have seen (West, 1967), low educational attainment is a prominent characteristic of behaviour problems and thus such pupils are not likely to achieve the favourable self-image they need. Docking (1980, p.175) comments "The irony of this situation is that pupils can maintain their self-worth only by making others feel unworthy".

Barker-Lunn (1970) showed that children of average, or below average ability, developed poorer academic self-images when taught in classrooms which were organised in a 'traditional' manner where teachers were 'less permissive' and 'less tolerant' of the slower child. The difficulty here of course is that the teacher is restricted in how permissive he can be depending on the degree of flexibility that the administrative structure of the school will allow. Barker Lunn's findings could be said to lend weight to the argument that it is more suitable for the lower-ability child to be educated in smaller, more intimate and homogenous groups, as opposed to being integrated in a larger class containing the full range of ability. This assertion is examined further in Chapter 7.

It could be suggested that the method of control exercised by teachers can be instrumental in alienating the pupil from the teacher and school. For example, Silberman (1973) warns that in exercising control, teachers could unwittingly be 'schooling for docility'. In other words, if discipline is seen to be the imposition of an infallible moral code, children may be discouraged from learning to reason about ways of behaving. In this respect, the case study investigation of Chapter 5 of this work argues that involving the pupil in making constructive
decisions related to his personal school curriculum can usefully be used to reduce problem behaviour, and reduce alienation.

It is certainly important that pupils develop a sense of social awareness which enables them to make rational choices, rather than merely 'learning the rules'. As Souper (1976) has argued, responsibility is something that has to be 'felt' before it can be understood. And one cannot be expected to 'feel', without having been in the position of making a choice between alternative courses of action.

The major recent observational study of schools has been that of Rutter et al. (1979). They found that academic and behaviour standards vary dramatically between schools with similar intakes, and that successful schools are those which encourage punctuality, are clean, well-ordered and set clear homework and discipline standards. Schools with less successful outcomes were those where, among other things, teachers felt that their views were not taken into account. Rutter and his team found that less able pupils do better in schools with more able pupils than in those where there are fewer clever children.

If we can accept Rutter's findings we can say that they imply that schools, in spite of the background of their pupils, are able to influence both behaviour and academic outcomes.

An important point to emerge from Rutter's study is that he found that behaviour and attainments are not just a continuation of patterns already established at an earlier age, and that school life does influence children's attendance, behaviour and attainments. This does not infer that other factors such as the child's personal characteristics, family circumstances, home background etc., do not influence, but his findings indicate that even taking these into account, school influences were still very important.
When Rutter's study was published it was widely acclaimed as an important contribution to educational research, and held to be a justification of many practices of local authorities and schools. More recently there have emerged many objections to the research e.g. Goldstein (1980), Heath and Clifford (1980), and Acton (1980). The complaints of these critics can be summed up by saying that they accuse Rutter and his team of failing to take into account major differences in intakes of the schools investigated, and wrongly analysing some of the statistics, giving the impression that some school factors were more important than they were. It is further claimed that Rutter over-estimated the extent to which schools can overcome social influences, this claim would probably be recognised by Bernstein who, in 1970, claimed that schools cannot compensate for society.

Undoubtedly Rutter's study will be the subject of further criticism; it is a bitter pill for many educationists to swallow if they can no longer blandly 'write off' problems of behaviour or academic outcomes as being due to factors which the school is unable to influence. However, the basic idea behind the investigation must be accepted as a useful one even if the methodology used has some defects. The work may be treated with caution, but not with scepticism. It raises important fundamental questions about life in schools and the work would benefit from replication by some of its critics. Here again, there is enough substance in his arguments to warrant further study. This thesis recognises the important lead that Rutter and his colleagues have given, and later attempts to further demonstrate the way that the school can be effective in influencing behavioural outcomes.

In talking to disruptive pupils about their behaviour one cannot help but observe the number that tend to express frustration with, or anxiety over, the teaching situation. The frustration appears to arise because of the nature of the material which has to be learned, or the circumstances under which the lesson is given. The teacher is sometimes at fault by setting too high expectations of the pupil, or failing to manage the material in a way that the pupil can realise the goals set. The anxiety occurs
where personal problems, outside of the lesson material, interfere with the learning situation. Within this category fall personality problems, home background etc., the result of which is an inability to concentrate on the task in hand. The pupil becomes resigned to the fact that he is again meeting something he cannot manage, recent work in Attribution Theory would seem to support such views. This is the very point made by John Holt (1965) who says that children fail in school because they are afraid, bored and confused. Afraid of failing, or disappointing adults; bored because school is so trivial and dull; confused because so much of the words used in school make little or no sense.

b). Methods used to influence school behavioural outcomes

The Plowden Report (1967) concluded that home influences far outweighed those of the school. Basil Bernstein, as already mentioned earlier, concludes that education cannot redress the balance. However, what has become increasingly important is what the school is able to do to change behaviour outcomes.

Traditionally, the way that teachers have attempted to change bad behaviour in school has been by the use of some form of punishment. In spite of a relatively recent movement away from the use of corporal punishment in British schools it still exists in many, and other forms of punishment (e.g. detention and imposition of extra work) are still the main method used by teachers in reaction to disruptive behaviour.

A major reason that a variety of punishments are still prominently used in schools is that alternative procedures for dealing with deviant behaviour have not proved viable to teachers.

An alternative to punishment which is receiving increased attention by researchers is the use of behaviour
modification techniques. This type of approach for dealing with behaviour problems is still in its infancy in British schools, but it is examined in this section as preliminary to more detailed investigation and application later in this work (Chapters 5 and 6).

(i) Punishment

Some people so strongly oppose the use of aversive control procedures that they prefer not to explore the topic at all (Gelfand and Hartman, 1975). However, considering the foregoing statement that forms of punishment are still extensively used in schools, and later implied recommendation that behaviour modification approaches should seriously be considered as an alternative, it is right that the position of punishment in schools should be given some consideration here.

Although many theorists define punishment as a pain-producing stimulus (e.g. Mowrer, 1960), we must be aware that many forms of punishment are not strictly painful. For example, Keesen and Mandler (1961) remind us that infants react with arousal, upset and crying to a variety of non-painful stimuli: such as loss of support, loud noises and isolation. So when we are referring to punishment we must bear in mind the wider view which could include verbal rebuke, disapproval and even silence as well as corporal punishment.

When Thorndike (1911) originally, stated his 'law of effect', in respect of punishment it was held that learning is a reversible process, reward strengthening it and punishment weakening it (in this respect learning refers not only to behaving in a certain way, but also about learning not to behave in an unacceptable manner). However, as a result of a long series of experiments on verbal learning in human subjects carried out later in his professional life, Thorndike (1931) came to the conclusion that his original position had been in error and that whilst reward does indeed facilitate learning, punishment does not necessarily weaken
This revised view, substantiated by subsequent research (reviewed in Postman, 1947), leads us to now conclude that punishment inhibits behaviour rather than extinguishing it. This view is endorsed by Skinner (1953).

Skinner says that punishment or as he prefers 'aversive stimuli', is not the opposite of reward, because it does not work by subtracting responses where reinforcement adds them. He refers to three effects of punishment which can clearly be seen to correspond with Freud's view of 'repressed wishes'.

(1) The effect of aversive stimuli used in punishment is confined to the immediate situation. It need not be followed by any change in behaviour upon later occasions. In other words, the aversive stimulus is only 'suppressing' behaviour temporarily.

(2) Punishment of behaviour can have an undesired enduring effect which is reflected in later behaviour which does not deserve punishment. For example, if we punish a child for calling out in class, this may deter him from talking in a lesson where we want this response.

(3) Punishment can reinforce other undesired behaviour. For example, if the individual avoids punishment by alternative activity, the action which brings about avoidance can become reinforced. Clearly, if the evasive action involves running away, hiding, silence etc., these may well be actions we do not wish to evoke. The effect of punishment in setting up behaviour which competes with, and may displace, the punished response is most commonly described by saying that the individual 'represses' the behaviour.

In short, Skinner suggests that punishment only has an immediate effect in reducing a tendency to act in a given way. It does not actually eliminate behaviour from
a repertoire. He maintains that the fear, anxiety and other emotions evoked by punishment may lead to psychosomatic illness, or otherwise interfere with the effective behaviour of the individual in his daily life. In other words, we may temporarily reduce one behaviour, but provoke other unwanted side effects, and the original behaviour is likely to return anyway.

Skinner (1961, p.36) summarised his position more recently in this way: "although we boast that the birch rod has been abandoned, most school children are still under aversive control -- not because punishment is more effective in the long run, but because it yields immediate results. It is easier for the teacher to control the student by threatening punishment than by using positive reinforcement with its deferred, though more powerful effects".

Even today, twenty years on from the date of Skinner's 1961 statement, it still has considerable foundation. The Society of Teachers Opposed to Physical Punishment (STOPP) say that it is a myth to claim that corporal punishment is dying out. Some support for this view can be found in the fact that despite the influence of various pressure groups, the National Union of Teachers decided to leave the question of discipline in schools to the judgment of teachers, and the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT) has recently endorsed this view. Nevertheless, there has been a trend for an increasing number of education authorities to ban corporal punishment in their schools irrespective of the views of professional bodies.

Some teachers, whilst recognising the ineffectiveness of punishment on the individual, still support its use in schools on the grounds that it is necessary to show other pupils that bad behaviour does not go unchallenged. However, applying Skinner's philosophy, would argue that what appears to be punishment is sometimes paradoxically reinforcing: "A student misbehaves to annoy his teacher
or to be admired by his peers when he takes punishment. If the teacher's attention is reinforcing, unwanted responses which attract attention are strengthened (Skinner, 1968, p. 190). From Skinner's point of view it can be seen that punishment may have the opposite effect to that expected and intended.

(ii) Behaviour modification

"The use of behaviour modification techniques in schools is a fairly recent development, and one has to search diligently in the literature to uncover published articles. Even in the 62 references in The Technology of Teaching (Skinner, 1968), there is only one reference relating to the treatment of children with behavioural problems, i.e. Wolf, Mees and Risley (1964), 'Applications of operant conditioning procedure -- to the behaviour problems of an autistic child'. There are two references to pigeons". Harrop (1980, p. 158). Not surprisingly, therefore, one finds that the use of behaviour modification techniques is almost non-existent in the 'normal' school, and even viewed with scepticism by the majority of classroom teachers.

Maurice Chazan (1974) has recently reviewed the work in the field of behaviour modification, and he states that the most frequently used approaches include positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement and social modelling.

Positive reinforcement techniques seem more effective in modifying behaviour than negative reinforcement as well as being more pleasant to use (Woody, 1969). This method is implemented by ignoring unacceptable or undesirable behaviour, while desired or approved responses are reinforced in a positive way. Positive reinforcement may take the form of concrete rewards or social approval which is made apparent by verbal conditioning.

Positive reinforcement has been demonstrated to be successful in reducing anxiety in children by using it to encourage anxious children to behave in ways that are
not compatible with anxiety (Wolpe, 1958).

Negative reinforcement involves the administration of an aversive stimulus when undesirable behavior occurs, thus influencing the individual to act to avoid the pain or discomfort by giving up the disapproved behaviour.

The application of the above methods of behaviour modification in the classroom situation have been shown to be successful in many studies (Becker et al. 1971), sometimes by operating a 'token economy' (Burchard, 1967, Burland, 1975) and even by using parents or volunteers showing individual attention and praise (Patterson et al. 1969).

The 'token economy' system of behaviour modification incorporates the giving of a token to a child, which can be exchanged for a tangible reward such as money, sweets, toys etc., as this is presumed to be of primary reinforcing value. When the child behaves in the manner approved by the teacher, he is rewarded with a token; when he behaves in an unapproved manner a token is taken away. This method is particularly useful for children where they lack intrinsic interest in school work, and those who exhibit emotionally disturbed behaviour. The aim of operating a token economy is to modify behaviour and gradually withdraw use of the tokens. This is examined further in Chapter 6 of this work.

Social modelling techniques have been the subject of development by Bandura (Bandura and Walters, 1963; and Bandura, 1969). The principle behind these techniques lies in the fact that behaviour can sometimes be changed by exposure to a social model. The social model does not have to be the subject's peers but can take the form of films, television programmes etc., featuring, or particularly emphasising the acceptable behaviour of others.

Exposure to positive social models has varying
degrees of success. The writer placed three social models in a class of lower ability pupils where one student was particularly disruptive, and this proved completely ineffective. However, when the single disruptive boy was placed in a class consisting entirely of social models his behaviour was greatly improved, and the improvement was maintained for three complete weeks whilst he was retained in the model class. But upon return to his normal class, poor behaviour returned immediately. This implies that exposure to social models does not have an enduring effect, and may be completely ineffective under some circumstances. However, this finding cannot be generalised from such a minor example. But it does suggest that, for containment of a single disruptive pupil, placement within a complete class of models has its merits as a method of containment even if it does not have an enduring effect.

In the earlier discussion on the use of punishment in the classroom, attention was drawn to Skinner's argument that the use of negative reinforcement can result in reinforcing undesired attention-seeking behaviour. The suggestion is that by punishing the pupil (verbally or otherwise) the teacher is in fact giving the pupil the attention he wants. Skinner is of course arguing for the use of positive reinforcement and the exclusion of negative reinforcement. But many teachers would argue that even the use of positive reinforcement can be seen to reward pupils who seek attention, especially if they are in classes containing pupils who are not disruptive.

On this assumption it could be held that behaviour modification techniques cannot be satisfactorily applied to disruptive pupils whilst they remain in the same class as 'normal' pupils. Schaeffer et al. (1968) tackled this problem by extending the work of Patterson (1965) in applying a behaviour modification programme to under-achievers, whilst keeping them in classes with normal achievers. An important feature of their programme was that it was relatively simple and was carried out by the class teacher who was advised and observed by the behaviour modifier.
The programme involved setting up the social environment to reward appropriate behaviours and to punish incompatible behaviours. For improvements in the subject's academic performance, the entire class was rewarded with points associated with a minute of free time, so the subject was working both for himself as well as for the rest of the class. The subject also lost points for undesirable behaviour such as being disruptive, not paying attention, attention-seeking behaviour etc.

The programme can be seen as mobilising student opinion in that the rest of the class were anxious for the subject to do well and this encouraged him to try hard; at the same time the subject was receiving the attention he often sought. The programme was able to use modelling because the subject was kept in a class and grouped with normal achievers, thus giving him the opportunity to observe behaviour he could imitate.

This programme was extended to several subjects and is held to have been successful in achieving both academic and social improvement as a result of positive reinforcement from teachers, peers and rewards.

Although the foregoing shows there is much to recommend the use of behaviour modification techniques, there are two aspects which many teachers in secondary education would undoubtedly comment upon.

Firstly, many reports of the successful use of behaviour modification techniques appear to take place in primary education (e.g. Schaeffer, et al. 1968 — U.S.A. 6th grade, Merrett and Wheldall, 1978 — British Junior school) or in special schools (e.g. Burchard, 1967 — antisocial retardates in residential centre; Martin, et al. 1968 — special school; Patterson, et al. 1969, — autistic children; Burland, 1975 — residential school for maladjusted; Cook, 1975, — residential school for maladjusted). Those involved with disruptive pupils in secondary education would welcome demonstration that behaviour modification
techniques can be successfully applied there, where, as discussed earlier, disruptive behaviour is felt to be particularly stressful to teachers.

Secondly, it would seem from many of the foregoing quoted studies that it is felt that for satisfactory application of behaviour modification techniques, it is necessary for an independent observer to be present. Some researchers (e.g. Karrop, 1980, p.158) even suggest that 'two independent recording observers are preferable to calculate their percentage agreement' i.e. two observers in addition to the class teacher. However, as most secondary teachers will readily confirm, time is at a premium and to provide independent observers (assuming there are those with appropriate skills available in the school) to measure changes in behaviour is difficult if not impossible to arrange. To try to bring in observers from outside the school (e.g. educational psychologist) has been shown elsewhere to be unviable.

In consideration of behaviour modification by positive reinforcement it is necessary to decide which methods of reward are to be used, because, as has already been observed, children will not all respond to the same stimulus, and differ in the rewards they prefer.

Dunn-Rankin et al. (1969) designed a questionnaire to find out what kinds of rewards children prefer. They found that children did differ in their reward preferences, both within schools and between schools. For example, they found that in one elementary school in the United States the most able children tended to express a preference for independence rewards as opposed to adult and competitive rewards which were favoured by the less able children.

Children from lower socio-economic backgrounds respond better to extrinsic reinforcement than intrinsic reinforcement according to Lowenstein (1975). He says that they particularly respond well to material or token reinforcement. Children with a middle-class background, possibly
because of their greater affluence, respond better to verbal reinforcement such as praise or gratitude.

Various forms of reward have been used successfully as positive reinforcement. Walker and Buckley (1968) awarded a 9 year old male, points for recorded attending behaviour and these points could be exchanged for a toy of the pupil's choice. Wolf, Giles and Hall (1968) used conditioned reinforcement to improve attending and low achieving in a group of children. The reinforcement was in the form of stamps. Every child had a booklet which had different coloured pages, each colour representing a different reward. When a child completed an assignment, he was given points by the teacher, who marked a square in his book. In addition, bonus points were given for quality of work, and the marked squares were built up to earn varying grades of reward.

Similar 'token' methods have been successfully applied by O'Leary and Becker (1967) working with a group of emotionally disturbed and minimally brain damaged children, and by McKenzie et al. (1968) as back-up for children with suggested minimal brain damage. Rose (1979) employed a small video unit as a primary reinforcer, which the subject was allowed to use as a reward exchanged for points gained by ontask behaviour.

Blackman and Silberman (1975) argue that in regular classrooms, praise might be used effectively for those who have mild difficulties in paying attention, but those with severe problems need tangible reinforcers, such as toys, sweets and privileges, coupled with secondary reinforcers. Premack (1965) proposed a notion of reward that he thought useful in school situations when he said that a reward is anything that someone likes doing. In Premack's view, the only condition is that the rewarding activity must be preferred to the activity being learnt, for which it is being offered as a reward. The experienced teacher will not fail to recognise the flaw in this view, in that it can denigrate
the value of the task being performed, and the method can be considered useless if the reward is not seen as preferable to the task.

The writer has found free time and early dismissal from school to be the most effective form of rewards in the secondary school. Both can be the subject of opposition from other teaching staff if the whole school is not operating the scheme. Most schools find it necessary to impose restrictions on the use of rewards other than those with intrinsic value. It is certainly difficult to find rewards which are effective for the upper-school secondary pupil and acceptable to teaching staff, and at the same time economically viable.

Later in this work (Chapter 6) it will be seen that this research has involved awarding disruptive pupil points for on-task behaviour, with the accumulated points being exchanged for periods of time out of school on field work.

In view of the foregoing indicated measure of success of behaviour modification programmes, one can see a case for increasing the use of these techniques in the school, and in fact, Ward (1976) predicted that this would be so. However, Harrop (1980) has warned that the development should be approached with caution, because in the past, education has suffered from an uncritical acceptance of new approaches and methods. If new approaches and methods are not backed by sound techniques of enquiry, Harrop suggests, their ultimate fate is liable to be rejection.

It is here that we find the dilemma of the classroom teacher. The picture of behaviour modification is far from complete and each new paper presented appears to raise more questions than it answers. Some researchers imply that behaviour modification techniques are never effective without monitoring of outcomes by a psychologist (Presland, 1980). But as indicated in this work (vide Chapters 3 and 4), many teachers do not feel they have access to a sufficient number of educational psychologists,
and where they do have access to them the teachers for their part do not recognise them as being effective.

It is further recommended that in the application of behaviour modification techniques an observer independent of the teacher should be present if progress is to be monitored (Hall, Lund and Jackson, 1968; Harrop, 1980). But teachers are at present only too aware of the difficulty of providing staff for such a venture, and even if an observer is available it does not ensure accuracy, as Wahler and Leske (1973) and O'Leary et al. (1975) have demonstrated.

We find, therefore, that classroom teachers appear to be discouraged from attempting behaviour modification techniques by the number of obstacles in their way, and doubts as to their ability to administer such techniques unguided. Coupled with the fact that the work involved can be time-consuming, exacting and frustrating it is not surprising that so few teachers consciously attempt to deal with problem pupils in this way. The writer believes that many teachers do apply behaviour modification techniques successfully but are not conscious of the fact that they are doing so. However, it is questionable if teachers generally at present have the knowledge, or resources, to operate behaviour modification programmes embracing the stringent requirements demanded by some of the researchers discussed in this section. This is another aspect of investigation, resulting in practical advice, to which this present study is addressed, particularly in Chapter 6 where experimental application of behaviour modification is related, together with constructive criticism.

(iii) Special units

The N.U.T. (1976) maintains that discipline in schools depends largely on the curriculum. The N.A.S. report 'Retreat from Authority' (undated) says that some disciplinary problems stem from a wrong-headed determination on the part of some teachers to impose on pupils a curriculum
which is unsuited to their needs and temperaments. The N.U.T. (1976) link this problem with the problems of alienation experienced by pupils who are not entered for external examinations. This may be one of the reasons why the greater incidence of disruptive behaviour problems are experienced in the upper-age range of secondary education (Lowenstein, 1975 and Chapters 3 and 4 of this work).

This situation is not helped in present circumstances of wide unemployment for school-leavers, when even the able and exam-oriented pupils are experiencing disillusion and are, therefore, also difficult to motivate.

Whatever the reasons for disruptive behaviour, and in whichever way it is manifested, the harsh reality in the classroom is that it is particularly stressful, even for the experienced teacher. He perceives the disruption as a personal challenge to his authority. The tension that results from this kind of situation elicits further disruption and becomes self-perpetuating. For both the teacher and the pupil it is essential that this vicious circle is broken. But we saw in Chapter 1 of this work that moving the pupil to a special school is often neither appropriate or necessary.

In response to this problem, some authorities have established withdrawal classes, exclusion areas, or sanctuaries within schools, or on separate sites serving a number of schools, in an attempt to deal with difficult behaviour. The Teacher (23.3.79) reports that 70 Inner London schools now have their own units for pupils who disrupt lessons. This development resulted from the Inner London Education Authority's (ILEA) policy to fund units within schools, to deal with pupils who cause havoc in lessons. The project was allocated £1m. in the ILFA budget.

The object behind the ILFA scheme is to withdraw disruptive pupils from normal classes to the unit, where it is hoped they will be gradually rehabilitated to normal
lessons. The scheme emphasises that it tries to keep pupils astride normal lessons, and this is very important because whilst pupils are withdrawn it is easy for them to fall behind in their learning, thus making it difficult to integrate them back into classes. Pupils with long-term behaviour problems are referred to a full-time withdrawal unit to cover a whole area of schools.

The ILFA has had mixed responses to the scheme from teachers. Some stress that disruptive pupils should be contained in ordinary, but small classes, whilst others feel that pupils can best readjust by separation from normal classes. The writer found a similar division of views on this point in response to the surveys discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 of this work. The Warnock Report (1978) recommended that special classes and units should, wherever possible, be attached to and function as part of ordinary schools rather than be organised separately or attached to another kind of establishment such as a child guidance centre (p.112).

The form that these disruptive units take is varied. H.M. Inspectors (1978) carried out a large-scale investigation into special behavioural units, and they found that about seventy percent of local authorities had developed special units of this kind. A quarter served one school only e.g. on-site units, while seventy percent took in children from more than ten schools. H.M. Inspectors found that the accommodation provided varied widely. Some units were housed in spacious, pleasant and well-furnished premises, whilst others could be dilapidated, dirty, smelly and insanitary. Finance provided for the schemes varied, even between units within an authority.

Despite the handicaps these units face, the attendance rate at units on nonschool sites averaged eighty-five percent (this is high for the type of pupils involved, many of whom will have a history of truancy). Part of the reason for the favourable attendance rate can be accredited to the small size of the units, close staff-pupil relationship and flexibility of the programmes operated.
Admission to units is generally school-based. The schools put forward recommendation for transfer to the unit in close liaison with the teacher or principal responsible for the unit. In some cases referral is instituted by the schools in consultation with outside agencies such as the educational psychologist or educational welfare officers and other officials outside the school.

One of the major criticisms directed at disruptive units is that the 'label' attached to them implies a stigma. Teachers in the ITFA schema have expressed dismay at the units being referred to as 'sin bins' and the result is that they are given a variety of names such as 'on-site units', 'sanctuary', and 'retreat', with 'sanctuary' being the most popular choices.

Clegg and Megson (1968) emphasise the injustice of 'labelling' children in respect of streaming, and similar arguments are put forward by McCall (1977) in respect of special units, when he says that we may call a special class whatever we wish, but it does not disguise the bleak uncomfortable fact that (as far as they are concerned) children of low academic ability reside there. Hargreaves (1967) similarly pointed out that there is a tendency for children in such classes to be labelled as 'failures' and to perceive themselves as such.

McCall (1977) attempts to show the balance between the advantages and disadvantages of these special classes. The main advantages are that such classes make it easier to have a one-to-one teacher/pupil arrangement, to establish a relaxed atmosphere and to teach specifically needed skills.

Apart from the aforementioned problems of 'labelling' the disadvantages are that the pupils who use such units are separated from other pupils, at least for part of the time, and this makes it difficult to apply the social modelling theory outlined earlier. McCall also points out that the units can result in being places where pupils are sent that other teachers do not want. There is also the
problem of transfer back to normal classes where lessons, books etc., may be more difficult than those in special classes. The consequence of this may well be that the pupil has fallen behind the progress of those in normal classes, and he will, therefore, find it difficult and frustrating trying to integrate back into the system.

A further disadvantage of the special class idea, which is put forward by McCall is a criticism in particular relation to dealing with disruptive children. Although such classes are often advocated for use with such children, on the grounds that they need a 'special curriculum', McCall maintains that often no such curriculum has been devised.

Chapter 5 of this study investigates some of the ways in which these special classes can provide a special programme for the disruptive pupil.

From the foregoing, it would seem that these special classes/units do have something to offer in the handling of continuously disruptive pupils. However, they should not be 'dumping grounds' for pupils that teachers do not want. Such classes must be subject to carefully designed programmes which include monitoring processes, and staffed by teachers (preferably especially trained) with the skills necessary to deal with the type of pupil involved. On-site units are preferable to ones located at a distance from the school because a consequence of the latter alternative is the pupil becomes even further removed as far as curriculum and methods are concerned. Possibly, on-site units could be effective in reducing the necessity to send problem pupils to special institutions outside the normal school.

2.4 Conclusions to literature review

From this chapter it can be concluded that the influence of factors outside the school undoubtedly affect behaviour within it, and these influences are many and varied. In fact, the volume of research evidence gives considerable weight to Bernstein's (1970) statement that 'education cannot
compensate for society'. But it is important that schools are not overwhelmed by, or distracted from, the task of exploiting the factors they can influence. In this respect, the writer believes that the references to the work of Rutter et al. (1979) do provide sound evidence of the extent to which schools can be effective in influencing behavioural outcomes, in spite of the emerging criticisms of the study.

No survey of literature of the size undertaken in this chapter can hope to cover all the areas of discussion related to disruptive behaviour in schools. For example, little space has been given to the effectiveness of counselling, appropriate curriculum or extra-curricular activities, all of which are valuable and may usefully be employed in helping the disruptive pupil. However, it is intended that these areas will also be given at least some further consideration during the remainder of this work.

From the literature review it can be seen that researchers included particularly highlight the following factors influencing disruptive behaviour in schools.

1. Factors outside the school's influence
2. Factors within the school's influence
3. Punitive methods
4. Non-punitive methods

These four main areas will be investigated further in Chapters 3 and 4 by asking teachers their considered opinion of the influence of the above factors on disruptive behaviour through a number of questions. It will be seen in these chapters that the questions were formulated partly from consideration of the contents of this review and also in response to a National survey carried out by the National Association of Schoolmasters. The elements of the questions used can be linked to the above four factors in the following way:
1. **Factors outside the school's influence**
   - poor home background
   - decline in general standards demanded by society
   - basic characteristics of child's personality
   - low intelligence

2. **Factors within the school's influence**
   - lack of early intervention (by the school)
   - size of schools
   - inexperience of some teachers
   - modern teaching methods
   - inadequate social services support
   - inadequate support by senior staff
   - inadequate local authority support

3. **Punitive Methods**
   - corporal punishment
   - detention
   - temporary exclusion from school
   - loss of privileges
   - imposition of extra work
   - verbal rebuke

4. **Non-punitive methods**
   - consultation with parents and pupils
   - calling in a specialist (e.g. educational psychologist)
   - organised monitoring of pupil
   - ignoring behaviour problems
   - small group teaching
   - mobilising pupil opinions
   - educating pupil in special school unit
   - sending pupil to separate institution
   - keeping pupil in normal class guided by specialists

A case was put forward in Chapter 1 of this work that many teachers are not confident they have the skills necessary to deal with seriously disruptive pupils. It was further suggested that teachers do not consider they are given
adequate support by the schools psychological service. Criticism was also raised in respect of educational research which is not always seen as reflecting the needs of the class teacher.

In this chapter we have examined the position of current research related to disruptive behaviour in schools. The following two chapters describe a survey carried out in a number of comprehensive schools to establish the views of teachers on the above-mentioned factors. A comparison between these factors and the results of the survey can usefully indicate where there exists a discrepancy between current research and the views of teachers, who are the ones faced with the problem. Conclusions drawn from this comparison will then provide a suitable basis for further research.
CHAPTER 3.

THE PILOT STUDY

3.1. Objective of the pilot study

The pilot study (Whitcomb, 1979a) was undertaken during the latter part of the school academic year 1978/79 (Summer Term '79). The objective was to formulate, and test, the effectiveness of a questionnaire designed to investigate teachers' views of the possible causes of disruptive behaviour in secondary schools, and their opinions of the effectiveness of various methods used to reduce such problems.

3.2. The Sample

Initial contact was made with the headteachers of three comprehensive schools in order to seek their assistance in carrying out the survey.

Firstly, a letter was sent, together with a copy of the proposed questionnaire. This was followed by a personal interview when specific questions were discussed. The headteachers were invited to suggest amendments and each was also offered the opportunity to receive a copy of the
analysis of the results. Neither of these offers were taken up at any of the schools. However, the interviews were conducted in an easy atmosphere and helped to establish the number of pupils and staff in each school.

Tentative promises of co-operation were received from the three schools, although it was carefully stressed by all the headteachers that no pressure would be brought to bear on members of staff to participate; therefore, co-operation by teaching staff would be entirely voluntary. It was further stressed that the findings should be anonymous, both from the point of view of individuals and the schools in particular, therefore, follow-up interviews were not possible unless the respondent contacted the writer further. In respect of the agreement to maintain anonymity the schools were only referred to by number in the eventual written presentation. The three schools finally used are all situated within a ten mile radius of each other in South East Essex.

These three schools are comprehensive — that is, they take practically all local children whatever their abilities (Pedley, 1963) and there are no selective schools impinging on their catchment areas. The few pupils who do not attend the comprehensive schools are those who attend private schools and the small number who are 'bussed' to the nearest grammar school outside the educational division.

Each of the schools has a pupil population of approximately 1,200 covering a wide range of ability. They are all situated in catchment areas drawing on residents from both private and council housing estates, but it was not possible to establish the ratio of these per school.

When it came to actually implementing the survey it was found that two of the headteachers had severe reservations about going ahead.

One of the heads who felt unhappy about it agreed to put the idea to a full staff meeting and allow the
teachers to decide if they wished to participate. Fortunately, a large number of the staff expressed a willingness to participate and therefore, the survey was agreed.

In the other school, where the head was cautious about allowing the survey to proceed, the outcome was less satisfactory. The reason he gave for his reluctance was that the school was experiencing considerable discipline problems at that time, and the staff had held several meetings to discuss the problems and had already carried out an internal survey. He felt that the imposition of a further investigation would be unfair to the staff, although he would not agree to consult them.

This subsequent reluctance on the part of the headteachers was also apparent in the current research (discussed further in Chapter 4 of this work). This timidity is difficult to understand considering the fact that from the initial interview they were fully aware of the contents of the questionnaire, were invited to make their own suggestions on it and were offered access to analysed results. One could hypothesise that the time chosen to initiate the survey was inconvenient, although it is unlikely that any time would be more suitable than another. The most likely conclusion would be that headteachers are apprehensive about investigations into their schools and perhaps they have little confidence that researchers will respect the anonymity they promise.

Fortunately, an alternative school was obtained at short notice within the intended geographical area and, therefore, the survey was able to proceed with the originally intended number of schools. However, the difficulties described here do indicate the cautious approach many schools have to studies of behaviour problems they are experiencing. For this reason, it was decided that for future research headteachers of proposed schools would be approached with a view to obtaining a firm commitment well before application of the survey.
3.3. **Construction of the questionnaire**

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was formulated in consultation with teaching staff at Bath University and consisted of twelve questions, some of which had several sub-sections each requiring a response.

The content of the questionnaire was partly influenced by the survey questionnaire used by the National Association of Schoolmasters (Lowenstein, 1975) in their survey into violent and disruptive behaviour in schools.

Whilst the NAS survey was undoubtedly thorough and far-reaching, the originators were disappointed with the response received (10% from primary and less than 25% from secondary schools). There are a number of possible reasons for the disappointing response. The questionnaire sought too many responses, some of which could have been eliminated by a single member of staff answering (e.g. questions 1 to 7, related staff and pupil numbers/ratio); other questions could certainly deter some respondents because they might not have sufficient knowledge to answer (e.g. questions 5 to 8 related to staffing ratio and actual incidence of violent behaviour throughout their school). These evaluations of the NAS questionnaire indicate some of the reasons why their questions were likely to be disregarded by the busy classteacher.

It was clear from the NAS survey, that the current pilot study require fewer responses by respondents, but at the same time it had to provide information which would allow suitable and worthwhile analyses. It was decided that the number of responses could be kept to a minimum by seeking basic information such as staffing levels etc., from the headteacher or a senior member of staff.

In designing the questionnaire it was intended to produce an instrument that would allow teachers to complete with reasonable ease, thus reducing the possibility that they would disregard it because of the time involved in completion.
At the same time, the information obtained had to be of
constructive use in any subsequent analysis. This balance
was one of the main objectives observed in the construction.

Some of the questions used in the Pilot Study
developed from personal experience and as a result of dis-
cussions with other teachers. For example, questions 3
and 4, relating to sex and age of disruptive pupils, took
shape during preliminary discussions when it seemed that
many teachers implied that a higher incidence of behaviour
problems occurred in the upper age group, and further that
boys were more frequently disruptive than girls.

Questions 5 and 6, which related to incidence
of disruptive behaviour, were included in response to the
implications (detailed in Chapter 1, section 1.1) by the
media that disruptive behaviour in secondary schools is in-
creasing.

Question 7 (effectiveness of the Schools Psychologi-
cal Service) also emerged from discussions with teachers
during which it was clear that a great majority are cynical
about the usefulness of this service, particularly in respect
of the effectiveness of the psychologist in helping to reduce
disruptive behaviour.

The main focusing of the type of questions re-
quired was obtained from a review of the literature rele-
vant to the research and detailed in Chapter 2 of this work.
This review revealed that researchers emphasised factors
which can be seen as influencing disruptive behaviour, and
various methods used by schools to influence behavioural
outcomes. The main bulk of the questionnaire, and particu-
larly the sub-sections of questions 10 and 12 is concerned
with examining the views of teachers in relation to these
factors.

The questionnaire contained items which would
allow comparison of responses between individual schools,
male and female teachers, and between three different lengths
of teaching experience.

The majority of the items were intended to be analysed by computer, but some items (e.g. Question 11) were intended to be analysed manually because it was expected that the responses would not prove suitable for computerised analysis, due to the fact that interpretation of the responses of necessity had to be somewhat subjective.

3.4. Criticisms of the pilot study questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed using a three point scale for responses, that is, most questions invited the respondent to choose between 3 alternative answers e.g. high contribution, some contribution, no contribution. There are some drawbacks against using this method in that the more response choices that are available, the more varied and interesting is the data obtained. But at the same time, the more involved a questionnaire, the more difficult it is to get busy teachers to give the time required to complete.

There is also the possibility that a three point scale might influence respondents to take a 'middle of the road' line and be inclined to indicate response 2 where they are undecided which category they wish to elect. A similar argument could be put forward in using a five point scale with respondents tending to choose option 3 when undecided.

There are other well-known factors which tend to 'contaminate' questionnaire techniques; such as those of acquiescence and social desirability. Providing that care is taken to minimise such effects then the questionnaire can be a useful, relatively simple and valid instrument.

Analysis of returns showed that in respect of question 10 and the sub-sections thereof (factors contributing to discipline problems), the respondents had discriminated between the alternatives. However, the responses to question 12 (methods used to deal with disruptive behaviour)
showed that the respondents had largely selected alternative 2, thus making the resulting analyses suspect.

Considering that both questions 10 and 12 were based on a three point scale, and bearing in mind that the respondents had shown discrimination between the 3 alternatives to question 10 sub-sections, it is possible that the reason that the respondents chose the 'middle of the road' approach was because the wording of the choices for question 12 (completely effective, moderately effective, ineffective) did not allow sufficient discrimination. For example, apart from permanent exclusion from school, it is not possible to suggest any single method from the alternatives listed which would be 'completely effective' in maintaining good discipline in the school.

From the foregoing it seemed likely that the weakness of the pilot study questionnaire was the wording of the alternative choices as opposed to the 3 point scale. For this reason, it was decided that in further research the questionnaire would show the following revised choice categories for the sub-sections of question 12.

1.) Very effective  2.) Effective  3.) Ineffective

In discussion with teachers during implementation of the survey it was discovered that some confusion had occurred in relation to question 10 A (lack of early intervention). Some respondents were unsure if this question was referring to lack of early intervention by parents or the school, in spite of the fact that the main question heading referred to schools in particular. To avoid further confusion it was decided to add the words (by the school).

Questions 10 and 12 requested responses to 11 and 16 items respectively, and the responses were to be recorded on a three point scale in boxes. As one progresses down through the possible responses it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish which box relates to each of the question sub-sections. This problem was overcome in the revised
questionnaire (Appendix B) by enlargement of the response boxes, and the sub-section letters have been repeated by the appropriate response box.

3.5 Implementation of the pilot study

The questionnaire was either distributed in the schools by the writer, or distributed by the headteachers directly, and collected personally by the writer one week later. This was done during one week in May, 1979. To encourage participation it was stressed that the survey was to be completely anonymous to the individual and the school, but that the writer was available for discussion if necessary. Alternatively, respondents were invited to attach additional sheets of paper with comments should they so desire.

A few discussions took place indicating, as previously mentioned in the criticisms of the pilot study questionnaire, that it would be advisable to include the words (by the school) to questions 10A, and to enlarge and letter the response boxes to both questions 10 and 12 to facilitate ease of selection of response alternatives.

The returns for the questionnaire (after elimination of two returns which did not have sufficient responses to allow analysis) are shown in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the percentage return of the pilot study with other surveys can be made by referring to Chapter 4 of this work. The return obtained was encouraging in that it compared favourably with other surveys, although at this stage in the development the results were received
with caution in view of the small size of the sample. However, it is possibly valid to suggest that the comparatively favourable return was influenced by the fact that the writer was present in the schools for collection of the questionnaires and for discussions. It was decided that for future research the work would benefit from researchers being available in this manner.

3.6 Punching and coding of data

It was decided that the 77 scored questionnaires would be transferred to punch cards to facilitate the analysis of the frequency distributions to each response.

Coding instructions were prepared for each individual respondent, within which were indicators of the school to which they belonged, whether the respondents were male or female and their length of teaching experience. Further instructions were prepared to include cross-tabulation Questions 4, 9 and 11 were omitted from the computerised analysis and were intended to be analysed manually, for the reasons given earlier (section 2.3).

3.7 Analysis of pilot study results

A frequency distribution was extracted first from the computerised analysis (results - Appendix C). These frequency distribution figures were then used in cross-tabulation between questions, and a chi-square test was also applied. Using a 5% significance level, those results found significant were extracted from the data and are shown in Appendix D.

It was decided to cross tabulate the main variables of the questionnaire to allow comparison between the sex of the respondents, their length of teaching experience and comparison between the three schools in respect of each computerised question analysis. The greater majority of these tabulation results were rejected because they had failed to differentiate between the variables at the 5% level of significance. The main significant findings of the pilot study can be summarised as follows:-
a). Incidence of disruptive behaviour

The findings of the pilot study in respect of the above indicated that a greater percentage of the teachers in the sample felt that incidence of behaviour problems in their school was neither increasing or decreasing.

Table 2. Summary of response to Q4 from pilot study

Q4. Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems? You may circle more than one year group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from none more than others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from none more than others)

| Combined Totals | 2 | 7 | 73 | 75 | 39 | 24 |

(Absolute frequency figures)
From the foregoing summary table (Table 2) it can be seen that the respondents generally considered that no difference was experienced between boys and girls as to age or incidence of behaviour problems. It was also found that the higher incidence of behaviour problems occurred in the upper-age group of secondary education, with a slight decline in the fifth year. So the result confirmed the subjective estimate of upper-age groups, but not the suggested difference between sexes.

b). Contributory causes of disruptive behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Summary of responses to Q10 from pilot study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following as contributory causes of discipline problems in schools. 1 - high contribution 2 - some contribution 3 - no contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted frequency figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A) Lack of early intervention</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B) Poor home background</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C) Decline in general standards demanded by society</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10D) Size of school</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E) Inexperience of some teachers</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10F) Modern teaching methods</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10G) Basic characteristics of child's personality</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10H) Inadequate social services</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10I) Inadequate support by senior staff of schools</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10J) Inadequate local authority support</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10K) Low intelligence</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted frequency figures obtained by elimination of non-response where these occurred.

The main points of interest from Table 3 can be summarised as follows:
Poor home background was thought to be a major contributor to discipline problems and decline in general standards demanded by society similarly so; whilst the basic characteristics of the child's personality were not seen as a high contributor.

Modern teaching methods, inexperience of some teachers and low intelligence of the pupil were considered by the respondents to be low contributors, whilst the size of schools was seen as only making some contribution to discipline problems.

The N.A.S. survey (Lowenstein, 1975) did not cover the causes of disruptive behaviour in the same manner as the pilot study and some of their conclusions in this respect were derived from comments and statements by respondents, as opposed to specific responses to questionnaire items. However, their statistics in relation to school size indicated that the bigger the school, the more disruptive behaviour is to be expected. Their findings are contrary to those of the pilot study and those of Rutter et al. (1979) who found the bigger schools did not imply greater incidence of problems.

c). Effectiveness of methods used to deal with disruptive behaviour

Table 4 Summary of responses to Q12 from pilot study

Q12. Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

0 - not used 1 - completely effective 2 - moderately effective 3 - ineffective
### Adjusted frequency percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12A) Corporal punishment</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B) Detention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12C) Temporary exclusion from school</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12D) Permanent exclusion from school</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12E) Temporary exclusion from normal classes</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12F) Consultation with parents and pupils</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12G) Loss of privileges</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12H) Referral to other teachers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12I) Referral to Head Teacher</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12J) Calling in a specialist (psychologist, social worker, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12K) Organised monitoring of pupil</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12L) Ignoring behaviour problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12M) Small group teaching</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12N) Mobilising pupil opinions</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12O) Imposition of extra work</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12P) Verbal rebuke</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted frequency figures obtained by elimination of non-response and not used responses where they occurred.

For reasons already stated (section 2.4), the findings related to this topic were considered to be less reliable than they might have been due to the fact that possibly the respondents did not discriminate between the alternative choices available. However, several of the findings had much in accord with the N.A.S. survey.

As one might expect, no single method of handling discipline problems could be seen as completely effective,
but, of course, permanent exclusion was rated highly. Corporal punishment was regarded by a very high proportion of the respondents as moderately effective, whilst only one person said it was ineffective, and similar results were recorded for consultation with parents and pupils. All of the foregoing findings were in close accord with the N.A.S. survey results.

From Table 4 it can be seen that the respondents felt that the two most ineffective methods of dealing with disruptive behaviour are, (i) ignoring behaviour problems and, (ii) calling in outside specialists. This finding was in complete agreement with the N.A.S. survey in that they also found that these two categories were considered as more ineffective than any other.

Of the three suggested methods of dealing with continuously disruptive pupils (Question 8) the respondents were closely divided between the suggestions of a special unit in the school, and sending the pupils to a separate institution. Least favoured was the suggestion that continuously disruptive pupils should be kept in 'guided classes', perhaps reflecting the apparent lack of confidence teachers have in the effectiveness of educational psychologists.

3.8 Conclusions to pilot study

Many aspects of the findings of the pilot study appeared to have valuable implications but, for various reasons already mentioned, the reliability of the findings in relation to some questions remained suspect, particularly those related to Question 12. However, it did seem that with a revised questionnaire and increased sample size, the results of such a survey could provide valuable information.
CHAPTER 4.

THE SURVEY

4.1 Objectives of the survey

The survey, which was carried out by questionnaire, had two main concerns. Firstly, to establish the views of teaching staff in comprehensive schools as to the possible causes of discipline problems in their schools. Secondly, the survey sought the teachers’ opinions of the effectiveness of various methods used to alleviate such problems, particularly in the case of handling continuously disruptive pupils.

4.2 The sample

There are a variety of methods of sampling recommended for use in research, the most rigorous of which is random sampling. However, this method can only be applied when the researcher is in the position where he is able to ensure the participation of the members of the sample randomly selected.
In education research, one is invariably faced with restrictions on sampling due to limitations on time, finance and administration, thus making random sampling unrealistic to use. In a survey such as that described in this chapter, which relies on voluntary participation by teachers and their schools, one is further restricted in applying recognised sampling designs. However, the sample described in this work has been divided into sub-groups (schools, sex of respondents, length of teaching experience), and comparison of these divisions provides valuable information even though this must be accepted with caution due to sampling restrictions.

One is faced with similar restrictions with regard to sample size in that the researcher is limited to an area that is physically and financially within reason. Again, in respect of this research, one is also dependent on the voluntary response of the designated sample.

It was decided to attempt to approach all the secondary school teachers in a complete educational division of the County of Essex to seek their assistance in carrying out the survey. It was hoped that the response from the sample would compare favourably with other similar surveys.

The Education Department of Essex County Council were contacted for initial permission to approach the schools. They were supportive, although they pointed out that participation by the schools and their teaching staff must be entirely voluntary. The Education Department were also helpful in providing various data they had available related to the research (this data has been referred to in Chapter 1 of this work).

The next stage in the investigation involved approaching the Divisional Education Officer prior to contacting the schools. Again, complete co-operation was given and encouragement in the form of suggested questions they
would have liked answered by researchers (e.g. "why do so many upper-school pupils lose the enthusiasm for learning?"). The Divisional Education Officer also emphasised that co-operation by the schools and their teaching staff must be voluntary.

The educational division included eleven comprehensive schools, one of which had only recently opened and contained only the first year of intake. This school was, therefore, omitted from consideration leaving a possible sample of ten schools.

Initial contact was made by letter to the headteachers of the remaining ten schools. This included a copy of the questionnaire and emphasised that all responses would be anonymous both to the school and the individual, and acknowledged that participation by teaching staff would be voluntary. The writer also offered to carry out the distribution and collection of the questionnaires personally and to be available in the staffroom to discuss the material with teaching staff if required.

Of the ten schools contacted, two headteachers ignored the approach and did not even acknowledge receipt of the letter and did not respond to a subsequent 'chase up' letter. Two of the headteachers replied but stated they were unwilling to give permission because "the amount of work involved would be excessive for the teaching staff" ...... and "I would not wish to add to the staff's work in any way".

From the latter two responses emerges a problem familiar to educational researchers: that of non-co-operation of schools in research, the blame for which is often attributed to the classroom teacher. However, the wording of the letters from the 'non-co-operative' headteachers, and the non-response from the other two headteachers seems to indicate that the initial contact went no further than the headteachers' desks. This situation was also clearly seen
to occur during the pilot study research where it was found that, after initially agreeing to participate in the survey, two headteachers withdrew their permission for reasons similar to those quoted above. One of these heads eventually agreed to consult his teaching staff and he expressed surprise that their majority response was that they wished to participate in the research. Unfortunately, the other head was unwilling to consult his teaching staff, thus, perhaps indicating that headteachers can be attributed at least some of the blame for the apparent non-co-operation of schools in educational research.

The remaining six schools in the educational division agreed to participate. Of these six schools, three invited the writer to visit to discuss the survey with staff, whilst the other three said they would prefer to receive sufficient questionnaires, which they would distribute, collect and return in due course. Initially, it was disappointing not to be able to meet the teaching staff in these three schools. It was felt that staffroom discussions would help to promote a worthwhile response, which was one of the conclusions drawn during the pilot study. However, it was decided that this limitation was an acceptable price to pay for the co-operation of the schools, and the survey went ahead using these six schools out of a possible ten.

4.3. The questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix B) was formulated incorporating the amendments referred to in Chapter 3 (vide section 3.4). It was duplicated and collated into booklets with a covering letter introducing the survey to teachers and confirming that all responses would remain anonymous.

4.4. Implementation of the survey

In accordance with the arrangements previously described in section 4.2, the questionnaire was either given out in the schools by the writer, or distributed and
collected by the headteachers and returned two weeks later. This was carried out during two weeks in November, 1980. Similar to the pilot study, to encourage participation, it was stressed that the survey was to be completely anonymous to the individual and the school, but that the writer was available for discussion if necessary in those schools where he was invited into the staffroom. Alternatively, respondents were invited to attach additional sheets of paper with comments should they so desire.

These comments (verbal or written) can be summarised as follows:-

a) Three senior teachers, each from a different school, pointed out that previous co-operation with researchers had been unsatisfactory in that, having obtained the co-operation of the schools and carried out their investigation, no further contact with the school was made by the researchers. This was considered to be discourteous and prejudicial to future research. In view of these comments, the writer resolved that immediately data had been collected a letter would be sent to each of the schools, for display on the staffroom noticeboard, thanking the staff for their assistance. This was carried out in due course.

b) Two teachers suggested that it would be useful in analysis if the questionnaire had positively identified where the respondent was a senior member of staff, as opposed to identifying length of teaching experience.

Whilst inclusion of such identification has its merits, one must also recognise that it could at the same time reveal the identity of some of the respondents, thus possibly discouraging some senior members of staff from participating. For these reasons it is felt that identifying length of teaching experience (question 2) is the most suitable method of identification, whilst at the same time maintaining the anonymity of the respondent.
c) Five teachers expressed scepticism of educational research and implied that they had little confidence that we give little more than lip-service to research findings, and that invariably little money is made available to implement recommendations. Some qualified this view by drawing attention to the need for 'specific provision of resources to assist the normal school in handling disruptive pupils as opposed to the existing casual or ad hoc expedients'.

d) Four respondents commented that the questionnaire should have differentiated between what is effective for the individual with behaviour problems, and what is effective for the institution to function, if necessary at the expense of the individual (refer question 12). This comment appears valid and could usefully be incorporated into future research by the inclusion of a further question in the questionnaire.

e) The greater proportion of the comments (nine) stated that they felt there was insufficient advice available on how to deal with disruptive behaviour, and expressed concern for the lack of facilities and resources within the normal school for dealing with pupils who are causing problems.

The returns from the questionnaire (after elimination of three returns which did not have sufficient responses for worthwhile analysis) are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>44.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Returns} \times \frac{100}{\text{N. Issued}} = \text{Response %}
\]
In a study of disruption conducted by the Authority in the London Borough of Croydon in 1972 the recorded response was 53.34%. The National Association of Schoolmasters carried out a National survey of violent and disruptive behaviour in schools (Lowenstein, 1975) and recorded returns of approximately 10% from primary schools and somewhat less than 25% from secondary schools. In comparison, the returns indicated in the foregoing table seem more than satisfactory, and contradict the implication that teachers are reluctant to participate in research into what takes place in their schools. This latter view is further substantiated by the fact that some respondents who had obviously missed the return of the questionnaires by their schools even took the trouble to post them to the writer.

Prior to implementation of the survey, it was hypothesised that response from the schools which the writer did not visit personally to discuss the survey (schools 2, 3 and 4) would be likely to return a smaller percentage of responses than the schools which the writer had visited for discussions. From Table 5 it can be seen that this was not the case, in fact the schools which were not visited gave a marginally better return than the schools which were visited.

4.5 Preparation for computer analysis

In order that the scored questionnaires could be analysed by computer, coding sheets (data sheets) were prepared. Within the coding there were included indicators of the school to which each respondent belonged, whether they were male or female and their length of teaching experience. Further instructions were included to allow crosstabulation between questions. Questions 4, 9 and 11 were omitted from the computer analysis because it was intended that they would be analysed manually.

Initially, it was intended to process the data on the computer (380Z) in the writer's own school; thus it was hoped that it would be valuable recommendation to be able to say that the entire research can be school-based. However,
having spent several months formulating a program for the school computer, it was not possible to be confident that the eventual analysis obtained was reliable. It was decided that rather than risk the possibility of prejudicing the value of the findings, the analysis of the data would be carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al., 1975, 2nd Edition) which provides ideal methods for analysis of data in the manner required for this research.¹

The eventual analysis of the data was carried out at the Open University, Milton Keynes, using one of their computer terminals to obtain access to the SPSS.

In using the SPSS for crosstabulation purposes, the analysis printed out offers four sets of figures as a count of the data in the cells, count (absolute frequency); row percent; column percent and total percent (refer p.240 SPSS).

1. The reader is recommended to refer particularly to the following pages in the SPSS for method involved in using the package in relation to this research:

p.13 Control cards and data used to enter data, perform a crosstabulation and save file (order of presentation is important)

pp.14,72,80 Run name — title of file

pp.33,34,36-38 Variable list

pp.59-60 Value labels — (allows user to include on printout labels such as number of school etc.)

pp.39-40 Input medium — card, tape, disk

pp.17,22,32,57-59 Missing values — e.g. no response

pp.41-49 Input format

pp.40-41 N of cases

pp.195-199 Frequencies

pp.218-247 Crosstabulation and application of chi-square

pp.66 Options (allows user to choose among available sub-program options)

pp.66-67 Statistics — (allows user to select among a number of available statistics to accompany the calculations)

pp.14,67,80 To read input data
The absolute frequency (or Count) indicates the actual number of persons who responded per each analysis cell. Row percent figures illustrate in appropriate cells the absolute frequency figures as a percentage of the rows in which they occur. Column percent figures show the absolute frequency in each cell as a percentage of the column in which they appear. The total percent expresses the absolute frequency figures as a percentage of the total response i.e. the total percent figures are related to all the cells in the resulting grid print out.

The use of all the above options is not necessary for the kind of illustrations it is desired to show in this work.

For this reason, and for increased simplicity in presentation of analysis, only two of the options are used in illustrations in the appendices, absolute frequency and column percent (the latter is indicated in the appendices as RF = relative frequency).

The use of column percent as the relative frequency is appropriate in this case because the main fixed variables which are being examined are those in the left hand margin of analysis. Therefore, here we are concerned with identifying any differences which occur in the columns, as opposed to the rows or over the complete matrix.

4.6. Analysis of survey results

The computerised analysis was required first to extract a frequency distribution for each of the questions (results - Appendix E). These frequency distribution were then used in crosstabulation between questions and a chi-square test applied. The usual convention was followed of taking any association with a significance level of 5 per
cent or less (< .05)\(^1\) as indicating the likelihood of a 'real' association. Those results found significant were extracted from the data and used for illustration (Appendix F).

The only statistical test applied was chi-square and wherever significance levels are quoted they are relevant to that test. For the reader interested in checking significance levels quoted from here on, the reader is referred to chi-square tables readily available in several related texts (e.g. Garrett, 1970, p.462 and Cohen, 1976 p. 400).

Chi-square is a test of statistical significance which helps to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables. This is done by computing the cell frequencies which would be expected if no relationship is present between the variables given the existing row and column totals (marginals). The expected cell frequencies are then compared to the actual values found in the table according to the following formula:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o^i - f_e^i)^2}{f_e^i} \]

where \( f_o^i \) equals the observed frequency in each cell, and \( f_e^i \) equals the expected frequency calculated as

---

1. 5 per cent significance level means that the likelihood of the result occurring by chance is 1 in 20. However, it also means that out of every 20 results, one may be statistically significant by chance.

The most commonly used levels of significance are .05 and .01 (Garrett, 1970). The level at which the researcher chooses to set significance should be determined by his estimate of the importance or possible practical significance of his findings (Siegel, 1956). Bearing in mind that the pilot investigation revealed only a few crosstabulations significant at the 5 per cent level, it is appropriate that significance levels of .05 should be set for the current research.
\[
f_{e}^{i} = \left( \frac{c_{i}r_{i}}{N} \right)
\]  
(Nie et al., 1975, p.223)

where \( c_{i} \) is the frequency in a respective column marginal, \( r_{i} \) is the frequency in a respective row marginal, and \( N \) stands for total number of valid cases.

The Chi-square shows (where significant) where differences of opinion occur and if these differences are not likely to have occurred by chance.

One of the limitations of the use of the chi-square test is that the expected cell frequencies in each cell should not be too small. When this requirement is violated, the results become meaningless. Cochran (1954) recommends that for chi-square tests with degrees of freedom larger than 1, fewer than 20 percent of the cells should have an expected frequency of less than 1.\(^1\)

In the crosstabulations carried out it was frequently found that the resulting analyses fell foul of this very problem. That is, often too many cells had an expected frequency of less than one, thus making the resulting significance figure unreliable.

One of the answers to this difficulty is to combine categories which are being compared so that fewer than 20 percent of the cells have expected frequencies of less than 5 and no cell has an expected frequency of less than 1. In this way the test can be meaningfully applied. However, the adjacent categories which are combined must have some common property or mutual identity if interpretation of the outcome of the test after combining is to be possible.

\(^1\) For more detailed discussion of this problem the reader is referred to Siegel (1956, p.178).
One of the reasons that some of the crosstabulations carried out in this research revealed cell weaknesses was that the sample contained only a very small percentage (2.8%) of teachers with less than one year of teaching experience (refer question 2). It was decided to combine categories 1 (less than one year experience) and 2 (1-5 years experience), in other words produce a single category of 0-5 years' teaching experience. However, this did not improve the position because there were other factors, such as insufficient response in some cells, which also led the computer analyses to warn that a too high percentage of the cells had an expected frequency less than 5.0.

Further combination of categories was not possible without destroying the overall aim of the questionnaire. Hence, one is forced to acknowledge the observation made by Siegel (1956, p.179) that the researchers' will guard against the necessity of combining categories if he uses a sufficiently large N in his research'. Future research along the lines indicated in this work would obviously benefit from a larger sample.

The greater majority of the crosstabulation results were rejected because they failed to differentiate between the variables at the 5% level of significance, or suffered from the difficulty described above, therefore these rejected results are not appended.

All the relevant results are shown in Appendices E and F and whilst some of the main results are tabled in the text the Appendices should now be read in conjunction with the text.
Questions 1 and 2 (Appendices E1 and E2)

The sample consisted of 178 teachers of which 98 (55.1%) were male and 80 (44.9%) were female. 2.8% had been teaching for less than one year, 20.8% had been teaching for between one and five years whilst the remaining 76.4% had been teaching for more than five years.

Question 3 (Appendix E3)

Which sex do you experience greater problems with?

Analysis of the combined response of the 6 schools showed that 24.7% of the respondents felt that they experienced greater problems with male pupils, 8.4% with females whilst the remaining 66.9% considered they experienced no difference between the sexes. This result showed close resemblance to the findings of the pilot study where 72.7% considered they experienced no difference between the sexes with regard to behaviour problems.

When question 3 was crosstabulated with the six schools, sex of respondents and with teaching experience no significant difference was found between the variables.

Question 4 (Appendix E4)

Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems?

The objective of including this question in the survey was to try and establish whether teachers felt that incidence of behaviour problems are more apparent in particular years of secondary schooling, and further, if there was any considered difference between boys and girls in respect of age.

The respondents were invited to indicate which years they considered showed the greatest incidence of behaviour problems, of which they might indicate more than one if necessary e.g. years 3, 4 and 5. In analysis, a point was awarded to each year category for each of the responses made and these points were then totalled per
category to form Table 6.

From Table 6 it can be seen that there is considerable consistency of response per category between schools. The resulting figures indicate that it is the third and fourth years of secondary education that the teachers in the sample encountered greatest incidence of behaviour problems, with a slight decline in incidence during the fifth year. The figures further show that there is little considered significant difference between boys and girls as to age of behaviour problems. These findings were very much in accord with the results recorded related to this question in the pilot study.

Table 6 (Appendix E4)

Q4. Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems? You may circle more than one year group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) in boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 9

Which age group do you teach? (Circle all appropriate years)

It is pertinent to discuss the findings of question 9 here because they have an important relationship with question 4.

The analysis of question 4 could be questionable unless we know which years of secondary education the sample teachers actually teach. For example, the finding that it is the third, fourth and fifth years of secondary education that shows the greatest incidence of behaviour problems could be meaningless if a greater percentage of the sample teachers were in fact only teaching this age range. For this reason, question 9 was included in the questionnaire to establish the age range with which the sample were involved in teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Totals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \cdot \) (0 - none more than others)

(Absolute frequency figures)
Total scored response

Comparison between boys and girls and age of greatest incidence of behaviour problems.
Teachers' opinion
From Table 6.
The method of analysis adopted for this question was similar to that for question 4. A point was awarded to each response per year category, and further discrimination was made between the six schools and between male and female teachers. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 shows that the sample of teachers used were generally employed in teaching throughout the age range of secondary education, and the trend is similarly reflected when one compares individual schools and the sex of respondents. Therefore, one can conclude that the responses to question 9 show that the age range the sample teach will not distort the findings of question 4.

The implication of the comparison between the results of the response to questions 4 and 9 are that the teachers in the sample feel able to cope with first and second year pupils, but less adequate to handle problems with third, fourth and fifth year age groups.

Table 7 (Appendix E9)
Q9. Which age group do you teach?
(Circle all appropriate years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1 Male Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2 Male Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3 Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4 Male Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5 Male Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6 Male Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1 Female Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2 Female Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3 Female Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4 Female Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5 Female Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6 Female Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Male/Female Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Absolute frequency figures)

Question 5 (Appendix E5)

Would you say that incidence of behaviour problems in your school occur, often, sometimes, rarely?

Analysis of the combined response of the six schools showed that 11.2% of the sample felt that behaviour problems occurred often, 65.2% said that they occurred sometimes, whilst the remaining 23.6% said they occurred rarely. These figures show that by far the greatest percentage of the teachers involved in the survey felt that behaviour problems only occurred sometimes.

Crosstabulation of question 5 with the six schools did reveal that schools 5 and 6 showed a higher proportion of the teachers in those schools considered that incidence of behaviour problems occurred often. However, this latter observation cannot be accepted without reservation because the computer output warns that 33.3% of the cells have expected cell frequency of less than 5.0.
Again, this result shows close similarity with the result obtained from the pilot study where 71.4% of the sample indicated that behaviour problems only occurred sometimes.

**Question 6 (Appendix E6)**

Do you believe that incidence of behaviour problems in your school is

1. Increasing?
2. Decreasing?
3. Not changing?

This question does allow for valuable comparison with question 5, because if the analysis of question 5 shows that the respondents feel that incidence of behaviour problems only occur sometimes, the analysis of question 6 should not indicate that incidence of behaviour problems is increasing. Comparison of these results could be considered an indicator of whether the respondents have given serious consideration to the questionnaire.

Analysis of question 6 perhaps confirms that the respondents have treated the questionnaire seriously. The combined schools response revealed that 23% of the sample believed that incidence of behaviour problems in their school was increasing, 15.2% felt that they were decreasing whilst the remaining 61.8% stated they were not changing.

Crosstabulation of question 6 with question 1 (sex of respondents) and question 2 (length of teaching experience) did not reveal any significant difference of opinion. Crosstabulation of this question with the six schools did reveal a highly significant figure (refer to Table 8).

This latter crosstabulation shows school 5 standing out with a relatively high percentage (43.3%) of the respondents saying that incidence of behaviour problems are decreasing. The reason that this school differs significantly from the others can possibly be attributed to two reasons. This school had a new headteacher and had recently
instituted a new policy aimed at improving behaviour in the school.

Whilst this result is shown in Table 8 as highly significant, it will be observed from the table that this analysis suffers from the problem described earlier in that the computer output warns that 22.2% of the valid cells have expected cell frequency of less than 5.0, therefore we cannot consider the finding conclusive.

This finding closely corresponds with the pilot study (compare appendices C6 and E6).

Table 8  
Crossttabulation of question 6 (incidence of behaviour problems) by schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6.</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>School 5</th>
<th>School 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Increasing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Decreasing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Not Changing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 38.21275$  10DF  SIGNIFICANCE 0.0000

(22.2% of the valid cells have expected cell frequency of less than 5.0)
Question 7 (Appendix E7)

How effective do you think the Schools Psychological Service is in helping your school to handle discipline problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response alternatives offered for this question were changed from those used in the pilot study (completely effective, moderately effective and ineffective) to very effective, effective and ineffective. This change was made for two reasons. Firstly, it is unlikely that any service could hope to be 'completely effective'. Secondly, the response to this question in the pilot study showed that a very large percentage (77.9%) of the respondents felt that the Schools Psychological Service is ineffective. It was considered that modification of the response alternatives would allow greater discrimination between the alternatives, or reaffirm teachers' lack of confidence in the service.

Analysis of the response to this question showed that only 1 person (0.6%) of the 178 respondents felt that the Schools Psychological Service was very effective, 21.3% stated that it was effective but 78.1% felt that it was ineffective. Thus we find that this investigation has reaffirmed the view expressed in the pilot study that teachers in this group do not have confidence in the effectiveness of the service in assisting them to handle discipline problems. This implied criticism is discussed further in the conclusions to this chapter when the point of view of the psychologist is examined.

Crosstabulation of question 7 by sex of respondents (Q1), length of teaching experience or the six schools did not reveal any significant difference of opinion on this question.
Question 8 (Appendix E8)

Which of the following would you prefer as a method for handling continuously disruptive pupils?
(Circle the number of your choice)

1. Contain the pupil in normal classes but teacher-guided by regular professional advice, e.g. educational psychologist, how best to handle the situation to bring about behaviour modification.

2. Contain pupil within a special unit of the school staffed by teachers operating a programme of behaviour modification.

3. Send the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils.

In response to question 8 it was found that in the combined response of all 6 schools 14.6% of the sample teachers preferred 'guided classes', 43.8% favoured the 'special unit' suggestion and 41.6% were in favour of sending the pupil to a 'separate institution'. These results are a close reflection of the responses obtained during the pilot study (refer Appendix C8).

From these figures it would seem that teachers are clearly divided between the 'special unit' and 'separate institution' alternatives. What is interesting is the apparent rejection of the 'guided classes' suggestion. This further underlines the response to question 7 where the respondents expressed lack of confidence in the effectiveness of the Schools Psychological Service.

There were no major variations when this question was crosstabulated with length of teaching experience or between the six schools. However, there was a trend, which fell just short of statistical significance (refer Table 9), for a smaller percentage of females to choose alternative 3.

This suggests that female teachers are more sensitive than males with regard to sending disruptive pupils to a special institution.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>(1) Male teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guided classes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Unit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Unit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.39083 \quad 2DF \text{ SIGNIFICANCE 0.0675} \]

**Interpretation**

2 df 5.991 at 5% level
2 df 9.210 at 1% level

Therefore, this result is just below chosen significance level.

Source: Garrett (1970, p.462)
**Question 10 (Appendices E10 to E21)**

Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following as contributory causes of discipline problems in schools. 1 — high contribution 2 — some contribution 3 — no contribution

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lack of early intervention (by the school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Poor home background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Decline in general standards demanded by society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Size of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Inexperience of some teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Modern teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Basic characteristics of child's personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Inadequate social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Inadequate support by senior staff of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Inadequate local authority support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Low intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in respect of the sub-sections of Question 10 are summarised for convenience in Table 10. This summary is formulated using only adjusted frequency figures. However, complete data for each of the question sub sections, showing absolute frequency, relative frequency, missing responses and adjusted frequency, can be referred to in Appendices E10 to E21.
Table 10 (Appendices E10 to E21 summarised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted frequency % figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Lack of early intervention (by the school)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Poor home background</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Decline in general standards demanded by society</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Size of school</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Inexperience of some teachers</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Modern teaching methods</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Basic characteristics of child's personality</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Inadequate social services</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Inadequate support by senior staff of schools</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Inadequate local authority support</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) Low intelligence</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adjusted frequency figures obtained by elimination of non-response where these occurred).

Table 10 shows that in respect of lack of early intervention by the school as a contributory cause of discipline problems, the sample have mainly elected for the alternative of 'some contribution' (58.2%) whilst 33.1% indicated that this was a high contributor. This result differed from the pilot study where the respondents were more closely divided between these two alternatives (52.6% high contribution, 46.1% some contribution). Part of the reason for this slight change in response may be attributed to the addition of the words 'by the school', which defines this sub-section more clearly.
The change in response compared to the earlier investigation shows that the respondents do not see lack of early intervention by the school as a high contributor, but that they do see lack of early intervention by some other factor (perhaps the home) as a higher contributor than the school. However, this interpretation of the result cannot be considered conclusive because we still have 33.1% stating that lack of early intervention by the school is a high contributor. This question could provide a more definite answer in future research with a separate sub-section seeking a further response on lack of early intervention by the home as a contributor, although the following sub-section probably indicates what the response would be.

Poor home background is seen as a high contributor (64.0%), 32.6% said there was some contribution whilst only 3.4% considered it made no contribution. These findings are a close reflection of the results obtained in the pilot study and therefore, perhaps not surprisingly, we can conclude that teachers consider that poor home background is closely related to problems in schools.

Decline in general standards demanded by society was seen as only making some contribution to discipline problems, as also was inexperience of some teachers. These findings were also a close reflection of those obtained during the earlier investigation.

Modern teaching methods was the highest scoring 'no contribution' factor, closely followed by inadequate social services. From Table 10 can be seen that these question sub-sections show the sample closely divided between 'some contribution' and 'no contribution'. Again, these findings show close similarity to the pilot study.

The table shows that in respect of the child's personality as a contributory factor, there is a close division between 'high contribution' (46.3%) and 'some contribution' (42.9%). This result differs from the findings
of the earlier investigation which returned scores of 27.3% and 58.4% respectively. There is no apparent reason for this movement towards the high contribution alternative. One can only hypothesise a possible change in opinion, or alternatively one could point to the increased reliability of the larger sample in the current research.

A comparison between the result of the poor home background and personality of child sub-sections (questions 1O8 and 1OG, Appendices E12 and E17) encourages speculation. Both of these sub-sections show that teachers consider that these factors make a significant contribution to behaviour problems in school. This would seem to be a rejection of the 'deficit' theory. Simply put, supporters of the 'deficit hypothesis' refute the thesis that children and their homes bring deficient qualities to school; they are more likely to blame the school or the education system for inadequacies apparent in the child. Obviously, from the aforementioned response it would seem that the teachers in this sample would reject this view.

Inadequate support by senior staff and local authority were not seen as high contributors, and neither was low intelligence. These findings also showed close similarity to the pilot study.

All the sub-sections of question 10 were cross-tabulated by the six schools, sex of respondents and teaching experience. The only crosstabulation which proved significant at the 5% level was between 1OK, low intelligence as a contributory cause of discipline problems, and question 1, sex of respondents. In Appendix F1 it can be seen that female teachers are more likely than male teachers to consider that low intelligence is a contributory factor to discipline problems in schools. There was a similar trend which fell just short of statistical significance with regard to this question in the earlier research.
In the pilot study, crosstabulation of section 10B, poor home background, and question 1, sex of respondents, it was found significant that male teachers are more likely than female teachers to consider home background is a factor contributory to discipline problems in schools. The current research revealed a similar trend but this fell short of statistical significance.

Question 11

Please write down here your own personal definition of maladjustment.

For the reasons stated in Chapter 3 it was not intended that this question would be analysed by computer, but the statements made by respondents were classified into 3 categories.

1) RULES
   - emphasised the norms of society
   - 'failure to accept norms of society'
   - 'failure to fit in with rules generally accepted by society'
   - 'rejection of behaviour patterns considered acceptable by society'

2) PERSONALITY
   - emphasised personality factors
   - 'inability to relate with other human beings''
   - 'unable to interact with others in an acceptable way'
   - 'inability to adjust to changing situations'
   - 'abnormality in perception of self'

   (the statements are selected from the responses)

3) MISCELLANEOUS
   - could not define, or responses too vague to categorise
   - 'child is a continual problem'
   - 'always misbehaving'
   - 'delinquents are maladjusted'
There are obvious overlaps between category one and two in that it may well be that personality problems could be the reason that a child cannot fit in with society, and of course there are unending questions as to what is the 'norm', or to which form of society one is referring. However, by observing whether the respondents placed emphasis on personality factors, or the rule factor, it was possible to categorise the results which are summarised in Table 11.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Category 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18(64.28%)</td>
<td>5(17.86%)</td>
<td>5(17.86%)</td>
<td>28(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19(54.29%)</td>
<td>7(20.00%)</td>
<td>9(25.71%)</td>
<td>35(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18(69.23%)</td>
<td>5(19.23%)</td>
<td>3(11.54%)</td>
<td>26(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19(51.35%)</td>
<td>13(35.14%)</td>
<td>5(13.51%)</td>
<td>37(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12(40.00%)</td>
<td>13(43.33%)</td>
<td>5(16.67%)</td>
<td>30(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9(40.91%)</td>
<td>8(36.36%)</td>
<td>5(22.73%)</td>
<td>22(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95(53.37%)</td>
<td>50(28.09%)</td>
<td>33(18.54%)</td>
<td>178(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that the findings of Table 11 can be criticised on the grounds that they are dependent upon the respondent's understanding of the term maladjustment, and also the writer's interpretation of their definitions. However, it does illustrate again the problems of using the term maladjustment which were outlined in Chapter 1.

Bearing the foregoing comments in mind, we may tentatively say that a trend can be seen where a greater percentage of the sample, in their definitions, stressed the need to fit in with the rules of society than those who emphasised personality factors. However, it will be seen that the trend is not consistent in all schools, and further, the percentage of deviation varies considerably comparing some schools.
The two main categories used as a basis for definitions are not entirely in opposition to one another, but, depending on which definition the teachers have chosen, may reflect their attitude to disruptive behaviour. For example, teachers who do not recognise the effect of personality factors on behaviour are probably more likely to discipline a deviant pupil rather than look to methods of helping the pupil overcome his personality problems.

This view can only be speculative, and more substantive conclusions cannot be drawn without further inquiry, perhaps through interviews. This hypothesis could be investigated in future research by linking the respondents' response to this question with another designed to determine whether they feel deviant pupils should be controlled or disciplined as opposed to helping them to overcome their problems.

**Question 12 (Appendices E23 to E39)**

Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

- 0 — Not used
- 1 — Very effective
- 2 — Effective
- 3 — Ineffective
Where respondents did not tick a question sub-section, or indicated 0 (not used) and failed to tick the sub-section, 'no response' was recorded into the data and in the analysis these 'no responses' were excluded to give an adjusted frequency.

In the summary of the findings for question 12 (Table 12) only the adjusted frequency is shown, but the full results showing absolute, relative and adjusted frequencies can be found in Appendices E23 to E29 which also show the 'no responses' and 'not used' responses where they occur. The customary minor rounding up to the total figure has been carried out in places.
Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted frequency % figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Corporal punishment</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Detention</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Temporary exclusion from school</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Permanent exclusion from school</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Temporary exclusion from normal classes</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Consultation with parents and pupils</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Loss of privileges</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Referral to other teachers</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Referral to Head Teacher</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Calling in a specialist (psychologist, social worker etc.)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) Organised monitoring of pupil</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) Ignoring behaviour problems</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) Small group teaching</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) Mobilising pupil opinions</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) Imposition of extra work</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) Verbal rebuke</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chapter 3 (vide section 3.4) it was stated that the findings in the pilot study relating to question 12 (see Table 3) were viewed with suspicion because the respondents had largely chosen alternative 2. It was felt that this might indicate that the respondents had taken a 'middle of the road' approach, choosing the middle alternative, possibly because the wording of the alternative choices for this question (completely effective, moderately
effective, ineffective) did not allow sufficient discrimination. For this reason, it was decided that in the current research this question would offer the following revised response alternatives.

1 — Very effective  2 — Effective  3 — Ineffective

If we compare Table 3 (Chapter 3) and Table 12 from the point of view of establishing which response columns the greater number of respondents have chosen for each question sub-section, we can see that the 'pattern' formed is very similar in both studies. In other words, in both studies the majority of the respondents are accepting or rejecting the same alternatives, thus giving greater creditability to the findings. For convenient comparison Table 13 is produced simply plotting where the majority choices were made in Tables 3 and 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response alternatives</th>
<th>Pilot Study</th>
<th>Current Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12 sub-section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst the illustration in Table 13 does allow useful comparison with the pilot study in indicating the main trend for question 12, direct comparison between the two studies have to take into account the previously described changes in response alternatives, and the fact that whilst the overall trend is very similar, the percentages involved often differ. Clearly, the most valuable method of examining the feedback from question 12 is to concentrate on analysis of the current research. For this purpose, the reader is referred to Table 12 and appendices E24 to E29.

The findings from question 12 show that, as one might expect, the most effective means of maintaining good order and discipline was permanent exclusion from school (Q12D). None of the remaining sub-sections are seen by the majority of the respondents as 'very effective'.

Calling in a specialist, such as psychologist or social worker (Q12D) was seen as ineffective by 60.7% of the respondents. This reaction also emerged from the pilot study where it became clear that respondents were particularly scathing of the effectiveness of the Schools Psychological Service.

Ignoring behaviour problems (Q12L) was overwhelmingly seen as ineffective (97%). Whilst this might at first sight not seem surprising, it does of course conflict with the ideal of the theories put forward by Skinner and his supporters. Simply put, Skinner maintains that we should reinforce acceptable behaviour and ignore undesired responses. This is of course an over-simplification of a more complex theory for the purpose of these brief comments, but it does seem surprising that there appears to be so little support for a theory which has at least divided educationalists for many years.

Mobilising pupil opinions (Q12N) was also seen as ineffective (56.6%) as was also imposition of extra work (Q120, 47.3%), although the sample were divided on the latter
question with 45.6% saying the method was effective. This division is perhaps not surprising when one considers that imposition of extra work is one of the most common methods of punishment used in schools.

One of the surprising revelations from the aforementioned 'ineffective' methods of dealing with problems was the number of respondents who stated that the methods suggested were not used. For example, in relation to question 12N, 60 respondents (33.7%) said that mobilising pupil opinions was not used in their school. It does seem difficult to believe that these 60 respondents could be so clearly aware of what procedure is being applied by all other colleagues in their school.

If one refers to other questions one finds similar responses (related to 'not used') as somewhat surprising, even though smaller numbers were involved. For example, in response to question 12J, 7 respondents stated that their school does not call in a specialist such as a psychologist or social worker. It is difficult to believe that these members of the sample can be fully aware of the procedures carried out by the school in which they are employed.

In some instances where the numbers indicating 'not used' were small, it was possible to clearly identify where the respondents were not fully aware of the procedure which was followed in their own school. For example, closer examination revealed that whilst a respondent had stated that a particular method was not employed in their school, a large majority of the remaining respondents declared that the method was used, thus indicating that some respondents were not aware of procedure in their school.

From Tables 12 and 13 it can be seen that the main trend for the majority of the methods suggested as a means of maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole are seen as having some effect. By reference to Table 12, it will be observed that the response to these
question sub-sections in the 'effective' category are also closely consistent, with almost all the sections recording percentages between the mid 50's and 60's.

In a similar manner to question 10, all the sub-sections of question 12 were crosstabulated by schools, sex of respondents and teaching experience. The only crosstabulation which proved significant at the 5% level was question sub-section 12B (detention).

Crosstabulation of question 12B (detention) by question 1 (sex of respondents) proved significant (0.0124) and showed that females were more likely than males to consider detention effective (refer appendix F2). In the initial computer analysis it was found that 1 out of 8 (12.5%) of the valid cells had a cell frequency of less than 5.0, and, as explained earlier such a warning renders the resulting significance level suspect. However, elimination of 10 'not used' responses (which were themselves suspect) and 2 no responses, produced a significant result and eliminated the cell frequency warning. We can therefore, conclude that females are more likely than males to consider detention is effective as a means of maintaining good order and discipline in the school (refer appendix F3).

4.7. Composite analyses of all variables

a) Incidence of disruptive behaviour

The findings of the survey indicate that a greater percentage of the teachers in the sample felt that incidence of behaviour problems in their school was neither increasing or decreasing, and further that no difference was experienced between boys and girls as to age or incidence of problems. It was also found that the higher incidence occurred in the upper age group of secondary education, with a slight decline in the fifth year. These results reaffirmed the findings of the pilot study.
The N.A.S. (Lowenstein, 1975) also found that upper school pupils cause most disruption, although they did not find it declining in the fifth year. In their survey however, they concluded that boys were more inclined to indulge in disruptive behaviour than girls, which is not in accord with the writer's findings.

The survey results showed that a large percentage of the questionnaire respondents felt that behaviour problems occurred only sometimes, with only a relatively small percentage stating that they occurred often, and further, that incidence of behaviour problems were not considered to be increasing.

These latter findings are in close agreement with the figures produced by the N.A.S. survey. However, the N.A.S. considered that there is a reluctance by teachers to talk about disruption in their classrooms, and they, therefore, suggest that their figures on incidence of disruptive behaviour may have been 'under-reported'. The generous response to this research by teachers contradicts the belief that teachers are unwilling to discuss this problem, and the close agreement between the survey result of the N.A.S. and those of the writer seem to indicate that the N.A.S. figures were not 'under-reported' and behaviour problems in school are not increasing, although one cannot generalise from a sample of this size.

b) Contributory causes of disruptive behaviour

Similar to the pilot study, poor home background was thought to be a major contributor to discipline problems and decline in general standards demanded by society similarly so. However, the current research differed from the earlier study in that the sample were divided in respect of the influence of the child's personality (question 12G, 46.3% 'high contribution', 42.9% 'some contribution' and 14.3% 'no contribution') compared with the pilot study where 27.3% said 'high contribution', 58.4% 'some contribution' and 14.3% 'no contribution'.
In respect of modern teaching methods, the sample were largely divided between 'some contribution' and 'no contribution', whilst inexperience of some teachers was seen by a large percentage as making some contribution to problems, as was also low intelligence of some pupils. Size of school was also seen as making some contribution to problems, but not a high contribution.

The N.A.S. survey did not cover the causes of disruptive behaviour in the same manner as this survey and some of their conclusions in this respect were derived from comments and statements by respondents. However, their statistics in relation to school size indicated that the bigger the school, the more disruptive behaviour is to be expected. This is contrary to the findings of Rutter et al. (1979) who found that this factor does not imply greater incidence of behaviour problems, and this research has shown that teachers consider that size of school only makes some contribution.

c) Effectiveness of methods used to deal with disruptive behaviour

Several of the findings related to this aspect of the survey have much in accord with the results of the N.A.S. survey.

Permanent exclusion from school was seen as the only highly effective means of maintaining discipline in school.

Corporal punishment was largely seen as effective, with only a relatively small percentage of the respondents saying that it was high effective or ineffective. All of the aforementioned findings are in close agreement with both the N.A.S. findings and those of the earlier investigation by the writer.
The current findings showed that the most ineffective method of dealing with problems was ignoring behaviour problems. Calling in a specialist was also seen as largely inadequate and this finding perhaps reinforces the response to question 7 where teachers expressed a lack of confidence in the effectiveness of the Schools Psychological Service. The foregoing were in complete agreement with the N.A.S. in that these were the same two categories that their survey also found were considered as more ineffective than any other method.

In acknowledging teachers' criticisms of the psychological service, one must also recognise the point of view of educational psychologists. These have recently been expressed by Gregory (1980) in the Bulletin of The British Psychological Society. One of the criticisms of the School Psychological Service put forward elsewhere in this work (vide Chapter 5, section 5.8b) is that when the educational psychologist visits the secondary school, he sees the pupil in isolation, and often without full consultation with teaching staff. However, there are counter arguments which support the psychologists. For example, Gregory (1980, p.383) points virtually the same kind of criticism at schools when he quotes examples of schools where the headteachers 'work hard to keep the "psychology boys" out of their schools, and made it extremely difficult for the psychologist to talk to the relevant staff in the school'.

Gregory also draws attention to the fact that a large percentage of problem children are generated by the inadequacies of the school. He quotes Tutt (1976) as the only researcher providing evidence that staff of institutions like schools can sometimes act against the interests of some children. However, this thesis by a practising teacher does recognise this problem (vide Chapter 5), and recent research by Rutter et al. (1979) makes a considerable contribution to the knowledge of school factors shaping children's behaviour.
Of the three suggested methods of dealing with continuously disruptive pupils, the respondents were closely divided between the suggestions of a special unit in the school, and sending the pupil to a separate institution. In other words, the sample were less receptive to the suggestion of classes guided by educational psychologists. There was a trend which fell short of statistical significance, which showed that females are more sensitive than males with regard to sending disruptive pupils to a special institution.

4.8 Conclusions to survey

Whilst many comparisons have been made with the N.A.S. survey, it must be stressed that the methods used and sample size differ considerably, and in many respects the surveys did not cover the same ground. It must also be stated that the current work has at times revealed that a larger sample would make the findings more reliable and conclusive, particularly in the case of some of the crosstabulations which suffered from lack of response in some cells.

The willingness of teachers to participate in the research can only be seen as commendable, and surely refutes the suggestion that they are unwilling to take part in such investigations. However, it has also been clear that headteachers are often unwilling to allow investigation in their schools. Furthermore, it seems likely that some headteachers do not even consult their staff to establish whether they wish to participate.

Much of the work discussed in this chapter has dealt with aspects which can be seen causal to behaviour problems, or methods which are used to try and offset these causes. Whilst within this part of the study the influence of the school has been included, these influences can be seen to be direct. What has not been investigated so far is the way in which a school can overtly influence behaviour, either favourably or adversely.
In the following chapter this aspect is examined through a number of case studies of problem pupils. These case studies constitute a worthwhile activity because they illustrate how the administrative policy of a school can influence the effectiveness of handling disruptive pupils. This can shed more light on possibly tenuous data emphasizing the need for explicit guidance to teachers and schools looking to research for constructive advice.
CHAPTER 5.

THE CASE STUDIES

5.1 The rationale for case studies

The child spends more time in school than in any other place than the home. The fact that the school is presided over by trained professionals should mean that the environment is at least theoretically manipulable, and able to provide conditions suited and adaptable to the varying needs of differing personalities. The extent to which schools provide these conditions must be debatable because many studies allege that schools can be included among the causes of disruptive behaviour, insofar as they do not provide suitable conditions for differing needs (Burt and Howard, 1952, Holt, 1965, Hargreaves, 1967, Clegg and Megson, 1968). Recent research has indicated that there may be some justification for the allegation (Rutter et al. 1979).

Wall (1973) says that teachers are not, at present, trained to detect maladjustment other than in a blanket way, neither do they have the time nor professional skills to deal with even the mildly maladjusted child. Wall further
maintains that the environment of schools is not suitable for the problem children to be found in them. Dunham (1976, 1977) suggests that even the 'managers' of schools (e.g. heads, heads of department, heads of houses and senior staff) need in-service training to help them to provide positive support for their subordinates who teach disruptive pupils. In other words, Dunham maintains that even the 'managers' of schools do not have the skills necessary to be of constructive help in dealing with problem pupils.

It would seem that if the school is in any way to provide for problem children, there must be some attempt to design an environment structured in the light of their specific problems. What is being suggested, is that, the schools have the child a sufficient length of time to make some contribution towards behaviour modification. But, due in part to the largely uniform curriculum of secondary schools, many fail to deal with disruption in a satisfactory way. Many teachers would maintain that circumstances prevent them from making a more positive contribution; which raises the question of whether, in this instance, administrative procedures could be effectively changed? This chapter investigates such a possibility, through a case study approach. Arguments supporting the use of this form of investigation are discussed in detail later in Chapter 7.

One of the major difficulties faced by the researcher involved in this form of evaluation is gaining intimate knowledge of the institution or individual he is studying. This particularly requires the researcher to gain acceptance of him by the community of the institution being investigated.

The report related here benefited from the fact that the writer was employed in the school where the study was carried out. However, whilst this is an advantage, it was important to guard against personal bias. This possibility can be crucial to the value of the eventual analysis, because the end product is not a set of 'findings', but an
interpretation of a highly complex system (Parlett, 1975).

The general aim of this part of the study is to evaluate the effects an institution has on pupils' behaviour and learning, particularly when the school develops special curricular arrangements for disruptive pupils. In pursuit of this objective several techniques were used: interviews, conversations, observation, examination of records and objective evaluation of the wealth of information these techniques obtained.

In the school-based case studies included in this chapter, it was expected that critical observation of pupils identified as disruptive would provide indications of whether the school can be seen as causal to problem behaviour because of the administrative policy adopted. The case studies were also intended to serve as the basis of an analytical investigation by direct feedback of how a school might be effective in reducing disruptive behaviour.

Most teachers and their schools would accept the suggestion that they contribute to behaviour problems, but what is important is why the school is adversely influencing behaviour. Without this information we can recognise, but not remedy, the situation. Case studies carried out in appropriate circumstances can provide this information. Within this chapter two differing administrative procedures of a single school are examined to investigate the effect of policy on two boys.

The final decision to embark upon the following case studies was influenced by the fact that the school, to which the writer had access, experienced a change in headteacher, and a subsequent change in policy for dealing with problem pupils. This presents an excellent opportunity to compare differing administrative procedures to establish their effect on behaviour. In this respect the case studies investigate both the institution and individuals.
This investigation assumes that the head of a school is critical variable, among other factors, in influencing school policy, even where teaching staff enjoy a degree of autonomy in the school decision-making process. There is not space here to go into details for every factor which could be mentioned to support this assertion, but the following are prime considerations. The head has a major influence in the appointment and promotion of staff, allocation of capitation to departments and is the member of staff who has contact with all the other factors which influence the policies and 'climate' of the school. Consequently, even in a school such as that investigated, where teaching staff enjoy a considerable degree of autonomy, the headmaster remains a powerful influence in the decision-making process.

The policies of both the aforementioned heads will be examined in more detail subsequently. It should be stated here that, contrary to the allegation of non-co-operation by headteachers put forward in Chapters 3 and 4, both these heads were very helpful at all times. Requests for interviews were always granted and they allowed lengthy and frank discussions. This chapter owes much to their assistance, as it does to the Heads of Year and other teachers who willingly participated in discussions.

The following case studies investigate two different administrative procedures in one comprehensive school and compare their effects on two disruptive boys. Examination of a third boy is also included because it provides useful insight into the manner in which the curriculum can be manipulated to motivate the less able or the troublesome pupil.

A criticism of the case study approach to research is that the quality of the investigation can be restricted by limited access to the subject of the study. The consequence of this problem is that case studies are frequently retrospective, and post factum studies cannot be replicated. Consequently, the investigator draws heavily on reference to
records or interviews which are based on the memory of the interviewee.

These case studies avoid the aforementioned problems because they were carried out in the writer's own school. A further advantage of this situation is that it was possible to interview the teachers involved without the time-consuming and inconvenient necessity of making a mutually convenient appointment. In addition, it was possible to draw on the writer's own experience with the pupils involved. At the same time, it was possible to gain access to confidential records which covered their secondary schooling, particularly in the Remedial Department.

A major problem in this kind of investigation is that of preserving anonymity. Schools, not unreasonably, are concerned that neither they nor their pupils should be identified. This problem has been overcome by referring to the subjects by fictional initials.

5.2 Some information about the school

The school is a comprehensive, in the terms of the definition stated in section 3.2 of Chapter 3. It was built in 1958, in a semi-urban area (i.e. a built-up area surrounded by rural countryside, as opposed to urban area of a large city) approximately 25 miles from the City of London, and educates about 1350 pupils. It was the local grammar school for the surrounding district until its conversion to comprehensive, the Headmaster retired and the Deputy Head left, as did many other members of staff, when the sixth form was transferred to a newly-formed sixth-form college.

The school catchment area draws pupils from both working-class and middle-class homes and is situated between a large council estate and private dwellings, many of the residents of which commute daily to London to work.
Although two other comprehensive schools are in close proximity, there is no lack of demand for entry to the school. In fact, many such requests for entry come from outside the school's catchment area.

A unit for partially hearing children operates within the school for pupils from a wide area. These children are transported to and from the school by special contract transport.

During the period covered by the case studies (5 years) detailed in this chapter there have been two Headmasters, each of whom has had a different policy for dealing with disruptive pupils, and these policies have been particularly reflected in the method of operating the Remedial Department and handling disruptive pupils.

5.3 The administration under Headmaster I

Headmaster I was appointed shortly after reorganisation as a comprehensive. He had clear ideas of how he wanted the school to function and his philosophy was that of a democratic and unauthoritarian approach to education. He was particularly aware of the problem of creating alienation towards school by attempting to change the child to suit the school, as opposed to recognising the individuality of the pupil. During an interview with the writer this Head expressed this view in the following way. "I feel that we talk of pupils as individuals, and then push them into a curriculum which largely assumes they are all the same. There are a few, extreme pupils, who will not or cannot accept a uniform curriculum and so we resort to coercion, which alienates them from school. Obviously, this is a source of stress to teachers and what we are attempting to do here is to reduce this stress, which will be of benefit to both the teacher and the pupil."

This Headmaster thought that the right kind of Remedial Department was part of the answer in dealing with seriously disruptive pupils. Remedial teachers are familiar with low ability pupils, and it frequently occurs that
disruptive pupils also have learning problems. The Remedial Department usually enjoys a generous teacher/pupil ratio which allows flexibility in curriculum innovation. In this respect he saw the work of the Remedial Department as twofold in nature.

a) To provide extra studies for pupils with learning difficulties

b) To provide withdrawal facilities for pupils who were showing behaviour problems (a fair amount of evidence indicates a correlation between antisocial behaviour and learning difficulties e.g. Lunzer, 1960; Yule and Rutter, 1968; Rutter, 1975).

These withdrawal facilities were seen as much a 'safety valve' for staff as for pupils, and the fact that the withdrawal facilities existed, would encourage teachers to be more tolerant of disruptive behaviour. The aim was to return the pupil to normal lessons as often and as soon as possible, but it was considered acceptable that the pupil could go right through his secondary schooling perhaps being withdrawn from some subjects permanently. In such cases, the lesson from which the pupil was withdrawn would be replaced by a socialisation programme which is discussed more fully later in this chapter.

Within this context, a major task of the department was to try and help problem children to cope better 'socially'. The method involved in bringing this about is examined in detail later in this chapter, but basically it involved helping the child experience satisfactory relationships with others within the school situation. In respect of the foregoing stated aim, the Remedial Department was expected to develop as a major department of the school, whereas prior to this Head's arrival it played a minor role.

Headmaster I proposed the appointment of a senior member of staff for a post designated as 'Course Co-ordinator'. The idea was that the holder would be responsible
for organising worthwhile, (worthwhile in the sense that they were perceived by the staff as relevant to pupil needs without reducing the content to academic trivia) courses for 4th and 5th year pupils who were unable to fit into the normal option scheme due to low intellectual ability or behaviour problems.

The person appointed would formulate courses and draw on specialists in the school to assist in their operation under the direction of the Course Co-ordinator. In effect, what was being established was a second Remedial Department for upper-school pupils, because the Course Co-ordinator was to provide mainly for the same pupils who were served by the Remedial Department during the 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of secondary schooling.

Some of the school's Heads of Department were not entirely in agreement with the proposition for two separate Remedial Departments. They would have preferred to see the development of a single large department run by someone holding a senior scale post of responsibility, and other non-scale teachers, with the department head having the authority to draw on other departments in the manner suggested for the Course Co-ordinator position.

During an informal discussion with Head I, it appeared that he was in sympathy with the latter view, but felt that the Head of Remedial Department he had inherited was not of the calibre necessary to run a major department.

The proposal for this appointment was eventually accepted by most department heads despite reservations, possibly because they saw it as a relief from responsibility for disruptive pupils, even though they would still contribute to the teaching of such children. However, the idea was never actually put into practice because the school was unable to appoint a suitable person to the position.

Although this Headmaster left the school after only two years his ideas were effected to some extent and his
influence in the running of the Remedial Department continued for a couple of years after the new Head was appointed.

5.4 The administration under Headmaster II

The newly-appointed Head's views were very different from those of Head I. He expressed unhappiness with 'labelling' children, nevertheless he felt that some pupils could not be allowed to remain in normal classes with other pupils, especially in the case of upper-school examination classes. In this respect he sought to establish a special curriculum for lower ability 4th and 5th year pupils and those who appeared to have behaviour problems; often these were one and the same pupils, for reasons stated earlier.

Some of the specialist departments were asked to formulate special non-examination courses for upper-school pupils who, for one reason or another, did not fit into the option scheme. In other words, the school was still to recognise and segregate problem pupils, but they were now to be catered for within the departments. They were to follow courses of a non-examination nature, but ones which it was hoped they would find of value. Departments were to draw up syllabuses for approval by the Head and other Heads of Department, and which aimed to teach pupils topics which the latter might recognise as relevant to their future life.

A typical example of the type of syllabus which was formulated is that developed by the Business Studies Department. Their programme contained, among other things, elements such as banking and money management, consumer protection, insurance, wages, home purchase and ownership, voting and elections and basic law and order. The emphasis of this particular course is to teach the topics in a manner which will cause the minimum of frustration for the pupils, and give maximum opportunity for success. This is achieved by breaking each topic into small, easily-managed stages, introducing practical activities and discussion at every
available opportunity and making maximum use of audio visual aids. A major aspect of the course is to seek every opportunity to recognise and praise the smallest success, consonant with behaviour modification techniques of 'successive approximations'.

The course described above is called 'Consumer Education' and other departments formed similar courses titled 'Home Management', 'Social Studies' and 'Environmental Studies'. Whilst these courses are essentially non-examination, successful completion of them results in tangible reinforcement in the form of an award of an internal school certificate. In producing the certificate, the school wanted to avoid the production of a piece of paper that the pupil might see as worthless. In this respect, the school employed professional artists and printers, the result of which is the attractive document shown in Appendix G.

The certificate is not awarded indiscriminantly, but is gained by the effort pupils give to class activities as opposed to ability. Thus, all pupils who take the courses, irrespective of their attainment level, can see that here is a situation where they can be successful, where at other times they have often been a failure.

The result of the development described above was that the Remedial Department's function was now largely seen as one of providing extra studies (particularly reading and spelling) for pupils with learning difficulties, with reduced emphasis on the socialisation aspect.

Whereas under Head I, the policy was for pupils displaying behaviour problems to be withdrawn to the Remedial Department, under Head II, the policy was to contain pupils within the classroom. However, there was also established a clear procedure for referral of problem pupils; initially to the appropriate Head of Department, and as a last resort to the Year Heads (discussed in more detail later in this chapter).
The Remedial Department

a) The Remedial Department Under Head I

The Head of Department had many ideas in sympathy with Headmaster I, and their development was encouraged while the latter was at the school. As pointed out earlier, under Head I the role of the Remedial Department was seen as twofold in nature; one of providing extra studies to cater for learning difficulties, and the provision of withdrawal facilities for pupils with adjustment problems. These latter facilities included a very flexible socialisation programme designed by the Head of the Remedial Department. Two of the activities of this programme are now outlined.

Child Care

M.A. was an upper-school pupil (Chronological Age 14) who was difficult at the best of times. He was of low academic ability (Reading Age 7.2), his writing was almost illegible. He was defiant, a constant truant, a known thief and was generally classed by his teachers colloquially as a 'pain in the neck'. He came from a broken home and was brought up by his father who did not speak English (foreign white immigrant).

I visited the Remedial Department in response to an invitation from the Head of Department, to view a part of the socialisation programme which was being operated for disruptive pupils withdrawn from normal classes. The part of the programme I was to see was a demonstration of bathing a baby by M.A.

For demonstration purposes he had a plastic bath filled with water and a life-size rubber doll. He proceeded through the process of undressing the doll, testing the water temperature, bathing the doll, drying and powdering and putting on a nappy in an efficient way which most mothers would have been proud to demonstrate.
The whole activity was carried out with meticulous care including support of the 'baby's' head and back at appropriate times. At one stage he held the doll up close to him and took great pains to emphasise the need to cuddle a baby to give it reassurance. This scene presented a vivid contrast to the defiant and disruptive description offered by most of those who taught M.A.

A common criticism of child care programmes in secondary schools is that they are guilty of stereotyping pupils. Boys tend to avoid participating in this type of course because of the obvious 'feminine' bias, and the lessons are predominantly attended by girls. Consequently, child care courses are often accused of reinforcing traditional sex roles.

The programme described above does not appear to be guilty of the foregoing criticisms because it was, perhaps surprisingly, as popular with boys as with girls. One of the possible reasons for the acceptability of the child care course to boys is that it was an integral part of a broader range of topics. These included subjects such as home management, money management and consumer education, which were particularly popular with boys.

Entertaining

The object of this activity was for pupils to invite any member of staff of their choice to have tea with them. Their task was to make polite conversation with the member of staff whilst making and serving tea and biscuits. At the end of a given period of time, the pupil had to end the session in a manner which would give the teacher the impression that the conversation had come to a natural conclusion.

In this activity, the writer was invited to tea by a boy whom he had never taught, but who obviously felt he wanted to talk to him. Even after this activity he still never attended any of my classes, but a form of friendship developed whereby he would come and discuss problems he had
in school, and I was later to help him writing letters when he was applying for employment prior to leaving school.

Obviously, this 'entertaining' activity gave considerable satisfaction, a degree of freedom and encouraged the development of verbal skills. In addition, in this boy's case, it gave him the opportunity to form a link with a member of staff with whom he would not have come into contact during the normal course of his studies.

It should not be concluded that the foregoing exercises were devoid of written work. Before each activity the pupils were required to give the Head of Remedial Department a written outline of the activity they wished to organise and, when it had been completed, the pupils were required to complete a form with details of what they had done. This form was then signed and a grade awarded by the member of staff the pupil had entertained or demonstrated to.

In addition to carrying out the tasks and the written work involved, the pupils had to go through the complicated process of negotiating times and dates with their visitors a week or two beforehand, and then give a reminder to the visitor nearer the time of the negotiated appointment. This process was quite involved, especially if the pupil was giving several such demonstrations to a number of staff members at different times.

Newspapers were a regular feature of the department at this time and it was not unusual to visit the Remedial Department and find groups holding discussions on a wide range of topics from the daily news.

The pupils were taught to make telephone calls and encouraged to write and perform playlets where the emphasis was on verbal as opposed to written skills. They grew seeds in class, kept fish, went out of school on visits and walks and received guest speakers in the department.
In addition, many of the visitors could be termed 'non-
professional' helpers whose function was to look at dis-
plays and praise progress.

Praise was considered to be of prime importance in the programme for a variety of reasons, particularly of course because it is more simple to provide than material rewards, but also in some studies praise has been found to be more effective than material rewards when given for intrinsically interesting activities (Lepper, et al. 1973; Smith and Pittman, 1978), probably because the rewards have the effect of replacing intrinsic motivation with extrinsic interest which depends on the receipt of prizes. Patterson (1977) showed that disapproval tends to increase the likeli-
hood of the child showing hostile behaviour, and recent re-
search has shown that schools where staff took more opportunit-
ies to praise pupils' work resulted in better behaviour out-
comes when compared with schools which gave less emphasis on praise (Rutter, 1979).

b) The Remedial Department under Head II

Under Head II the socialisation aspect of the Remedial Department largely disappeared soon after his appointment with a subsequent change in the withdrawal system. The department's role now was largely one of dealing with learning difficulties rather than with emotional adjustment, albeit that the two often involved the same pupils. Dis-
cipline problems were now seen to be largely the province of the Year Heads, and it was hoped that the containment of disruptive pupils would be brought about in the upper-school by the new non-examination courses described earlier.

5.6 The role of the Year Heads

a) The role of the Year Heads under Head I

One of the roles of the Year Heads under Head I was the enforcement of punishment for disruptive behaviour where, for continued offences, classteachers and Heads of Departments felt unable to handle the pupils. A further role was referring to the Remedial Department those pupils whom
the Year Heads felt should be withdrawn from normal classes and who might benefit from the socialisation programme.

Whilst the task of enforcing punishment conflicts with the traditional role of Year Heads as being of a pastoral nature, it did include a certain amount of counselling, but the burden of counselling was lessened by the fact that the Remedial Department offered a social adjustment programme.

At the same time, this system appeared to allow Year Heads more time for communication with parents of children who were giving problems to the school and allowed some additional time for counselling problem pupils. In addition, it relieved a lot of staff tension in that they felt they had a safety valve for explosive situations. Because they had this safety valve, staff also felt more willing to try and understand and tolerate problems, whereas previously their attitude was a preventative one, i.e. they tended to anticipate problems before they arose, and consequently they reacted quickly and sometimes unnecessarily firmly to minor misdemeanours in trying to prevent exacerbation of disruptive behaviour. This latter approach was always of limited success because it 'invited' a head-on collision between teacher and pupil and too often left the teacher in a powerless position.

Under the policy of Head I teaching staff also expressed willingness to contribute time to the Remedial Department. Some of this time was provided by staff voluntarily giving up 'free' periods to increase staffing of the Remedial Department. Here we can see the influence of what Jackson (1968, pp.33-34) referred to as the 'hidden curriculum', in that factors outside of the recognised curriculum have an influence on the experience of pupils and teachers in a way that is not planned in the 'official curriculum'. In this respect, the additional 'unofficial' teaching time provided by teaching staff helped reinforce the expressed curriculum aims.
b) The role of the Year Heads under Head II

The role of the Year Heads should have changed in character and emphasis with the appointment of Head II, if one follows through his policy of removing the socialisation element from the activities of the Remedial Department. It would seem that the socialisation factors should largely have been incorporated at the same time as the evolvement of the previously mentioned non-examination courses. In effect, their role continued to be one of disciplining deviants, where problems arose which the classteacher or the Head of Department were unable to solve. The policy was to send disruptive pupils to Year Heads who would enforce the appropriate punishment where necessary.

Apart from the fact that such a task was hardly conducive to counselling, very little counselling could in fact take place due to sheer pressure of having to handle the pupils who, under the policy of the previous head, would have been withdrawn from the normal classes and taught in the Remedial Department.

The result of the changes in the school organisation as far as problem pupils are concerned is that teachers now have to contain them as far as possible within normal classes, and they feel they have to impose the same behaviour restrictions on problem pupils as on others if only to save face. As one teacher told the writer, "If a pupil is abusive to me I have no alternative but to send him to the Year Head, and I cannot accept him back into class unless other class members are aware that he cannot get away with such behaviour. But what do we do if this punishment does not reform him, which it rarely does?"

It seems that the school has possibly created more problems for itself in abandoning the original idea of the Remedial Department providing a 'safety valve' and a socialisation programme for problem pupils, even though the new policy can be seen to be less guilty of 'labelling' pupils than the former one.
Even in departing from the original policy, the outlet for both teachers and pupils would still have existed if part of the new policy had included or emphasised the role of the Year Heads as a counsellor rather than one of 'wielding the stick'. However, these two roles are incompatible for a number of reasons. The characteristics of counselling are derived largely from the work of Carl Rogers (1942) who saw the relationship of the counsellor as one of warm acceptance and absence of any coercion. Docking (1980, p.180) similarly defines counselling as 'non-directive', 'non-judgmental' and 'client-centred'. Clearly, these interpretations of the relationship between counsellor and client cannot be compatible with a role which includes the enforcement of chastisement.

From the foregoing it will have been seen that the new policy is criticised because of a lack of counselling facilities, and doubts cast on the suitability of the Year Heads to provide this service. Economic restraints restrict the possibility of appointing a full-time counsellor, but even if such an appointment were possible, it is doubtful if a counsellor could give the time and activities which were offered by the Remedial Department under the original system, especially in a school other than the one investigated where incidence of disruptive behaviour may be higher.

The answer to this problem would seem to lie with appropriately appointed Year Tads with counselling qualities and sufficient relief from teaching commitments to allow them to carry out the counselling required, assuming that economic conditions will allow such appointments to be made. Non-directive counselling in this respect could usefully be used as complimentary to the behaviour modification techniques described elsewhere in this chapter.

5.7 The effect of policy on two problem pupils

It is now intended to relate the progress of two problem pupils through this same school. They serve to illustrate how the differing administrative policies influenced the modification of their behaviour in different
ways. Examination of the first boy describes his progress through the school almost entirely under the influence of Head I, which emerges as a considered critical variable when compared with the later study of the second pupil who spent part of his time under each of the heads. This factor is considered important because, as discussed earlier, the headmaster is at the hub of the decision-making process in the school and the policies described in this chapter were reflective of the views of the two heads. It will be argued later that these policies were distinct and differed in their effectiveness.

a) Pupil 1. (under Head I)

M.H. comes from a lower-working-class background; his father is a building labourer and his mother works on a factory production line. Although he comes from what might be termed a 'disadvantaged' background there were no serious conflicts at home. His mother and father seem happily married and no behaviour problems were reported from home by his parents.

Prior to coming to the secondary school M.H. had been seen on a number of occasions by the educational psychologist. He was seen shortly after entry to the infant school where the following information was recorded:

Chronological Age ......... 5.10y.
Mental Age .............. 5.1y.
I.Q. .................... 86

This placed him at the lower end of the normal range of ability, but the educational psychologist suggested that this low score may have been an underestimate of M.H.'s ability because his speech was retarded and he had been unable to score on some verbal items. He was also recorded as being unable to concentrate on classroom activities for other than a very short period of time. There was also a record of tantrums, disobedience and inability to form satisfactory relationships with his teachers or classmates.
During his junior schooling he began to build up a record of truancy, and he was again seen by the psychologist in relation to behaviour problems similar to those experienced in the infant school, but which had become more pronounced in the junior school. The educational psychologist again found that M.H. scored below average on both verbal and non-verbal tests, and again the psychologist suggests that the score is 'underestimated', and he attributes this to the 'strangeness of the situation' on this occasion.

The main diagnosis of the educational psychologist was that M.H.'s conflicts arose from an inability to cope with the level of work presented. He consequently spent as much time as staffing commitments would allow in remedial lessons.

Although outbursts were less frequent in remedial groups than in normal lessons, truancy continued, and behaviour in normal classes was still too frequently bad to be considered acceptable by the junior school staff, who predicted that during his secondary schooling M.H. would be referred for education in a school for the maladjusted.

At the time of entry to the secondary school his Chronological Age was 11.2, Reading Age 6.9 and Spelling Age 6.3.

In the secondary school, the policy adopted for M.H. was that for all pupils showing behaviour problems, already outlined in the earlier explanation of the policy of Head I. He was to attend normal classes wherever he could keep up with the class, and attend extra studies in the Remedial Department in those subjects where he was experiencing difficulty, which was mainly with English and Mathematics. In addition, he was told that if, in any lesson, or at any time, he was in a temper he could walk out of class, but he must report immediately to the Remedial Department. No inquisition was made on his arrival there, and usually he would join in whatever activity was going on in
the department at the time in which he felt interested. Occasionally, if he showed no interest, he would be left to contemplate, or given the daily newspaper to read, until he felt in the mood to take part or return to normal lessons.

As he progressed through the school M.H. withdrew more and more from normal lessons, and spent the greater part of his school time in the Remedial Department. When he reached the upper-school (4th and 5th year of secondary education) he took no C.S.E. courses and attended 'normal' lessons in only a few subjects of his choice. Those that he attended were art, metalwork and woodwork and games. The remainder of his time was spent directly working in the Remedial Department on extra studies and the socialisation programme described earlier in this chapter.

His art work was of a mediocre standard but the art teacher found him not only keen, but a helpful member of his class, commenting that he often gave up his breaks to assist in preparing the classroom for lessons.

His practical woodwork and metalwork were of above average standard, although written work was almost non-existent. In his 5th year of secondary schooling he could not be persuaded to enter for the C.S.E. examinations of these subjects, even though it was certain that he could achieve some sort of a pass grade on his practical work alone.

He enjoyed games in the P.E. Department and participated in these activities enthusiastically although not entirely successfully, mainly due to slight overweight. However, his weight did help him to achieve some success in rugby and putting-the-shot.

In these lessons which he was attending of his own accord, M.H. showed no behaviour problems and staff found him co-operative and helpful. But although intermittent attempts were made to work him back into normal
classes, these were largely unsuccessful because after a while he would behave in a way that the class teacher found unacceptable.

The most probable reason why the acceptable behaviour of M.H. in the lessons of his choice was not carried over into 'normal' classes, is that he felt inadequate in certain learning situations. This inadequacy was particularly apparent in academic subjects, which is possibly why he avoided these, showing obvious preference for practical, non-academic subjects, and distress and non-co-operation when faced with the possibility of joining normal classes in academic subjects. It is not possible to say if his feeling of inadequacy was solely the result of his low ability, but certainly he had a weak self-concept and the 'special' programme designed for him gave him the opportunity to improve his self-concept. Examples of these opportunities are now discussed and later related to the importance of self-concept.

In spite of his behaviour problems, M.H.'s stay in the school was punctuated by considerable worthwhile contributions. He spent a lot of time helping the school groundsman, who maintained that his assistance was most valuable and said he was always willing to do any task, no matter how menial. His school attendance record for his secondary schooling was excellent and in complete contrast to the truancy record he had built up in his junior school.

He was given the title 'stage manager' for school productions and he organised a squad of pupils, mainly from the Remedial Department, which took a large part in assembling and painting scenery. He turned up at every night of the productions with one of 'his' roses from the school garden in his buttonhole to 'carry out running repairs' on the scenery. He also actually took the part of a sailor in the chorus of two Gilbert and Sullivan musicals.
'How a person sees himself (his self-image) and what value he puts on himself (his self-esteem) clearly is crucial in determining the goals which an individual sets for himself, the attitudes he holds, the behaviour he initiates, and the response he makes to others' (Cohen, 1976, p.96). This suggests then, that behaviour problems can frequently be related to a weak self-concept and some writers (e.g. Webb, 1975, p.70) suggest that 'inadequacy feeling will be at the root of every problem', although this suggestion is too broad a generalisation even in the context of problems in the infant school in which it was made.

The determinants of the self-concept are generally held to lie in early experiences of parent-child relationships. The developing self-concept is also influenced by school experiences, and can be adversely affected by lack of success. As pointed out earlier, it is frequently the case that disruptive pupils are also of low academic ability, thus too often they experience repeated lack of success. These repeated experiences of failure can result in the pupil feeling alienated from school, thus providing fuel for disruptive behaviour.

M.H.'s case is certainly not one of the most difficult experienced by the school, but the consensus of opinion at a staff meeting discussion of the boy was that it was considered to be successful in that a programme had been initiated whereby he was contained within the school with behaviour that was within the boundaries which he had, to a certain extent defined himself. At the same time he maintained an excellent attendance record.

The criteria which justify the view that the school dealt with M.H.'s problems successfully are perhaps most aptly demonstrated in the comments of the Head of the Remedial Department and the Year Heads during interviews with the writer. "During his first year in the school I predicted that M.... would not be kept in the school ...." (Head of Lower School). "I had a sense of guilt in that I
felt we were containing M.... but not really educating him. But complaints from staff were less frequent than they had been, and this relieved me of a lot of pressure ......

"M .... 'found himself' in the socialisation programme..... he entered the programme a confused and uncompromising boy, but he left the school far happier than he was when he joined it."

(Head of Upper School) and (Head of Remedial Department).

From the foregoing it can be seen that some of these comments particularly look to the school's point of view e.g. relief of internal pressure. This is perhaps understandable where it is necessary to balance the needs of the individual against the needs of his teachers and classmates. Nevertheless, M.H. was not 'sacrificed' for the sake of internal peace (this could have been achieved by transferring him to a school for the maladjusted), he also benefited in an improved personal social development which is the point that the Head of the Remedial Department is making.

Undoubtedly, improvement in self-concept was crucial to the considered success of M.H.'s case. This improvement may at least in part be attributed to the fact that he was involved in determining the boundaries within which he participated in school life. Further, in contrast to an earlier background of failure, he was able to achieve a considerable degree of success.

Whilst it may be questioned how much M.H. gained educationally (and his programme was far from devoid of academic content), he certainly learned a lot of worthwhile things, not least of which was living in cooperation with others, albeit in limited situations. He performed many worthwhile activities for the school, and was in fact awarded the school governors' prize in recognition of these services. The presentation of this award to a pupil of M.H.'s attainment and behavioural background was without precedence in the school's history.
When he left M.H. was employed by one of the school governors in a building yard, initially in a menial task capacity of cleaning the yard and loading vehicles, and later in the more responsible task of servicing vehicles. At the time of writing, three years after he left the school, he is reported as still successfully maintaining this position and is even attending day-release classes at the local technical college.

Conclusions to investigation of pupil 1

Whilst M.H.'s parents maintained that there were no problems at home, this does not necessarily imply that his problems did not originate in the home. For example, a repressive atmosphere in the home may well suppress problem behaviour there, but the pupil might look for an outlet for his feelings in the school. However, the fact that his parents feel that circumstances at home are satisfactory does indicate that the school must consider if the source of his problems lie within the province of the school. Even if we were confident that the source of the subject's problems were outside the school, this does not mean that the school can escape at least some of the responsibility of helping him to overcome them.

In his case it seems that his problems were initially aggravated by the education system that existed for him, and which was trying to impose on him something he did not feel capable of coping with. Although this was probably initially due to his limited academic ability, it is likely that repeated failure reduced his self-concept, and this feeling of inadequacy was increased in the normal class where his failure was open for the many other pupils in the class to witness.

Once he was able to get away from the normal classroom situation, his behaviour problems declined; at the same time his replacement activities gave him the feeling that what he was doing was worthwhile and relevant to him, thus, improving his self-esteem.
Had it been possible to eventually integrate M.H. back into the mainstream of school activities, the handling of this boy could have been claimed to be even more successful. Whilst this was not the case, under different circumstances it may have been necessary to transfer him to a school for the maladjusted.

b) Pupil 2 (during the tenure of both Headmasters)

F.T. comes from a broken home. His father left home shortly before he started infant schooling and he was brought up for a while, with his younger sister, by his mother alone. Both children were taken into care by the local authority during his junior schooling because their mother was an advanced alcoholic who was frequently under treatment for 'drying out' sessions.

He came to the secondary school during the time of the administration of Head I with a junior school report that stated that he showed serious behaviour problems, but was not considered of low ability, although he was thought to be in need of some remedial education. He was subject to violent tempers and had on several occasions attacked both teachers and other pupils, and was reported to have a particular aversion to female teachers.

The reason for this apparent aversion to females is not unusual. F.T. identifies female teachers with a weak and ineffective mother and antagonises them for the ambivalence he feels towards his own mother. Male teachers may be seen by him as firmer disciplinarians and, therefore, give him the strength of support he knows that he lacks within himself. The implication for him is that if they are 'strong' enough to control him, they are strong enough to help him.

Because of the difficulties which occurred when F.T. was involved with female teachers, for the latter part of his junior schooling he had been taught by male members of staff only. During this latter part of his junior schooling he was a frequent truant, suspected of theft in school,
had been in minor trouble with local police, and frequently used foul language.

F.T. had regularly been seen by the educational psychologist whilst in the junior school. The psychologist reported that testing with the Rutter Child Behaviour Scale (Rutter, 1967) and the Bristol Social Adjustment Guide (Stott, 1974) showed that F.T. was severely maladjusted in an anti-social way. This mainly took the form of aggression towards other children and general overactive, unpredictable behaviour.

Despite regular consultation over a period of three years of his junior schooling between the educational psychologist and teaching staff, no improvement in his behaviour was achieved. In fact, as he grew older and bigger, his violent tempers were considered to be of increasing danger to those around him. He was recommended for transfer to a special school but this was deferred, mainly to see if his secondary schooling, and the recently devised 'programme'(described earlier), brought about any improvement.

On his entry to the secondary school, F.T. was initially included in normal classes with some extra studies in the Remedial Department. At this time he was recorded by the department with a Chronological Age 11.0, Reading Age 9.6, Spelling Age 9.0, and I.Q. 106.

Shortly after this, the educational psychologist assessed F.T. 's general level of intelligence using the Wechsler(1955) Intelligence Scale for Children (Chronological Age 11.4).

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Type</th>
<th>I.Q.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Scale</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Scale</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these scores are within the average range, tending towards the upper end of the range. On the sub-tests, the scores were average or above, apart from a low
score on arithmetic. In the Wechsler test this is the sub-group which tends to indicate anxiety. Despite his outwardly aggressive nature, F.T.'s tutor asserted that he was also a very anxious child; some of his anxiety was possibly related to his apparent alienation from school which can be discerned from the following description of his life in the secondary school.

Observations of F.T. in his tutor group in informal situations over a period of two years revealed that he was a bully, even though he was smaller in size than average for his age. He intimidated most of his tutor group, including female members, and eventually two parents of girls made complaints of his behaviour towards their daughters.

Researchers suggest a variety of reasons for aggressiveness in children the age of F.T. Mussen and Jones (1957) showed that late maturing boys displayed more aggressive tendencies than early maturers, although they related the aggression to strong motivations to escape from, or defy, parents. F.T. was certainly immature, but it is unlikely that he felt the need to 'escape' from his parents with whom he had only limited experience. However, aggressiveness is also related to the loss of one or more parent (Docking, 1980) and this of course applies to F.T.

Probably the most likely reason for F.T.'s aggressive behaviour can be found if we refer back to the personality theories discussed in Chapter 2 of this work, and particularly the theories of Eysenck. Eysenck (1975, 1977 and 1979) argues that an important determinant of antisocial and violent conduct is due to the genetic basis of personality differences, though he does not deny the importance of environmental influences. According to Eysenck extroverts are less easily conditioned than introverts; they therefore, tend to seek sensation and have a lower resistance to temptation. Consequently 'extroverts need a firmer, more consistent type of upbringing' (Eysenck, 1975, p.201).
F.T. frequently displayed behaviour typical of the extravert. He was a dominant, outgoing and impulsive character, very talkative and constantly seeking attention although he could not be said to be 'sociable' which is also a characteristic of the extravert. Obviously, it was not very likely that with his parental background he would have the firmer, consistent type of upbringing which Eysenck maintains is important to the extravert, and this is possibly the key clue to his aggressive behaviour.

During the initial two-year period F.T. was in his secondary school there were a considerable number of complaints from staff members about his unacceptable behaviour.

Head I called a special meeting of all those who came in contact with F.T., including the senior housemaster of the council home where he was in care. The objective of the meeting was to encourage an intensive effort by staff to see if a way could be found to solve his problem, or at least to set up a special education programme which would allow him to be kept in the school.

This meeting revealed that few who came in contact with F.T. were willing to continue teaching him under the existing circumstances. It was further revealed that his poor behaviour did not appear to indicate any discrimination between male and female teachers (contrary to the junior school report). In fact, one of the few acceptable reports came from the female Head of the Remedial Department.

The reason that F.T. maintained an acceptable relationship with this one particular female member of staff was because she is a strong disciplinarian who was never intimidated by him. The apparent increased disruption with male members of staff is less easy to discern, but is most likely associated with an increased general alienation to school which he was showing.

The home housemaster felt that his conduct in the house was acceptable and he did not experience great difficul
with him there, possibly because in the home he was not faced with the need to produce academic work. Thus, the solution, and part of the reasons for his behaviour problems, lay within the school.

The programme which evolved from the meeting called by Head I was similar to that adopted for M.H. (the wisdom of this decision is discussed shortly) as described previously and incorporating the 'withdrawal system' which is a familiar behaviour modification technique. F.T. was to attend normal lessons followed by other pupils, and continue in some extra studies, but the 'safety valve' system would operate. If he felt frustrated with a particular lesson or teacher he would be allowed to walk out of the lesson. Similarly, if a member of staff felt he was behaving in an unacceptable way, he could be sent from the classroom. F.T. was to be made aware that under the system there was no reason for him to be disruptive in class.

On withdrawal from class he was to report to the Remedial Department. Upon his arrival, no interrogation was to be made, but he was to be allowed to 'cool off'. At a later, more convenient time, he was to be allowed to talk out his problem in an informal atmosphere, if he showed the inclination to do so.

Teaching staff involved with F.T. were encouraged to be as tolerant as possible towards him and to turn a 'blind eye' towards his behaviour problems as far as possible. This again is another basic behaviour modification technique advocated by Clarizio (1976), for example, where 'extinction procedures' weaken undesired behaviour by ignoring it or otherwise removing its rewarding consequences. Coupled with 'positive reinforcement' (i.e., using rewards to bring about and maintain desired behaviour) this technique is held to be effective in shaping behaviour. The model is dependent upon the ability of the teacher to predetermine what behaviour is appropriate and inappropriate and then systematically apply reinforcing procedure. We have already discussed in several
places elsewhere in this work the question whether all teachers have the necessary skills, but withdrawal into a specific programme operated by specially designated staff similar to that described in this chapter can reduce the number of skills necessary for normal teaching staff.

The decision by the school to adopt a policy for F.T. similar to that which proved successful for M.H. is contentious for a number of reasons. The main argument put forward at the special meeting for following this course of action was based on the similarity of the problems and behaviour of these boys as expressed in school, particularly the apparent alienation they experienced.

One can recognise the similarity between the boys in respect of this alienation but symptoms must not be confused with causes. Whilst it is quite likely that the school contributed to both boys' problems, their backgrounds (the major origins of their behaviour difficulties) were quite different; F.T.'s unsettled background and M.H.'s apparent lack of problems at home.

Based on the foregoing observations it could be argued that their different backgrounds indicated that the approaches to solving their problems should have been dissimilar. However, it did initially seem that the school had chosen the correct approach because for two years following the decision some improvement was apparent in F.T.'s behaviour and attitude to school.

During this two-year period F.T. is recorded as working in his spare time helping a County mini-bus taking handicapped children from their homes to day centres, entertainment programmes etc. The writer's discussions with him about this activity showed that he had an obvious genuine compassion for these children. This compassion stems from F.T.'s recognition of individuals 'disadvantaged' as he feels he is, mainly due to the absence of parents. His sympathy for these children is in fact symbolic of his sentiments for his own position.
By his third year of secondary education, F.T. was still following the special education programme set up for him, in that he attended both a normal programme and extra studies in the Remedial Department. But he differed from the case of M.H. in that he did not withdraw completely from normal lessons. Although outbursts of bad behaviour were more frequent than those of M.H., it was felt that the programme was proving reasonably successful. Reports of disruption from members of staff were now less frequent than they had been, and withdrawal from lessons also occurred less often. This was particularly encouraging because it is during the third year of secondary education that the teachers in this school found that incidence of behaviour problems increased (Appendix E4, School 1).

During this period F.T. was caned once for smoking in school. This caning was considered as a necessary token gesture for flouting a well-established school rule. The caning did not appear to disturb him very much. In fact, he gave the impression that he was quite proud of the fact that he had broken the rule, had been rightly punished, and had accepted his punishment in an adult manner. His explanation of the situation to the writer was that it was similar to "getting the red card in football.... it's just one of those things that happen."

Part way through F.T.'s third year of secondary schooling the change of Headmaster was effected and a consequent change in policy as previously outlined. F.T. was now to attend the same programme of lessons, part normal, part extra studies, but withdrawal procedures were to change in that he would, on withdrawal by a teacher, be sent to the Year Head when his behaviour became unacceptable. But staff were to try and tolerate and handle him as best as possible before sending him from the classroom.

Most of the staff did make a concerted effort to contain him but he seemed to interpret their tolerance as a 'weakness' (this is how he described it to the writer) which
he used to try to goad them into reaction.

It will be observed that weakness in this instance incited provocative behaviour, whereas weakness in handicapped children (as described earlier) elicited his compassion. The reasons for the apparent disparity lies with the recipients of his feelings. The weakness of handicapped children was seen in a sympathetic light because he could see similarities with his own disposition. Weakness in teachers on the other hand is seen as a further example of the absence of strength and support which has been missing in his life. This perceived weakness on the part of teachers was despised by F.T., and further alienated him from school. Consequently, conflict situations between F.T. and members of staff occurred with increasing frequency with regular withdrawal from lessons to the Year Heads, later to the Deputy Head and eventually to the Headmaster as pressure built up from staff who were unwilling to teach him.

A variety of punishments were now being used to contain F.T., detention, banned from games and school visits, made to work outside the Deputy Head's room and even to work inside the Headmaster's study. In each case, return to the normal teaching situation resulted in further disruption and withdrawal from lessons.

In relation to the ineffectiveness of the various forms of punishment imposed on F.T., the reader is redirected to the discussion of the effectiveness of punishment in Chapter 2 of this work. A dilemma has developed; if teachers give way to his agitation, F.T. has learned that he can control them by coercion. At the same time, for the teacher to react to unwanted behaviour with punishment can act as a reinforcer to the undesirable behaviour by underlining the weakness of adults who give in to him.

By his fourth year of secondary education F.T. was receiving more frequent visits from the educational psychologists, and had been in several 'scrapes' with the local police for minor offences. At Christmas time the members of
F.T.'s tutor group had collected a box of wrapped gifts to present to each other. These gifts were stolen and circumstances indicated that F.T. was the likely suspect, but this could not be proven. Shortly after this (early in his fifth year of secondary education) he was put on probation and sent to a residential school for the maladjusted.

Conclusions to investigation of pupil 2

One of the surprising things about F.T.'s problems is that whilst he was being seen on a regular basis by the educational psychologist, at no time did the latter consult teaching staff or offer specific guidance. The educational psychologist never saw F.T. in the teaching situation and all interviews between the psychologist and the pupil always took place in an interview room.

Whilst one can understand that there are occasions (such as when carrying out tests and confidential interviews) when it is beneficial for the subject and the psychologist to be alone, it does seem that it would be sound practice for the psychologist to see the pupil in the teaching situation, and to engage in discussions with those involved in teaching the pupil. This situation (which has reoccurred with subsequent cases) has been the subject of discussion by teaching staff, and the consensus of opinion is that the psychologist does not feel confident to involve himself in classroom pedagogy. However, when the psychologist was approached on this matter by the writer, he said that he would be at a disadvantage in dealing with the subject if he was seen as associated with the provoking situation.

We have already discussed the question of whether the school was correct in adopting the same policy for F.T. as that which had proved successful for M.H. It was also suggested that in spite of the criticisms put forward related to this discussion, the decision did seem justified initially, in that there was a clear improvement in his behaviour for two years after the implementation of the special programme.
However, it does seem that he was to some extent the victim of administration policy (discussed in Chapter 1 of this work) in that the initial programme set up for him, if continued, could have possibly meant that he may have been contained in the normal school. Unfortunately for him, change in policy seems to have been a crucial factor in his eventual withdrawal from normal schooling. The recognition of policy change as a crucial variable influencing the outcome of F.T.'s secondary education can be found in the following summary of this study of him.

F.T.'s aggressive, extravert nature, coupled with his background of absence of a consistent caretaker not unexpectedly resulted in serious behaviour problems. These problems required firm, consistent handling by those involved in teaching him. However, in the secondary school, in the normal teaching situation, the pupil meets many different teachers and some will undoubtedly be intimidated by an aggressive, volatile character such as F.T. In addition, in the normal teaching situation F.T.'s alienation from school becomes openly apparent and challenging for the teacher, and the opportunities for conflict situations are more numerous because the teacher has a large number of pupils to consider and can only give limited attention to the deviant. Consequently, the circumstances which exist frequently force the teacher to contribute adversely to conflicts which arise.

A solution to this difficulty could involve withdrawal of the subject from the normal teaching situation, into a special programme designed to reduce alienation to school, and staffed by firm, but understanding and versatile teachers. It would seem that this suggested solution must have some foundation because it was apparent that withdrawal from normal lessons into the special programme did result in improved behaviour and reduced conflict situations. Later, when the special withdrawal programme was abandoned, behaviour problems increased and eventually resulted in withdrawal from the school.
F.T.'s case is a useful illustration because it allows comparison of two differing methods of handling the same person. It would seem that there is some evidence to suggest that the initial programme was the more successful of the two in respect of F.T., and it may possibly have proved more so had F.T.'s withdrawal from normal classes been more pronounced, as they were in the case of M.H.

What is suggested is that the initial programme, if continued, could have proved more beneficial to F.T., if he had actively been encouraged to adopt those subjects he felt relevant to him, and if he had participated fully in the socialisation programme offered by the Remedial Department. As it happened, the eventual abandonment of this programme may have meant that it was inevitable that F.T. would not complete his secondary schooling in the normal way.

5.8 Analysis and evaluation of the case studies

The contents of this chapter have investigated the effects administrative policy has on pupil's behaviour and learning, particularly when the school adopts special curricular arrangements to handle disruptive pupils. It has been apparent that the case study approach does constitute a useful method of investigation of the problems to which this work is directed. This method of enquiry has helped to focus observations to provide important sources of data. Some of the information gained from this investigation is now analysed.

In the study of Pupil 1, it was seen that his behaviour problems were only recorded as having originated after he started school, and were only subsequently manifested in the school situation, if we are able to place any reliance on the opinion of his parents. Although the cause of his behaviour problems cannot be divorced from the low academic ability of M.H., a plausible theory is that the school contributed to the alienation which developed.
With F.T., his behaviour problems were founded in personality problems which were the result of the absence of family support and a consistent caretaker. In this respect the school cannot be seen as a prime causal factor to his difficulties. However, having identified his problems and made some progress in solving them, the eventual abandonment of the successful programme may well have contributed to his eventual withdrawal from the school.

The results of this study have shown that whilst the school can at times be a factor causal to behaviour problems, other factors can also be at the root of the difficulty which the pupil is experiencing. However, even when 'other' factors are seen to be the origin of behaviour problems, the school can exacerbate an already delicate situation.

The events related in this chapter shows that the school can help to reduce behaviour problems, especially if the pupil experiencing the difficulties can be removed from the normal teaching situation.

It would seem that a pupil such as that discussed here should be moved into some form of specially devised education programme. The earlier described programme of special non-examination courses has much to commend it, and the limited evidence of this investigation seems to indicate that a socialisation programme incorporating behaviour modification techniques which improve the pupil's self-concept has a particularly beneficial effect on disruptive behaviour. Part of the reason for this beneficial effect is that the pupil's self-concept is improved by engaging his own co-operation in the programme and the resultant perceived improvement.

There are, of course, other possible reasons for the behaviour improvement, and there are techniques other than behaviour modification which might have been even more successful in raising the self-concept. One could suggest that the improvement which occurred was a natural result of
maturation, although this does not seem likely because periodic attempts to integrate both pupils back into normal classes did not prove successful. As an alternative to using behaviour modification to bring about an improvement of self-concept one could put forward a case for using psychotherapy. However, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 of this work, this technique is time-consuming and requires an expertise which the majority of teachers do not possess.

Head II maintains that there has been no increase in disruptive behaviour, and certainly the school records do not show an increase in the number of pupils suspended or referred for psychological treatment, but in discussion with staff members some state that there has been an increase. However, it does not necessarily follow that the two views are inconsistent. What has happened is that more behaviour problems are now having to be handled by the class teacher which would have been dealt with by the Remedial Department, and this gives the impression to the class teacher that problems are increasing because prior to this he was relieved of most seriously troublesome situations.

From the foregoing examination of the two differing administrative policies, there is a danger of assuming that the position is clearly stated of one particular policy working and reducing disruptive behaviour whilst the other did not. This is not the case. There are many beneficial aspects of the policy of Head II which have not been particularly emphasised in this chapter and which will now be subjected to a critical evaluation.

There are many advantages in keeping the problem child within the normal class, not least of which is the fact that the pupil does not feel apart from his fellows, and many of the staff of the school preferred this method because it is less open to the criticisms which would be supported by labelling theorists discussed in Chapter 2 of
this work. In addition, as was pointed out to the writer by several members of staff, the policy of Head I for children with behaviour problems was questionable from the point of view of how much 'education' ('education' in the sense of direct teaching) was in fact given to these pupils. The point they appeared to be making here was that the programme described earlier and related to Head I was not considered as entirely 'educational', and, therefore, inappropriate.

Certainly it must be said that under the policy of Head I, when pupils were following the special programme outside normal lessons, they did not maintain the same degree of academic progress as their counterparts in normal classes. Consequently, return to the ordinary timetable was all the more difficult for these problem children, and perhaps not surprising if one accepts the earlier arguments associating maladjustment with lack of academic success.

The foregoing discussion raises the question of whether it is acceptable to sacrifice academic progress for the benefits to be gained by a socialisation approach? We have seen in this chapter that in some cases academic progress cannot be made until socialisation has taken place. In this respect, the policy of Head II gave less emphasis to the socialisation of the pupil than the policy of Head I.

It could also be argued that pupils at the stage of education (upper-secondary) referred to in this case study investigation have reached such a late stage in their education, that socialisation must now, if necessary, take priority over academic progress in order to assist the student in the transition to responsible adulthood.

However, the implementation of the foregoing advocated policy is dependent upon availability of teachers with the necessary skills and time available, and teaching time is always at a premium. It must be recognised that the policy of Head I was expensive in teaching time and
owed a lot of its success to the fact that some members of staff voluntarily gave up some of their 'free' time to help make the programme successful. This kind of support cannot be guaranteed, if only at times due to political or economic reasons.

The policy of Head II has particular attractions in that it makes the treatment of problem pupils less conspicuous than that of his predecessor, and the formation of the special non-examination courses for upper-school pupils who do not fit into the school option scheme is commendable. These courses avoid the difficulty of trying to integrate pupils back into the classroom when they have been withdrawn from normal classes. But this policy is heavily dependent on the assumption that class teachers have the expertise to handle the extremes of behaviour when they occur. As previously stated in this chapter, Wall (1973) would say that teachers do not have this expertise, and the survey in Chapter 4 of this work shows that many teachers themselves would agree with this view. In fact, The Professional Association of Teachers also recognises this problem and has recently stressed that student teachers should be trained to deal with violent and disruptive pupils.

It would of course be inadvisable to draw emphatic conclusions from the study of the administrative policies of a single institution. However, the implications of this chapter suggest that some benefit can be obtained by removing a disruptive pupil from normal classes, into a programme designed to modify behaviour, although a criticism of this approach is that it can be seen as guilty of 'labelling' the child, and separation of the pupil from normal classes creates difficulties of later integration back into the mainstream of the school. A further criticism of the special programme described in this chapter is that the behaviour modification techniques described do not meet recognised research criteria; changes in behaviour were not monitored or measured and, therefore, the resulting
observations are less reliable than they might have been.

In order to answer these criticisms we need to show that behaviour modification techniques can be carried out in the classroom, by the normal teacher and incorporating a methodology which allows measurement of behavioural outcomes.

To this end, the following chapter describes a programme initiated within the framework of the policy of Head II, and is designed to show how the normal class teacher can use behaviour modification techniques to increase on-task behaviour of pupils recognised as disruptive. Such a programme, if accepted as successful and workable by the normal class teacher, could considerably enhance the policy of Head II and other schools following a similar policy.

It would seem, therefore, that successful attempts to ameliorate inappropriate reactions by children investigated in this chapter, were founded in behaviour modification techniques as outlined earlier. The account of the foregoing investigation lends further support to the need for explicit guidance to teachers, and continuing investigation. Anecdotal descriptions such as those used in this chapter can give life to the underlying philosophies and theories which initiate the more rigorous experimental methods required for significant results. Practising teachers also need to feel confident that the researcher has the kind of experience which can command their respect, it is again suggested that effective research by a serving teacher can be a sound base from which this respect can be gained.
6.1 Behaviour modification reappraised

In the field of clinical psychology, which is indirectly related to the present topic, most researchers would acknowledge that the development of neurosis depends to some extent on experiences during the lifetime of the individuals, in other words, neurosis is accepted to be at least partly learned. However, views on how the neurotic learning occurs and what is actually learned, differ considerably.

Psychoanalysts and related theorists, whose approach stems primarily from the work of Freud (discussed in Chapter 2 of this work), stress the existence of a central state of which neurotic behaviour is a symptom. The psychoanalyst views neurosis as a disease which has symptoms similar to physical disease. The aim should be to cure this underlying
condition, generally by psychotherapy, upon which the symptoms will eventually disappear (Borger and Seabourne, 1970).

An alternative view is that neurotic behaviour is a learned response and should be removed by behaviour therapy. The neurotic condition is seen as one in which certain behavioural characteristics have been acquired. The task of the behaviour therapist is to set up learning situations in which behaviour can be changed, by the application of stimulus-response devices.

It is not possible, nor necessarily desirable here, to attempt an evaluation of which of the two foregoing methods is more effective in the long-term. However, it is generally accepted that the psychoanalytic model has limited usefulness for teachers in the everyday classroom situation, partly because of the need for special training required to recognise underlying symptoms, and partly because even if teachers were able to recognise the symptoms of behaviour problems, it is not always necessarily clear what constructive action should be taken in the interest of class control, or even more importantly, for the satisfactory readjustment of the pupil.

Probably, the major argument against the use of psychodynamic theory in the normal classroom is that the treatment sessions are time-consuming and expensive when compared with the behaviour modification method. In contrast to psychodynamic theory, therapy based on learning theory is generally more simple to use (depending on the degree of technique which is considered acceptable by the modifier) and can result in relatively easily observable behaviour changes. What is less satisfactorily established is to what extent we can be sure that the application of behaviour modification techniques can be seen to have an enduring effect for all ages and intensity of problems in children.
In the foregoing chapter it will have been seen that in many respects, the programme described as used to deal with disruptive behaviour involved modifying behaviour. However, the methods described did not include experimental procedure. The eventual behavioural outcomes were not measured in any way and were dependent on observation and subjective opinion. They also involved to some extent, agreement with the suggestion that it is beneficial to remove continuously disruptive pupils from the normal class; a proposition which has the drawbacks which were explained in the previous chapter.

An alternative arrangement would be to retain the pupil in the normal classroom, and apply some form of experimental behaviour modification programme which would measure changes in behaviour and establish if it can be said that such changes can be safely attributed to the procedures set up to bring the change about.

This chapter is concerned with evaluating whether such an experimental programme is a practicable proposition for the normal class teacher. In this respect, the work herein attempts to formulate and evaluate an experimental model which teachers might usefully employ in the classroom. The reader is reminded here that this study is directed particularly towards behaviour problems of upper-secondary pupils, and, therefore, it is to this age group the experimental programme is intended to apply.

In Chapter 2 of this work it was seen that the most frequently used approaches to behaviour modification in schools include social modelling, positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement.

The principle behind social modelling techniques lies in the fact that behaviour can sometimes be changed by exposure to a social model. The social model does not have to be the subject's peers but can take the form of films, television programmes etc., featuring or particularly emphasising the acceptable behaviour of others.
Social modelling techniques have been the subject of successful development by Bandura (Bandura and Walters, 1963; and Bandura, 1969) and are held by many to be a useful instrument in improving behaviour. However, in Chapter 2 it was explained that the writer has experienced limited and unenduring success using this method of behaviour modification in the secondary school.

Positive reinforcement techniques are held to be more effective in modifying behaviour than negative reinforcement as well as being more pleasant to use (Woody, 1969). This method is implemented by ignoring unacceptable or undesirable behaviour, while desired or approved responses are reinforced in a positive way. Positive reinforcement may take the form of concrete rewards or social approval which is made apparent by verbal conditioning.

Negative reinforcement is generally considered less attractive to use because it involves the administration of an aversive stimulus when undesirable behaviour occurs; thus influencing the individual to act to avoid the pain or discomfort by giving up the disapproved behaviour.

Positive reinforcement has been shown to be successful in the classroom situation in a number of studies (Becker et al. 1971) and it has been demonstrated that a variety of forms of reinforcement are effective. For example, Patterson et al. (1969) used parents and volunteers showing individual attention and praise to encourage appropriate attitudes by pupils to work. But the method of reinforcement that has received considerable attention recently is the operation of a 'token economy'.

The operation of a token economy involves the giving of a token to the child as a reward for behaving in a manner approved by the teacher. When he behaves in a way which is unacceptable a token is taken away. The 'token' is anything such as a coloured disc or mark on a progress chart which the pupil can later exchange for a tangible
reward such as money, sweets, toys etc., which are presumed to be of primary reinforcing value. The aim of operating a token economy is to modify behaviour and gradually withdraw use of the tokens.

The operation of a token economy has been demonstrated to be successful in a number of studies (Becker et al. 1971). In one account of the application of this system, Cook (1975) successfully reduced outbursts of swearing by a boy called Billy in a residential school for the maladjusted, using a carefully constructed scale of 'payments' aimed at reducing his swearing. Presland (1978) described how 'dumb insolence' which typified the behaviour of a thirteen year old girl in a non-selective secondary school was reduced by the teacher writing a favourable report to the girl's parents every time thirty tokens had been earned for good behaviour.

A frequent criticism of the token economy is that it amounts to bribery (Docking, 1980) and denigrates the value of the task which is being undertaken. O'Leary and O'Leary (1977) dispute this criticism and maintain that token reinforcement is not encouraging corrupt behaviour but promotes behaviour which is beneficial to the receiver. They further argue that money or reward is not considered as 'bribery' when people are paid to do a job in which they have no intrinsic interest; that we must face reality in that many children do not behave as we would like; and that the token system is not an end in itself. In other words, we want the child to operate under the same contingencies and rewards that motivate adults, and the token economy can be seen to encourage this (Nielson, 1974).

A criticism of behaviour modification research, put forward in Chapter 2 of this work, is that many reports of successful use of these techniques appear to take place in primary education, or in special schools, although they have become widely practised in the U.S.A. (Docking, 1980). Many examples were cited in Chapter 2 to substantiate this
view. It was further stated that teachers involved with disruptive pupils in secondary education would welcome further demonstration that behaviour modification techniques can be successfully applied there, where disruptive behaviour is felt to be particularly stressful to teachers.

This chapter describes the application of a programme of behaviour modification initiated in a comprehensive school by a normal class teacher, within the framework of the administrative policy of Head II described in Chapter 5.

This latter point is extremely important because it must be recognised that, no matter how successful or desirable a programme is, it must of necessity take place within the contingencies of the school. These will include straightforward economic limitations, or more complex difficulties such as organisation structure which has become inflexible due to factors inherited or developed by the current administration. One could carry this argument even further to include aspects such as political influences etc., but the result invariably leads to the same conclusion: the teacher is obliged to operate within boundaries which are often beyond his immediate influence.

6.2 Reward preferences

From the foregoing, it will have been seen that successful use of positive reinforcement is dependent on the application of appropriate rewards. But children will not all respond to the same stimulus and differ in the rewards they prefer (Dunn - Rankin et al. 1969), and Burns (1978) in a study of 785 eleven to fifteen year old children found that staff and children also differ in the value they place on incentives. In other words, what the teacher sees as a suitable reward is not necessarily recognised as such by the pupil. Consequently, a variety of rewards are found to be used in the application of behaviour modification techniques.

Some of these methods of rewards were examined in Chapter 2 (vide section 2.3, bii). For example, Lowenstein
(1975) found that children from lower socio-economic backgrounds respond better to extrinsic reinforcement i.e. material or token reinforcement, whereas children with middle-class backgrounds, possibly because of their greater affluence, respond better to verbal reinforcement such as praise or gratitude.

Covington and Beery (1976) have distinguished between praise for high achievement and praise for sincere effort. They emphasise that while teachers may value persistence, effort alone is not sufficiently rewarding for the pupil whose achievement is poor, and it is on achievement that the other pupils will judge him. It is suggested that children in this position may even view the teacher as untrustworthy, if they do not believe their work deserves praise. 'Praise given to a student who believes he has done a poor job does nothing to relieve his sense of failure and may only strain an already uneasy relationship between teacher and student'. (p.35)

Some support for Covington and Beery's argument can be found in Rotter (1966) who, in a review of a number of studies, found that rewards or experience of success are not always reinforcing. Rotter stresses that the crucial factor seems to be the extent to which the person perceives the rewards or success as being dependent upon his personal skill and effort rather than sheer luck or chance. The pupil must believe in the power of his own efforts.

Whilst there is considerable validity in the view of Covington and Beery there are also some reservations. Certainly, praise which is not deserved will be treated with suspicion or contempt, but it does not necessarily follow that pupils will not value praise for effort even if they recognise that their achievement is low. It must be remembered that the disruptive pupil is frequently of lower ability and not capable of high achievement; thus, often we find that we are forced to praise effort as opposed to attainment. But to follow Covington and Beery's argument, it is important
that the praise is deserved, whether it be for attainment or effort. However, we do need to do all we can to give the pupil the maximum opportunity to be successful by breaking tasks down into small units or stages, and then reinforce the success with praise or reward.

Even where praise is effective it must be used with caution because it can create as many problems as it solves. Marland (1975) has pointed out that persistent troublemakers do need praise, but not necessarily openly because they may see commendation by someone in authority as a threat to their reputation, and if they feel scornful about public praise, this will devalue it for others.

Blackman and Silberman (1975) argue that in regular classrooms, praise might be used effectively for those who have mild difficulties in paying attention, but those who have more severe problems need tangible reinforcers, such as toys, sweets and privileges, coupled with secondary reinforcers.

If one accepts that tangible rewards are necessary for the more seriously disturbed pupil, and it makes sense that they would be more effective, one is still left with the problem of the form the reward should take. Economic restraints in the normal school prevent the use of the majority of tangible rewards described in many related research papers and some of those which may be within economic reach (e.g. sweets and comics, O'Leary and Becker, 1967) would be scorned by the majority of secondary school pupils.

The writer has found free time and early dismissal from school to be effective rewards for older pupils. But both of these can evoke opposition from other teaching staff if the whole school is not operating the scheme. The mere departure of pupils from school whilst others are still working can result in distraction for other classes, and the writer is reminded of the tragic result which occurred when a teacher dismissed a pupil from school early as a reward, and the child was killed crossing a busy road outside
the school because his departure was too early for the arrival of the school crossing attendant.

Clearly there is a need to find a reward that has the following qualities. It must be
a) within economic reach of the school
b) recognised as of value by the pupil
c) acceptable to the whole school

In the experiments described in this chapter it was decided to award disruptive pupils points for on-task behaviour, with the accumulated points being exchanged for periods of time out of school. This scheme was made more acceptable to other members of staff in that the time out of school was used on field work, and the field work was specially constructed to make it attractive to the pupil, and coupled with travel in the school minibus which the pupils particularly enjoyed.

6.3 Subject and treatment

F.P. was first referred to the educational psychologist by his junior school for 'odd' behaviour and his lack of progress despite apparent ability.

The reason for the description of 'odd' behaviour is not entirely clear from the junior school report, or that of the educational psychologist, who mainly emphasised the child's inability to concentrate. However, the reports formulated later in his secondary school give a clearer understanding of some of his strange behaviour.

At 7 years 8 months, the educational psychologist reported that F.P., 'is a boy of very uneven development who, whilst being intellectually able, is not emotionally stable enough to make progress satisfactorily and cannot yet get into the habit of working for other than short periods.'

Later during his secondary education F.P. regularly attended the Child and Family Guidance Clinic together with his parents who, whilst defensive about the need for child guidance, agreed to co-operate. His secondary school was also concerned about his inability or unwillingness
to give sustained concentration to school work. It was at this time that the reason for the earlier statement of 'odd' behaviour became clearer. Some of this behaviour pattern is summarised in the following school observations obtained from discussions with F.P., his parents, and those who taught him.

a) A fear of the dark and the need for a torch to be lit during the night.

b) Inability to get to sleep until the early hours of the morning (F.P. attributed this to family rows. This was denied by his parents).

c) Threatened suicide and pre-occupation with death.

d) Bizarre statements written into school books (actual statements not recorded).

e) Acknowledging being guilty of offences in school which it was known other pupils had committed.

f) A rapid alternation between a calm responsible attitude to an erratic and emotional form of behaviour.

g) Ran away from home and school on several occasions.

The educational psychologist's report early in his secondary education records:--

Chronological Age 11 years 9 months
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Maxwell: short form).

Verbal scale I.Q. 111
Performance Scale I.Q. 114
Full Scale I.Q. 112
Schonell Reading Age 9 years

F.P.'s secondary education has been punctuated by reports of restless attention-seeking behaviour, unwillingness to co-operate in class and periodic incidents of intense anger which sometimes culminated in him running away from school or home and repeated suicide threats. It seems likely that many of these problems stem from his need for
attention. This need is satisfied by these outlets, much to the consternation of those that teach him.

Upon reaching the 4th year of his secondary education and making his choices of 'options' for his final two years of school, he elected almost entirely to follow non-examination courses, in spite of the fact that he was capable of taking examination courses. This perhaps underlines his unwillingness to work in class.

F.P. was observed by the writer over a period of ten weeks in a class of one of his non-examination option courses. His attention was constantly being drawn by noises; for example, scraping of chairs in overhead classroom, and movement e.g. to and from, and in other classrooms. His distraction was general and not task-specific. Once distracted it was difficult to regain his attention, and even when his attention was recaptured it was retained only for short periods. Often he deliberately tried to sidetrack the teacher from the task in hand by asking questions completely unrelated to the topic being taught. He rarely came to lessons on time or prepared to work, frequently forgetting to bring pen or books, and would not conform to school rules related to wearing uniform.

F.P.'s distractibility was felt to present a major problem in the classroom, not only because much of his own time was wasted, but also because he made learning difficult for other pupils, by disruptive attention-seeking behaviour, often manifested by violent outbursts when he could not get his own way.

This situation added to problems which always exist in non-examination classes for upper-secondary school pupils where there are often several pupils with learning or emotional problems, or both.

There are obvious ways to reduce distractibility. For example, it could be an advantage to arrange the classroom environment in a very simple way e.g. absence of wall
displays, screening of windows, isolate the pupil from other students. In this way the child is less likely to be distracted by other children or items of interest in the classroom.

Apart from the fact that such a situation is often impractical in the normal school, and can result in a less interesting environment for other pupils, Frances-Williams (1976) says that it is our goal to help these children to live and learn in as normal conditions as possible. She also argues that a child cannot profitably tolerate sensory deprivation for too long. In other words, structuring the classroom environment in this way can create as many problems as it solves.

Earlier in this chapter (vide section 6.1) it was stated that positive reinforcement techniques have been found to be effective in modifying behaviour, as well as being more pleasant to use (Woody, 1969). It was felt that in view of the degree of distractable and unpredictable behaviour of F.P., a powerful agent would be needed to overcome this child's problem. The fact that F.P. was so often attention-seeking made it likely that praise alone would be ineffective in his case. It was, therefore, decided to use primary and conditioned reinforcement, coupled with secondary social praise in an attempt to increase his attending behaviour.

Section 6.2 of this chapter discussed the use of rewards as positive reinforcement, and it was explained that choice of rewards which could be used were limited in this school (as it is in most), but visits using the school mini-bus were very popular. It was also intended to link the primary reinforcement of the mini-bus trip to secondary reinforcers in the form of a system of points and tokens which were aimed eventually to have a wider application. It was hoped that the introduction of conditioned reinforcement and extension of application would avoid the problem of satiation which could occur if the primary reinforcement were used alone.
It was anticipated that the mini-bus outing would be such a strong reinforcement that 'Premack's Differential Probability Principle' (Premack, 1959) would operate. This principle holds that for any two behaviours emitted by an organism, the lower rate of behaviour can be made more probable by making contingent upon its occurrence the opportunity to engage in the higher rate of behaviour.

In the experiment described here, if the chosen primary reinforcer is effectively powerful, F.P.'s attending behaviour should increase. The amount of reward to be given was contingent on the amount of appropriate behaviour exhibited.

Method

It was decided to carry out the experiment in one of F.P.'s non-examination classes, which he attended for four periods (2x1 hour sessions) a week, along with nine other pupils with learning or behaviour problems, or both.

Following preparatory discussions with F.P., when he was made aware of the programme it was intended to introduce, it was explained to the whole teaching group that F.P.'s teacher was not satisfied with the concentration he was giving to his studies or the standard of work he was presenting. It was pointed out that a special programme was being introduced which would help F.P. improve, and at the same time provide a reward for the whole class. Thus, treatment began on a contractual basis, and F.P. was going to be working for the whole class as well as himself.

The ultimate reward and the proposed system of awarding points was outlined to the class. They were very enthusiastic about the idea, and suggested they should be allowed to choose names for the achievements which would earn points. These chosen names are shown in brackets in the description of the points system shown in Table 14. Whilst at first sight the choice of names appear flippant, the enthusiasm of the pupils indicated that it would be worthwhile to include them in scheme.
Table 14

**POINTS SYSTEM**

1. Attendance (Crawler) = 2 points
2. Prepared for lesson (Groveller) /pen, books, etc./ = 2 points
3. Wearing school uniform (Super Creep) = 2 points
4. Paying attention (Square Head) = 1 point per
(i.e. possible 12 points in one hour lesson = 12 x 5 minutes)

Possible 18 points per lesson (36 marks possible per week)

Plus Bonus points (Boffins) = 1-5 points for particularly good quality work

Minus Penalty points (Neck Pains) = 1-5 points for poor behaviour

Points exchange = 2 points for 1 minute out of school in mini-bus for field work

---

Table 15

**POINTS GRID DISPLAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous points earned</th>
<th>Attendance (Crawler)</th>
<th>Prepared (Groveller)</th>
<th>Uniform (Super Creep)</th>
<th>Attention (Square Head)</th>
<th>Bonuses + (Boffins)</th>
<th>Penalties - (Neck Pains)</th>
<th>Points to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson one</td>
<td>Lesson two</td>
<td>Lesson one</td>
<td>Lesson two</td>
<td>Lesson one</td>
<td>Lesson two</td>
<td>Lesson two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 14 it can be seen that during each lesson two points were awarded for each of the following; attending the lesson on time, coming to the lesson prepared for work (pen, books etc.), and wearing school uniform. One point was also awarded for every five minutes of paying attention (i.e. a possible 12 points in one hour lesson — 12x5 minutes), so for this part of the recording 18 points per lesson could be gained (36 points per week). In addition, 'bonus' points were available to be added for particularly good quality work, and 'penalty' points could be deducted for poor behaviour (1 to 5 points in each case). Points attained by F.P. could be exchanged by the whole class at the exchange rate of two points for one minute out of school in the mini-bus for field work. With maximum sustained effort it was possible for F.P. to gain 23 minutes out of school in the mini-bus for the class each week.

A grid system (Table 15) was drawn up to record points gained each lesson. The grid was displayed on a large chart in the classroom every lesson. This was done to show F.P.'s progress and to encourage the remainder of the class to motivate him to do well.

Experimental Design

It was intended that the design to be used should be able to demonstrate experimental control and the effect of certain variables on behaviour. Application of behaviour modification must be carried out under controlled conditions if we are to be able to measure change reliably and to establish a cause and effect relationship.

Two 'classical' designs used in application of behaviour modification are the ABA design, and the more commonly used ABAB or reversal design. The ABA design, where A is pre and post measures and B is the treatment, has a number of critics. For example, Gelfand and Hartmann (1975) say that using this method (they refer to it as OXO) we cannot safely attribute changes in behaviour to the treatment alone. In other words, extraneous factors or confounding
variables might be mistaken for a treatment effect (Hersen and Barlow, 1976). Harrop (1980) also criticises this design for the same reasons, and he further comments that it may not be acceptable to the practitioner because it presents difficulties in withdrawal of treatment.

For the purpose of this study it was decided to adopt the ABAB design, of which an excellent, easy to follow process description can be found in Gelfand and Hartmann (1975).

The basic characteristics of the ABAB or reversal design are as follows: During stage A, a series of baseline observations are obtained of the subject's behaviour; during the first B stage, the treatment or independent variable is manipulated while continuing observation/recording of the subject; during the second A stage, or return to the baseline, the treatment variable is removed and the procedures that were in effect during the baseline are reinstated while observations are continued. The last B stage is a return to the treatment procedures.

A standard method of depicting records of observations carried out during the ABAB stages is by a series of graphs, similar to the fictional example of Figure 16. If behaviour is controlled by the experimental manipulations, it should rise and fall with each introduction and removal of the independent variable if we are trying to accelerate a behaviour. When we are attempting to decelerate a behaviour (as in this experiment where we are attempting to decrease off-task behaviour) the opposite direction change should occur with each introduction and removal of the treatment variable (producing the opposite graphical effect to that shown in Figure 16).

In the experiment described in this chapter the programme followed was in fact an extension of the ABAB design. In the second treatment session, the treatment differs from the first in respect of the nature of the
Example of method of depicting demonstration of experimental control in application of ABAAB design. Adapted from Saltzberg & Horwitz, (1973, p.53).

Figure 16.
reinforcement and in terms of the schedule of reinforce-
ment. We could, therefore, refer to the current design
as ABAC as opposed to ABAB.

Procedure

Al: Baseline period

During this period observations were to be made of
the duration and frequency of off-task distractible behaviour.
Before instituting formal data collection, it was necessary
to establish a definition of the target behaviour to be ob-
served.

According to Hutt and Hutt (1970) there are two
general approaches to defining and describing target behaviour.
It can be described in terms of the movements comprising
the response, or it can be defined in terms of its functions
or the effects it has on the environment. Hutt and Hutt say
that some behavioural abnormalities are manifested primarily
in the former characteristics of behaviour, whilst others in
the functional definition. Other problem behaviours require
specification in both spheres. For this reason, they suggest
that in practice both are necessary for a full analysis of
behaviour.

In view of the previously stated objective of this
experiment to reduce distractibility, target behaviour is
on-task or attending behaviour. This can be further defined
in topographical terms as follows:

Facing instructional materials and engaging in
activities related to the task in hand; seeking
assistance from the teacher for specified purpose
relating to the task; engaging in movement which
related to the task in hand.

Anything which fell within the above definition
was considered to be on-task. For example, it was accept-
able if F.P. sought attention from the teacher related to
the task in hand, but not if the assistance was on a non-
related kind in which he was so frequently prone to engage. Sharpening his pencil, for example, was considered to be on-task only if it needed to be sharpened, otherwise such activity would be considered off-task.

It is relatively easy to define on-task behaviour in topographical terms, but it is more difficult to define attending behaviour, and this can present problems to this kind of programme (discussed further later in this chapter). For example, how can one adequately define the difference between serious thought and aimless daydreaming? Purposefulness, which is a covert mental activity, is assessed by the observer and of necessity must be subjective, although observation can be helped by skilful questions put to the subject by the teacher. Obviously, where the behaviour observed is clearly evident and dramatic the difficulties involved in recording are less of a problem than where many subtle problems occur. Hence, Gelfand and Hartmann (1975, p.28) suggest that 'the undesired behaviour should occur at a high rate ........ lower rates of behaviour create difficulties in observation'.

The baseline observations were carried out over 10 one-hour sessions on different days. Two of these sessions took place in a week, and the subject was observed for 15 minutes during each session. Frequency and duration of off-task behaviour during the 15 minute period was recorded and where evident the antecedent event for each distraction. The 15 minute periods were instituted in the second quarter of the lesson i.e. to give sufficient time for the teacher's introductory talk and for the class to settle down to concentrated work. Appendix H shows an example of the data sheets used to record the baseline observations.

Harrop (1980) suggests that when carrying out behaviour modification techniques, two independently recording observers should be used, who then calculate their percentage agreement to achieve observer reliability. This recommendation is well founded, but it is difficult to arrange in the secondary school because it requires the provision of three members
of staff (teacher and two observers); an arrangement which is costly of staff provision and often impossible to reliably arrange in the normal school. Therefore, in spite of the desirability of providing two observers independent of the teacher, this experiment used only one independent observer, and this was only possible because the experiment took place during the Summer Term, when some teachers had received relief from contact time due to the departure of the leaving fifth year pupils. However, unsatisfactory though it may seem, arrangements were made for the class teacher to record behaviour in addition to the independent observer and then percentage agreement between the two was calculated. In view of the following disclosed limitations, it is appropriate here to remind the reader of the earlier stated intention of carrying out this experiment within the limiting contingencies of the class teacher in the normal school.

Harrop (1980) draws attention to the distraction which can occur by the presence of somebody timing in the classroom. It is felt that this problem was satisfactorily overcome by using both the teacher and the observer from the same department which F.P. was attending during the experiment, and by introducing the observer into the classroom on a regular basis for several weeks prior to the introduction of the programme. Thus, the subject became used to seeing the observer present in the classroom.

Baseline observations were continued in accordance with the recommendation of Gelfand and Hartmann (1975, p.230) until it was possible to be 'confident that the behaviour was not consistently changing in the desired direction without intervention'.

**B: First phase of treatment**

F.P. was introduced to the primary reinforcer in the manner described earlier. He was informed that his teacher was not satisfied with the attention and effort he was giving to his studies, and the programme to be introduced
was intended to help him. The programme procedure was also described to the remainder of his class to enlist their support; this resulted in the enthusiastic response described earlier in this chapter, and encouraged F.P. to do well because the ultimate reward benefitted them also.

F.P. and the class were informed that a timing arrangement would be instituted while he worked, but that he would not be told when timing was in progress. The purpose of the independent observer was not divulged to the class, therefore, as far as they were concerned, the fact that the observer was present was coincidental and a situation to which they had become accustomed.

The actual timing procedure was to institute the recording during the second 15 minutes of each one hour lesson. It was felt that the second 15 minutes of the lesson was appropriate because it allowed time for the class to settle down and get to work following the teacher's introductory talk and work instructions.

It will be recalled that the arrangement with the pupils was that one point would be awarded for each minute of attending behaviour, but the foregoing described recording procedure only covers 15 minutes of the lesson. In allocation of points to the pupils' recording grid chart the actual points earned during the recorded 15 minutes were multiplied by four, but as far as recording for the purpose of the experiment, data was collected on a strict observation basis.

During the lesson the observer kept two stop watches running. One was used to record accurately the length of the 15 minute session, the other was used to measure off-task behaviour in a manner similar to that recorded in the example shown in Appendix H. On some occasions both the teacher and the observer carried out this form of recording and inter-observer reliability was measured (discussed later).
At the end of the lesson the teacher collected a piece of paper from the observer showing the score achieved. The teacher multiplied the time recorded as on-task by four to establish the points to be awarded, and advised the class of F.P.'s score which was entered on the large grid display chart. If appropriate the subject was given social praise for his achievement, and it was emphasised how many points had been gained and what this meant in terms of time out of school.

At the end of the week the primary reinforcer of the mini-bus trip was effected. The teacher and the observer planned the trip meticulously, taking care to make sure that the pupils were aware that they only gained exactly the time out of school that had been earned. The actual time allocated as a reward in the first week was deliberately generous, but even so this only gained a 30 minute mini-bus trip, which was not long enough to do anything really constructive other than give the pupils a ride out of school and a taste of things to come.

A2: Reversal

After five days of treatment (spread over a period of two-and-a-half weeks) during which time the duration and frequency of off-task behaviour was recorded, the treatment was withdrawn. F.P. and the class were told that the mini-bus was booked by other groups and, therefore, was not available. The observer continued to make observations during the reversal period (4 days — 2 weeks).

C: Second phase of treatment

After the reversal period, treatment was reinstated. F.P. and the experimental class were informed that the points system was being re-introduced because the mini-bus was now available again. But during this phase of treatment it was intended to begin certain generalisation and diffusion of control.

Firstly, it was decided to encourage the group to
accumulate the reward time gained by F.P., the object being to use the time on extended visits which would have stronger reinforcing value. Extended use of time allocation also helped to reduce the administration work involved in arranging visits out of school. The pupils decided that they would like to use the time achieved on a field study trip to a local fishing village. A worthwhile trip such as this would require two hours, so the group had a positive target to aim for, and the definition of the target behaviour had been extended to include points accumulation and delayed gratification.

Secondly, it was intended to introduce 'tokens' for the 'bonus' points that were awarded (refer Table 14) whenever F.P. made a particularly good response. Thus, it became immediately clear to the subject when he had done something really worthwhile. The bonus points system was to be extended in that now there was to be no limit to the number that could be gained. Tokens were to be given for good work, answering questions sensibly, maintained concentration and other clear indications of co-operation.

Initially, it was intended to also award 'penalty' tokens for bad behaviour, but this idea was dropped in consideration of the possibility that the subject might deliberately hide or 'lose' these tokens, thereby making it necessary for the teacher to record the tokens when issuing them. Instead, it was decided that a penalty would constitute the removal of a bonus token. For this to be effective it was necessary at the start of each session to look for the earliest opportunity to award bonus tokens, so that some were available to be taken away if necessary. If this opportunity was not available the system became a little more difficult to operate and, therefore, the teacher looked for even the most minor reason to award a bonus token.

We have already discussed earlier the various forms that tokens can take. In this case the tokens consisted of 2" square cards on which the word BONUS was printed, followed by the teacher's signature.
At the end of the lesson the whole class were involved in the task of recording the points earned on the chart. This was a time when F.P. became the centre of attraction because it was now that the recording of his bonus points drew maximum attention from the remainder of the group.

The main aim of the change of treatment in this phase was to step up the strength of the reinforcement to allow ease of extension of the programme, and to offset the effect of delaying application of the primary reinforcer. The level of work was carefully controlled at the beginning of this phase of the programme to give the maximum opportunity for the subject to experience success.

An advantage gained from the introduction of conditioned reinforcement in the form of tokens is that it has greater possibilities for manipulation in the administration of the programme. For example, it now became easier to use intermittent and delayed reinforcement which are useful in demonstrating experimental control.

In the previously described phase of treatment, F.P. received continuous reinforcement. Whilst an element of this form of reinforcement was continued in treatment phase C, the introduction of token reinforcement was on an intermittent basis.

Ferster and Skinner (1957) suggest that the wise therapist should incorporate increasing intermittency of reinforcement into the programme. They say that subtle changes in the schedule of reinforcement might generate dramatic differences in behaviour. At the same time of course we want to bring the child to the point at which appropriate behaviour is maintained by the type of reinforcement which would normally occur in the classroom e.g. varied intermittent reinforcement.
Initially, as in this programme, the reward is administered continuously for appropriate responses. Later this has to be changed to intermittent reinforcement. Gelfand and Hartmann (1975, p.122) recommend that 'when the child is responding correctly on 80 percent or more of the training trials for two or three consecutive days, reinforcement can be administered for every other correct response' (fixed ratio = every nth response reinforced — reinforcing every second response produces a FR2 schedule). Eventually, the modifier is working towards a variable ratio (VR) schedule where increasing intermittency can be introduced progressively until tokens are no longer needed to maintain the target behaviour.

The transition from continuous reinforcement to increasingly intermittent reinforcement must be conducted with extreme care. Skinner (1968) writes on the care one needs to employ in 'stretching the ratio'. If too much is demanded, no response may satisfy and the behaviour generated up to that point will be extinguished. Gelfand and Hartmann (1975) say that if necessary, stable correct responding should be re-established, moving again towards greater intermittency.

It is essential that the subject is eventually brought under the control of intermittent reinforcement to reach the stage where behaviour is maintained indefinitely by a small number of reinforcements. To reach this desired stage it is necessary to increase the demand of what is expected for each reinforcement, to the greatest extreme that the behaviour of the subject allows. It is here that the use of the token system lends itself to flexible, variable and delayed reinforcement. We can raise the 'cost' of the token, or we can simply vary the times when rewards are given. We can also extend the use of the token to alternative rewards e.g. from the mini-bus trip to early departure from school.
By gradually demanding more appropriate behaviour for the award of a token, increasing generalisation and diffusion of control, it is expected that the transfer of control to normal classroom methodology will occur more easily.

Results

During the experimental programme, off-task behaviour was recorded in two ways, the frequency of off-task events and the duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session. These recordings are shown graphically in Figures 17 and 18.

It is useful to display the information obtained in both the ways used in Figures 17 and 18 because neither method alone gives us the kind of comprehensive view of treatment effect we are looking for here. For example, we might say that in a hypothetical situation, on session one the subject was off-task twice but on session two he was off-task four times. But this information is more relevant if we can link it with measurement of the percentage of the session time length that was spent off-task. In the foregoing example, although session two showed the higher frequency of the subject off-task, it could be that in session one he spent a greater percentage of time off-task. For this reason both sets of information are shown in the graphical representation.

F.P. responded dramatically and immediately the first treatment session began. From figures 17 and 18 it can be seen that his baseline of off-task behaviour was virtually extinguished, and the trend is clearly reflected in both graphs. It can be seen that there is not a 100% correlation between the frequency of off-task events and the duration of off-task behaviour. For example, it can be seen that whilst with session 14 the frequency of off-task events was twice that of session 12, the actual duration of off-task behaviour was the same for both sessions. What is important for this work is that both representations show that implementation of the treatment was very effective in
Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

Formula: \( \frac{100 \times \text{time off-task}}{\text{session length}} = \% \text{ off-task} \)

**Baseline Period (A1)**

**1st Treatment (B)**

**Reversal (A2)**

**2nd Treatment (C)**
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Figure 18

Figure 18 shows the percentage of off-task behaviour over the course of sessions, divided into baseline and treatment periods. The graph indicates a decrease in off-task behaviour from baseline to the 1st treatment, followed by an increase during reversal, and finally a decrease during the 2nd treatment.

- Baseline Mean: 65.1%
- 1st Treatment Mean: 49.0%
- Reversal Mean: 9%
- 2nd Treatment Mean: 12%
reducing off-task behaviour.

During this first treatment phase of the programme, the primary reinforcer of a trip in the school mini-bus was implemented after each second session (e.g. once per week). Whilst this was satisfactory in that pupils were frequently experiencing reinforcement, the drawbacks discussed earlier emerged.

a) The 'time' earned by the subject was not sufficient to allow the mini-bus trip to incorporate constructive field work, and this was essential to obtain the approval of the remainder of the teaching staff.

b) The administration involved in arranging for the use of the mini-bus on such a frequent basis became restrictive.

For these reasons, and for the purpose of manipulating delayed rewarding sequence, it was decided to change the next treatment phase in the manner described earlier.

During the reversal period (A2), when the treatment was suspended, the subject's baseline of off-task behaviour increased significantly, which indicates that the behaviour of the subject was controlled by the treatment. It should also be noted that during this period the baseline was generally slightly below the trend recorded during baseline period A1. This could be said to indicate that there has possibly been some enduring effect of the treatment, but the apparent long-term gain is not emphatic enough to consider this suggestion as conclusive.

In phase two of the treatment (C) the baseline target was promptly re-established in that both frequency and percentage of time spent off-task were again dramatically reduced. During this phase of treatment the rewarding process was changed in the manner described earlier in that the
subject was now required to 'save' reward time gained and the 'token' system was introduced. During this phase it can be seen from figures 17 and 18 that although F.P. still spent some time off-task, this compared very favourably with his initial baseline.

Inter-observer reliability

Inter-observer reliability rates were calculated on three occasions for this initial experiment. It should be reiterated here that whilst it is preferable to use two independent observers, it was only possible to use one with the classteacher also recording. This latter situation was helped by the fact that the measurement sessions were not instituted until after the teacher had given the introduction to the lesson.

The method used to record observations and calculate inter-observer reliability followed the recommendations of Gelfand and Hartmann (1975), the full results and methods of which are included in Appendix I. The treatment session was divided into 15 one minute periods, and the observers simultaneously made a tick on a prepared chart to indicate the occurrence of off-task behaviour. Percentage agreement was then calculated using the method advocated by Gelfand and Hartmann (1975, pp.208-211), which demonstrated a high degree of agreement (refer Appendix I).

It should be emphasised here that whilst inter-observer reliability figures were obtained using the classteacher, all other observations were recorded by the independent observer whilst the teacher worked with the class i.e. it is not inferred that at any other time the teacher was involved in both teaching and recording, which would make the findings suspect.

6.4 Subsequent experiments

Having worked through the process of conducting a single experiment from beginning to end, become familiar with the procedure involved, and identified the related difficulties, it was decided to conduct a series of further
experiments. From this additional investigation it was hoped that more reliable conclusions could be drawn.

Four programmes were initiated following the same procedure as that previously described in this chapter. A disruptive upper-secondary pupil was identified in four different classes of the 4th year (terms 2 and 3) of one school. The subjects chosen were all boys, the reason for this being that there were no 'suitable' female pupils in the classes where it was most convenient to implement the studies.

The same reinforcement procedures as previously used (and described earlier) were applied, and intervention effect was recorded and displayed in the dual graphical form of frequency and duration of off-task behaviour similar to the method shown in Figures 17 and 18.

These later experiments included a follow-up measurement of each of the pupils four weeks after completion of the programme, thus allowing objective consideration of the extent of enduring effect the technique had implemented. Inter-observer agreement was calculated in the same manner as that previously used and described in Appendix I (for results refer to Appendix J).

Each experiment is identified by the letters W, X, Y and Z, and the data recorded is shown in Figures 19 to 26. Follow-up measurements taken four weeks after completion of each programme are combined together in one diagram (Figures 27 and 28). For the purpose of effective simple illustration and discussion, the mean readings for each of the experiments are summarised together in histogram form in Figure 29. However, whilst histograms represent results in a format that is easy to interpret, in this application it does not necessarily disclose the more subtle interpretations such as fluctuations in performance and trends (for detailed discussion see Kazdin, 1982, pp.304-307). Therefore, for more detailed interpretation, the reader is recommended to consult each individual graph.
### Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

**Formula**

\[
\frac{100 \times \text{time off-task}}{\text{session length}} = \% \text{ off-task}
\]

**Basis for graphs Figures 20, 22, 24, 26.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Baseline (A1)</th>
<th>1st Treatment (B)</th>
<th>Reversal (A2)</th>
<th>2nd Treatment (C)</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>16 17 18 19</td>
<td>20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>[1 2 3 4 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Mean</td>
<td>50 83 70 78 55 60 70 60 80 90</td>
<td>25 10 5 7 6</td>
<td>10 32 85 80</td>
<td>17 0 3 6 5</td>
<td>73 58 76 72 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \left( \frac{696}{10} = 69.6% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{53}{5} = 10.6% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{207}{4} = 51.75% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{31}{5} = 6.2% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{344}{5} = 68.8% \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Mean</td>
<td>64 67 65 90 77 75 88 62 80 76</td>
<td>52 5 14 12 6</td>
<td>54 67 57 75</td>
<td>12 3 10 0 7</td>
<td>68 72 58 73 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \left( \frac{744}{10} = 74.4% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{89}{5} = 17.8% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{253}{4} = 63.25% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{32}{5} = 6.4% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{347}{5} = 69.4% \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Mean</td>
<td>53 63 66 46 78 70 53 73 75 80</td>
<td>7 5 18 10 2</td>
<td>34 58 36 67</td>
<td>18 23 5 7 4</td>
<td>54 58 62 60 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \left( \frac{657}{10} = 65.7% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{42}{5} = 8.4% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{195}{4} = 48.75% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{57}{5} = 11.5% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{293}{5} = 58.6% \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Mean</td>
<td>88 70 86 82 92 65 72 52 57 68</td>
<td>7 2 6 3 16</td>
<td>67 82 72 85</td>
<td>7 5 7 2 3</td>
<td>60 64 65 55 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \left( \frac{732}{10} = 73.2% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{34}{5} = 6.8% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{306}{4} = 76.5% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{24}{5} = 4.8% \right) )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{303}{5} = 60.6% \right) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency of off-task events
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Figure 19 (W) Number of Sessions
Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

Formula: \( \frac{\text{Session length} \times \text{time off-task}}{100} = \% \text{ off-task} \)

Baseline Period (A1) | 1st Treatment (B) | Reversal (A2) | 2nd Treatment (C)

Figure 20 (W) | Number of sessions
**Frequency of off-task events**
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- 2nd Treatment (C)

- Mean = ...

**Figure 21 (X)**

- Number of Sessions

- Mean 9.7
- Mean 4.2
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- Mean 1.2
Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

Formula \[ \frac{100 \times \text{time off-task}}{\text{session length}} = \% \text{ off-task} \]

Baseline Period (A1) | 1st Treatment (B) | Reversal (A2) | 2nd Treatment (C)

Mean = ....

Mean 74.4%

Mean 17.8%

Mean 63.26%

Mean 6.4%

Figure 22 (X) Number of sessions
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Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

Formula: $\frac{\text{time off-task}}{\text{session length}} \times 100 = \% \text{ off-task}$

- **Baseline Period (A1)**
  - Mean: 65.7%

- **1st Treatment (B)**
  - Mean: 8.4%

- **Reversal (A2)**
  - Mean: 48.75%

- **2nd Treatment (C)**
  - Mean: 11.5%

**Figure 24 (Y)**

Number of sessions:
Frequency of off-task events

Baseline Period (A1) 1st Treatment (B)  Renewal (A2) 2nd Treatment (C)

Frequency of off-task events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Mean 1.4</td>
<td>Mean 7.75</td>
<td>Mean 11.1</td>
<td>Mean 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25 (Z) Number of Sessions
Duration of off-task behaviour expressed as a percentage of each session

Formula: \( \frac{100 \times \text{time off-task}}{\text{session length}} = \% \text{ off-task} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Period (A1)</th>
<th>1st Treatment (B)</th>
<th>Reversal (A2)</th>
<th>2nd Treatment (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mean = ...

Mean 73.2%

Mean 6.8%

Mean 76.5%

Mean 4.8%

Figure 20 (Z) Number of sessions
Duration of off-task events expressed as a percentage of each session
Follow-up recordings taken 4 weeks after completion - Summary of all 5 experiments

Figure 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Experiment</th>
<th>Experiment W</th>
<th>Experiment X</th>
<th>Experiment Y</th>
<th>Experiment Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean 65.4%</td>
<td>mean 69.4%</td>
<td>mean 68.8%</td>
<td>mean 58.6%</td>
<td>mean 60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of sessions
Frequency of off-task events

Follow-up recordings taken 4 weeks after completion - Summary of all 5 experiments

Initial experiment | Experiment W | Experiment X | Experiment Y | Experiment Z

| Mean 9.6 | Mean 5.6 | Mean 11.0 | Mean 8.6 | Mean 7.4 |

Figure 28
Analysis of all experimental programmes

In all the graphical representations presented in Figure 29 we can see a clear indication that application of reinforcement contingencies had the effect of reducing off-task behaviour. This effect was not always as dramatic and conclusive as it was in the initial experiment, but a significant change in behaviour was invariably recorded. This trend is reflected in both absolute frequency and duration bar graphs, but it is more clearly demonstrated in the latter illustrations.

Changes in behaviour recorded between application of 1st treatment (B), reversal (A2) and subsequent 2nd treatment (C) clearly demonstrates experimental control. Thus, we can be confident that change in behaviour can be attributed to the primary reinforcer. This is discussed further shortly.

When referring to absolute frequency graphs W, X and Y, the effect of the intervention programme seems less convincing in that we cannot see the same clear pattern of experimental effect that is so apparent with the remainder of the graphs. However, if we examine the 'duration' recordings (which are the more important representations) for these particular experiments, we can see the pattern of effect on behaviour is similar throughout the experiments. From this observation we can certainly conclude that behaviour modification, using the described reinforcement procedures, has been found to be effective with the upper-secondary school pupils which comprised this sample.

1. Absolute frequency of occurrence of inappropriate behaviour can be misleading. For example, the observation that misbehaviour happened on only one occasion in a lesson may seem satisfactory, but if that one event lasts 50% of the lesson one's view of the event is less benevolent. Consequently, the essential feature of this study is duration rather than frequency of event (Refer Gelfand and Hartmann, 1975, pp.58-59 and Kazdin, 1982, pp.32-33).
Consideration of the 'follow-up' measurement of behaviour, when compared with the original baseline and intervention effect, gives a clear indication that application of the technique to this age group does not have an enduring effect. One could, therefore, conclude from this investigation that behaviour modification, as applied here, 'contained' the subject while reinforcement contingencies were in effect, but did not have a lasting effect.

6.6 Summary and discussion

The procedures followed and related in this chapter are designed to establish experimental control over the behaviour by eliminating the effect of possible confounding variables. In the experiments relating herein, for example, we must ask ourselves, was the improved behaviour the result of the reinforcement contingency, or was some other variable such as change in teaching technique responsible for the behaviour improvement?

Discussion between the class teacher and observer concluded that involvement in operating the programme had affected teaching technique. Due to the more rigorous preparation demanded in effecting the experiments, it was felt that awareness by the teacher was increased and this resulted in more effective teaching and class control. However, if the improved pupil behaviour was the result of more adept teaching technique, as opposed to the effect of the reinforcement schedule, then the baseline would not have been raised so dramatically during the reversal period. We can, therefore, be reasonably confident that the programmes did demonstrate experimental control, and that the alteration in behaviour was due to the influence of the primary reinforcer.

Whilst the treatment programme was clearly effective in the lessons where it was applied, periodic discussions with teachers of classes that the subjects attended outside the sphere of the experiment revealed that the improved behaviour was not carried over to other lessons. Similarly, follow-up observations of the subjects just four weeks after conclusion of the experimental period revealed that they had
all returned to their former baseline or close to it, thus perhaps indicating that the technique did not have an enduring effect.

The foregoing observation makes one suspect that the procedures initiated were in fact controlling the subjects as opposed to modifying their behaviour. This is a familiar criticism of behaviour modification techniques, and Silberman (1973) warns that there is a danger of control becoming an end in itself, so that the real business of teaching becomes forgotten. This is of course only a danger and not an inevitable consequence, and it has already been stated that in these cases it was felt that teacher competence had been improved. However, it is worthwhile noting that Silberman comments that it is on control that teacher competence is invariably judged, and, therefore, it is not surprising that teachers themselves become obsessed with silence and lack of movement in the classroom. Hence, one needs to be aware of the danger of encouraging this inflexible attitude when selecting target behaviour in applying behaviour modification techniques.

In spite of the foregoing opinion that involvement in the experiments appeared to have a beneficial effect on teaching technique the teachers seemed more concerned with what the subjects did or did not do, as opposed to establishing what they thought about their actions. In other words, the experimenters tended to place little emphasis on the need for them to reason or to develop intrinsic interest in their studies. If this is true, then again, it can be suggested that behaviour is being controlled as opposed to modified, and the experimenters may be guilty of ignoring underlying factors which may be responsible for deviant behaviour and, therefore, symptoms are being treated whilst causes are ignored. Support for this kind of argument would be forthcoming from those who would prefer the psychodynamic approach when dealing with behaviour problems.
Whilst the data shown in Figures 17 to 29 show that manipulation of the reinforcement contingency produced a significant change in both the frequency and the percentage of time spent off-task, it tells us little about the quality of the subjects' work. The fact that a pupil works 'hard' does not mean he is producing good work, or the best work he is capable of. For example, although during the initial experiment F.P. produced a greater quantity of work than he normally did, his teacher felt that during the first phase of treatment the quality of his work actually deteriorated; there was just more of it. However, the introduction of the token system during the second treatment stage was felt to be instrumental in bringing about some improvement in the quality of his work. A similar conclusion was reached in relation to several of the subsequent experiments, but this must, of necessity, remain the subjective opinion of the class teacher.

It was pointed out earlier, the reservations of using the class teacher as observer when establishing inter-observer reliability rates, but from what at first sight appears a weakness in the programme later emerged as a benefit gained by using the teacher in this way.

Sometimes it appeared that the subject was staring aimlessly out of the window and unaware of the talk the teacher was giving, but when asked a question by the teacher he was able to answer adequately. Where the teacher was unsure that a subject was paying attention, she could initiate a question to establish if he was attending. Where the observer is unsure, of course, he cannot intervene in this way.

The fact that the observer must seem to be unobtrusive in the room can also put him in a less advantageous position to view behaviour, especially if the environment of the classroom makes it difficult to rearrange the room for experimental purposes. However, the fact that the experimenters had frequently been seen in the classroom together made it easier to adopt unobtrusive positions, and the good
inter-observer reliability rates appear to confirm that this was so (refer to Appendix J).

Towards the end of the investigation described, the classteacher commented that it appeared that the behaviour of pupils other than the subject of the experimental class had improved. Unfortunately, this possibility had not been considered prior to implementation of the experiment and, therefore, this consideration remained subjective opinion. It was only after this part of the investigation had been concluded that it was discovered that Harrop (1977) had also noticed this effect and had the foresight to include evaluation of it in his research. This would be a useful extension of the experimental procedures described here for future studies.

At the completion of the full programme of experiments, the classteacher expressed the view that the administration of the programme had been a taxing and exhausting experience. This was partly due to the increased preparation that she initiated in an effort to give subjects the maximum opportunity to achieve success, but also due to the involvement in the administrative side-effects, such as arranging mini-bus bookings and consultations with other teachers involved with the subjects, which was time-consuming.

Because the programme was initiated at a time of the year when some respite from teaching contact time was available (due to the fact that the 5th Year had left the school when the main bulk of the experimental work was implemented), the additional workload involved was acceptable. However, it was felt that at other times of the year it would have been impossible to staff under strict research conditions.

There is clearly a case here for suggesting that if a pupil is identified as being a problem requiring special attention in the manner prescribed in this chapter, and it is deemed desirable that he is retained in the normal class, there should be some recognition of the need for teachers involved with such pupils to receive some relief from contact
time so that they can adequately initiate a programme to help the pupil. This relief from contact time need not necessarily mean the provision of a greater number of 'free' periods for the teacher, but could take the form of a smaller teaching group size.

Although this investigation has indicated that behaviour modification techniques applied to upper-secondary school pupils in the manner described in this chapter appears to be unenduring, the experimental period was not long enough to incorporate the gradual withdrawal of the reinforcement contingency. Further extension of the experiment in this way may have revealed that the technique could have had a more lasting effect, although there is a dearth of evidence to support this suggestion. Neither does there appear to be any consensus of the length of time to be allocated to withdrawal procedures. Kazdin (1982) cites a number of recent studies which have investigated the possibility that sequential or partial-withdrawal of interventions may have the effect of sustaining performance, but, so far, the findings are inconclusive. However, it has been argued in this chapter that it was not possible to further extend the period of time given to the application and we are forced to work within limitations if we wish to observe the difficulties imposed by the normal teaching situation.

We could also say that these experiments suffered from the fact that the subjects attended only one experimental class. Can we really expect to modify a pupil's behaviour when we 'switch on' the experimental conditions for only one hour in a day, where at other times he is not motivated by the same reinforcement contingencies? But, of course, this is the situation we are faced with in the mainstream of school classes.

This latter point could perhaps be interpreted as a strong argument to support the type of programme described in Chapter 5 of this work, where the pupil with behaviour problems was removed from the normal class into the withdrawal facilities provided by the Remedial Department. In the latter
situation, there are greater possibilities for continuous application of behaviour modification techniques. This is the subject of further discussion in the final chapter.

In conclusion, we can say that positive reinforcement used in the manner described here was seen as effective to the extent to which it contained older pupils with behaviour problems within the experimental classes. However, the question of whether behaviour modification techniques have an enduring effect, or can be seen to be modifying behaviour as opposed to controlling it, in respect of upper-secondary school pupils remains an unanswered question as far as this investigation is concerned.

In the secondary school, the choice of reinforcement contingencies is of crucial importance and it does seem that there should be some involvement of this age group of pupils in the choice of reward. The token system used here and culminating in an out-of-school visit using the school minibus certainly proved effective.

Whilst the investigation described here can be viewed as a qualified success, it is very demanding of teaching time and commitment. There remain strong arguments for removing the continuously disruptive pupil from the classroom into a special programme such as that described in Chapter 5 of this work, and where the application of techniques such as those which have been the subject of this chapter might have more chance of enduring success.
CHAPTER 7.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Critique of methodology employed

The thesis has employed two main forms of investigation: survey by questionnaire and case studies. The questionnaire approach was used in six Essex comprehensive schools to ascertain teachers' opinions on the determinants of disruptive behaviour as defined in Chapter 1., and the effectiveness of methods used to deal with such behaviour. The case study approach was applied in two ways. Firstly, in an examination of two administration policies, and the effect of an on-site withdrawal unit on two disruptive pupils. Secondly, the case study approach was also employed when behaviour modification was evaluated experimentally to examine whether it is practicable for classteachers to apply and if the technique is effective with upper-secondary school pupils. The latter particularly, was expected to form the basis of new knowledge.
Investigation by questionnaire

The choice of the questionnaire approach was influenced by three main factors:

(i) economy
(ii) convenience
(iii) preserving anonymity

Having chosen the questionnaire approach it was necessary to design an instrument that would allow teachers to complete it with reasonable ease, thus reducing the possibility that they would disregard it because of the time involved. Equally, the information obtained had to be of constructive use (i.e. as comprehensive as possible within the imposed constraints) in any subsequent analysis if it was to give the desired direction to the research.

Although it was originally intended that the survey would include all the teachers in ten secondary schools in a complete educational division of one County, in effect only six schools were eventually used. The major stumbling block to the original plan was that of non co-operation by some headteachers who refused permission to approach their teaching staff (refer to Chapter 4, Section 4.2 for full discussion).

In view of the foregoing difficulties, and by comparison with the return rate reported from other similar, but better funded surveys, (e.g. London Borough of Croydon, 1972, 53% and N.A.S., 1975, 25%), the response by teachers in the six schools which did agree to participate was encouraging. An average return of 44% (N = 178) of the questionnaires compares favourably with the aforementioned surveys, and indicates that, in respect of this limited sample, teachers are willing to participate in educational research, and appeared to find the questions posed by this survey to be worthwhile.

It is acknowledged that some of the results of the survey carried out in this investigation cannot be accepted without reservation, not least of which are those related to sampling technique.
Invariably, and particularly with part-time research, one is faced with restrictions on sampling due to time, finance and administrative limitations. The most rigorous method recommended is random sampling; however, it is only possible to institute this form of investigation when the researcher is in a position where he is able to ensure participation of the sample randomly selected. For reasons stated in Chapter 4, this was not possible, and, therefore, one is forced to adopt deliberate or opportunity sampling which does allow greater possibility of error. However, the division of the sample into sub-groups, and cross-tabulation between these groups as demonstrated in Chapter 4 helps to increase representativeness of the findings (vide Siegel, 1956, p.178).

Whilst dividing the sample into sub-groups eliminated some of the inadequacies of the sampling technique applied, it did not eradicate them all. It was found that in some instances the cross-tabulations carried out, with a chi-square test applied, revealed that the expected frequencies in some cells were too small, thus making the resulting significance figure less reliable than it might have been. Whilst this does not invalidate the findings, it does restrict some of the conclusions one can safely make in relation to the cross-tabulations carried out. The survey would have clearly benefited from a larger sample size and perhaps greater refinement in defining the sub-groups applied. This does not, however, invalidate the overall conclusions drawn (for a fuller discussion the reader is referred back to Chapter 4, Section 4.6).

The questionnaire approach to survey investigation can provide direct feedback of issues requiring clarification on certain facets that teachers seem worried about. It allows comparative ease of contact with schools and staff and enables busy teachers to complete at a time which is convenient to them. It also allows greater possibility of retaining anonymity than interviews; a factor which is important to teachers, particularly in respect of controversial topics such as those included in this work.

In spite of earlier acknowledged reservations, the survey carried out and related herein proved worthwhile and
did obtain a wealth of useful information. Not least of all it directed attention towards examination of the role the school should play in effectively dealing with problem behaviour in the upper-secondary age group. It also demonstrated that teachers are willing to participate in research which they perceive to be useful if they are given the opportunity to do so.

The case studies

Case study research is not new because investigation of the single-case has a long and respectable history. For example, Wundt (1832-1920), Pavlov (1849-1936), Thorndike (1874-1949), Freud (1856-1939), and many others, recognised as prominent psychologists working in a number of different areas, are noteworthy for the focus they placed on one or a few subjects at one time. But there has been a relatively recent movement towards a more methodical approach to this type of research. The development of single-case research, as currently practised, can be traced to the work of Skinner. Most of Skinner's experiments were essentially single-case studies, but others have used straightforward replication or multi-case studies and reached the same conclusions as Skinner.

Kazdin (1982, pp1-16) has thoroughly explored the arguments in support of case studies as a useful alternative, or complement, to traditional between-group designs in many clinical and research settings. Kazdin argues that single-case investigation represents a methodology in its own right with its own unique features that are of special reference to clinical work i.e. exploration of the effects of variables on an individual.

Although single-case research may involve investigation of one person, it can also evaluate the effects of intervention with a large group and, therefore, have wider implication than just the individual subject. Conversely, such a study may be single-case but involve observation of a complete institution where many variables exist. Both of these interpretations of case study investigation can be seen
in Chapter 5, where the focus of attention was a few individuals but encompassing a wider and complex analysis of the administrative procedures of the school on the behavioural outcomes of the subjects.

Kazdin (1982) usefully distinguishes between 'uncontrolled' and 'controlled' case studies. Uncontrolled studies tend to offer unsystematic assessment in which the therapist merely provides his opinion (albeit informed) about the observations rather than systematic and objective measures which are a prominent feature of controlled studies and experimental approach. Consequently, uncontrolled case studies tend to be 'pre-experimental' (see Kazdin, p.88); providing focus for more rigorous future experimentation as demonstrated in Chapters 5 and 6 of this work.

Under some circumstances, uncontrolled case studies are able to provide information that closely approaches that which can be obtained from experimentation, and can provide insights and hypotheses which escape traditional experimental research. But a frequently valid charge against such studies is that they sometimes do not provide conclusive results and, because we cannot prove cause and effect, limited inference can be drawn. Most pre-experimental designs do not provide sufficient information to rule out major threats to internal validity. Nevertheless, case studies may permit some inferences to be drawn about the basis of treatment which might be appropriate. They help to 'focus attention on the variables considered to be important' (Sarbin and Coe, 1968, p.27) and when applied as case histories of institutions or groups of people they can provide important sources of data (Hilgard, Atkinson and Atkinson, 1971).

The case study investigation in Chapter 5 helped to direct attention to the possibility that school administrative policy can adversely affect disruptives. More importantly, it also allowed comparison of two alternative administrative procedures for dealing with problem pupils, and observation of how a school might effectively deal with problem pupils. In this investigation, the case studies in
Chapter 5 were primarily a source of 'soft' as opposed to quantifiable data. (This is discussed in depth shortly) in other words they represented an 'uncontrolled' investigation.

Lawton (1980) draws attention to the 'new wave' of evaluators who do not wish to reject all traditional methods of measurement (survey, questionnaire etc.), but who want to develop methods of describing the whole context of the subject under evaluation. These evaluators advocate the inclusion of 'soft-data' derived from observation etc., which can reveal subtleties involved which are often outside the scope of traditional research methods. For example, Chapter 5 drew on anecdotal contributions from welfare workers, educational psychologists, headteachers, a variety of categories of teaching staff, form tutors and even the school groundsman. All of these made useful contributions towards building up a dynamic picture of the school system, and its influence on problem pupils.

Lawton (1980) cites Adelman, Jenkins and Kemmis (1976) reporting on the advantages of the case study approach and these can be summarised as follows:-

a) Whilst difficult to organise compared with conventional research methods in that quantification is less easily established, case studies are 'strong in reality'. This reality is achieved because case studies are down-to-earth and attention-holding and can be related to the reader's own experience.

b) Case studies allow generalisation about an instance and can give attention to subtleties of the case, although sample size tends to be limited and, therefore, the generalisation cannot be applied from a small sample to many.

c) They can represent something of the discrepancies and conflicts between viewpoints of those who are subjects of the enquiry.
d) Case studies may form an archive of descriptive material which is rich enough to allow re-interpretation. This can allow subsequent researchers access to source data from which they can abstract whatever applies to their own context.

e) Case studies can be one step in an on-going process. They can contribute to institutional or individual development and provide a basis for formative evaluation because their insights may be directly interpreted and put to use. In the following work, the findings could form the basis of recommended procedures.

f) Because the language in the form of the presentation used is less esoteric and less dependent on specialised interpretation than conventional research reports, case studies present research in a more publicly accessible form than other kinds of report (although this is sometimes at the expense of their extended length). The fact that case studies include a considerable element of descriptive report can allow the reader to judge the implications of a study for himself whereas experimental research tends to produce a less equivocal result, and, therefore, sometimes less flexible than case studies for re-interpretation.

Although the above summary of the advantages of case study investigation appear flexible and attractive, it will be recognised that it emphasises the use of only 'soft-data'. McCormick (1982, p.184) suggests that a preferable approach would be to include the use of 'hard-data' (quantifiable-data) with the flexibility of 'soft-data' investigation by observation etc. Kazdin (1982) similarly points to the desirability of including some means of reaching internally valid conclusions which he says can be achieved through replication (which implies a need for inclusion of 'hard-data').
The investigation in Chapter 5 adopted a 'soft-data' approach because the nature of the source of information did not easily lend itself to analysis by conventional methods; at the same time a form less esoteric than statistical analysis was required to express the subtleties involved to allow re-interpretation and adaptation to alternative contexts. For example, that chapter identified a variety of aspects of the 'hidden curriculum' which it was held influenced behavioural outcomes, and which do not lend themselves to statistical analysis. The more traditional approach was adopted in Chapter 6 which more readily allowed quantifiable analysis and this was enhanced by incorporating the use of 'soft-data' similar to the foregoing recommendation.

Generalisations from case studies are necessarily limited because 'one swallow doesn't make a summer', although Kazdin (1982, p.288) asserts that 'there is no evidence that findings from single-case research are any less generalisable than findings from between-group research. In fact, because of the type of interventions studied in single-case research, the case is sometimes made that the results may be more generalisable than those obtained in between-group research'. However, it was never intended that the work reported in Chapter 5 should imply generality, but rather an in-depth study with which the practising classroom teacher could identify. Neither was it intended to produce an 'end package', as we cannot prescribe an action which will adequately replace those in process in another institution because no two schools are sufficiently alike. The intention was to provide an interpretation and evaluation of some of the alternative strategies which teachers and schools might usefully adapt to their individual requirements. But the investigation in Chapter 5 did identify implications for further exploration in the next stage of the research. In the subsequent work of Chapter 6, generality is more viable through results obtained by replication of intervention effects across several subjects and situations. In fact, replication in the manner applied in the experiments of Chapter 6 lend more readily to generalisation than large sample sizes.
The author's role in this part of the research has been one of participant observation. As a member of the teaching staff of the school investigated it was easier to observe whilst participating within the institution as a part of normal employment. Although I was an 'open' observer as far as teachers were concerned, my role was partly 'disguised' in respect of the pupils. For example, in the experimental work described in Chapter 6 the pupils saw me in my normal role as their teacher, but they were unaware of the full purpose of the 'experiment'. In this role I was able to avoid a major problem in this kind of fieldwork: gaining access and acceptance in the setting, thus, achieving the deeper participation and 'total involvement' advocated by Wolff (1964). Further advantages of adopting a participant observer role were identified in Chapters 5 and 6.

7.2 Discussion of main findings from the survey of teachers

In the literature review we saw that there is considerable evidence indicating that school behavioural outcomes are the result of influences outside the immediate control of schools, such as home background and personality problems. The volume of this evidence gives much weight to Bernstein's (1970) statement that 'education cannot compensate for society', because the implication is that the school can do little or nothing to remedy external factors. However, it is too easy to dismiss problem behaviour as attributable to factors outside the immediate sphere of the school. Bernstein himself made it clear that the problem is more complex than the currently fashionable simple interpretation of his work, attributing problems of working-class children to the use of 'restricted-code' language alone, and recent research (e.g. Rutter et al. 1979) has shown that the school can influence behavioural outcomes in spite of environmental background. There is less evidence available which identifies how the school can adversely affect behaviour ('labelling' e.g. Woods and Hammersley, 1977), or can counter the influences recognised as outside the school's control.
The literature review outlined in Chapter 2 was concerned with two aims. Firstly, establishing the determinants of behaviour, and secondly, identifying the means by which inappropriate behaviour might be changed or contained whilst retaining the disruptive pupil within the normal school.

In respect of the determinants of behaviour, it was found that writers place considerable emphasis upon factors outside the school's immediate control. Even areas of investigation such as personality problems, recognised by many writers as within the field of influence of school factors (e.g. alienation, distractibility, low self-esteem, etc.) provide no clear-cut answers for the school. The personality theories reviewed in Chapter 2 emphasised the possibility of two approaches, neither of which have been proven to be completely practicable. The psychodynamic approach is recognised to involve long, specialist treatment; to be time-consuming, difficult to evaluate, and is generally accepted as impractical for the classteacher. Alternatively, the behaviour modification approach is still in its infancy in British schools, but thought to be within the scope of the normal teacher (see Merrett and Wheldall, 1978), and possibly questionable with regard to the extent of its effectiveness with older pupils (e.g. see Harrop, 1977).

The examination of literature exploring the effect on behaviour of influences outside of school gives considerable weight to the suggestion that the school cannot 'compensate for society'. However, what is important is whether schools accept the effect of influences outside their control as an inevitable limitation on their efforts to educate children, or if they are concerned to establish ways in which they can constructively help disruptive pupils. The references to Rutter et al. (1979) and the case studies reported in Chapters 5 and 6 are particularly held to show that schools can be effective in influencing behavioural outcomes despite influences beyond their immediate control, and, therefore, can 'compensate for society'.
It seems sensible that any investigation into behaviour problems in schools should make considerable use of the opinions of classroom teachers, who are, by virtue of their training and experience, the major group of professionals involved. We have seen in this work that enlisting the help of teachers involves many difficulties. Not always, as one is sometimes led to believe, due to the unwillingness of teachers to participate, but because of the obstacles one sometimes faces in trying to obtain permission from their superiors to approach them; and as Douglas (1982) found, sometimes principals and teachers have different opinions about children and will not express their differences openly in front of each other. This is a further advantage gained from the anonymity of the questionnaire approach.

One of the stated objectives of the survey was to establish if there exists a difference of opinion between current research, as expressed in the review of literature in Chapter 2, and the views of teachers in the sample. The survey also provided the opportunity to further extend observations drawn from the literature review and possibly give focus and direction to subsequent chapters.

Relating to the section of the questionnaire concerning contributory causes of disruptive behaviour, it was considered by the respondents that home background and decline in general standards demanded by society were both major contributors.

The sample were divided in respect of the extent of the influence of the child's personality on behaviour, although only a small percentage (10.7%) claimed it made no contribution. Thus, teachers in this group examined do recognise the important effect of the child's personality on behaviour.

Few (8.5%) of the respondents expressed the opinion that modern teaching methods are a high contributor to behaviour problems in school, with the large remainder of the sample evenly divided between the view that this aspect made
'some' or 'no' contribution. This item of the questionnaire calls for further amplification. 'Modern teaching methods' was included as a sub-section for two reasons. Firstly, informal (used synonymously with modern in this context) teaching methods are often quoted in the popular press as one of the causes of a purported decline in behaviour and educational standards. Secondly, the inclusion of this factor was intended to investigate the implication that less formal methods make it more difficult to keep discipline because they give the pupil greater freedom and opportunity to avoid observation by the teacher.

Inexperienced of some teachers was seen as making some contribution to problems, and this was also the highest scoring 'no contribution' factor in this section. This is an aspect of the questionnaire which would benefit from refinement because of ambiguity. The implication was that the more years teaching experience a teacher has, the more adept they become at dealing with behaviour problems. However, as most teachers would probably acknowledge, some teachers, in spite of long experience, do not become more adept. It would perhaps have been more appropriate if this section had sought teachers' opinions on this latter assertion.

In view of the frequent association between behaviour and learning problems one might have expected that the survey would have shown that teachers considered low intelligence of some pupils to be a high contributor to behavioural outcomes, but this was not the case. Overall analysis of the response showed that only a small percentage (13.6%) considered this a high contributor, while 53.7% said that low intelligence makes 'some' contribution. The reason

1. Also implicitly recognised by adverts for inner-city supply teachers when it is stated that the posts are 'not suitable for probationers'.

2. It is also possible that there is a subjective element in how teachers 'see misbehaviour'. What would horrify one teacher can be acceptable self-expression to another.
for this unexpected result is difficult to identify, but it could be interpreted that 'other' factors are considered more influential (i.e. the more pronounced division of opinion in respect of personality as an influencing factor). However, this remains speculative and unsubstantiated.

It is interesting to note that there was a trend showing that female teachers are more likely than male teachers to consider low intelligence is a factor contributory to behaviour problems in school. A similar trend was seen in the response to the section on 'home background', where female teachers were more likely than male teachers to consider that this influences behavioural outcomes in school.

Although both these trends fell short of statistical significance, it is interesting to note that a similar trend also emerged in the pilot study, and later discussions related to the use of withdrawal units draws attention to a similar difference between male and female response. The possible reasons for this trend are discussed later.

The debate on the influence of the size of school on disruptive behaviour is contradictory. The N.A.S. survey indicated that the bigger the school, the more disruptive behaviour is to be expected. This is contrary to the limited Rutter study (Rutter et al. 1979) where it was found that this factor does not imply greater incidence of behaviour problems, and the present research has shown that teachers consider that size of school does make some, although not high, contribution to problem behaviour.

This apparent disparity lends some substance to the discussion in Chapter 1 of the problems of assessing incidence of disruptive behaviour. Both this survey and that of the N.A.S. relied on the questionnaire approach whereas Rutter employed a greater degree of direct observation. It is unlikely that non-observational investigation can reliably establish incidence of disruptive behaviour because we cannot be sure that all events are reported by teachers. However, inclusion of questionnaire items investigating this aspect
are useful because although they may not reliably reveal incidence of disruption, they do indicate what teachers in the given sample think the position is, and this can be of value.

Although teachers' professional associations imply that incidence of disruptive behaviour is increasing, the findings of the survey reported in this work showed that teachers in the sample surveyed generally did not consider this was so. The N.A.S. suggest that the problem is increasing despite the fact that their own survey results did not show this was so. One must firstly question whether the N.A.S. view is politically motivated in that it increases their bargaining power in wage negotiations to say the problem is increasing. Secondly, it must again be recognised that it is doubtful if non-observational methods of collecting data related to incidence of behaviour problems can ever be reliable; a fact which is acknowledged by the N.A.S. It is also accepted that the survey reported in this investigation represented a limited size sample compared with the N.A.S. survey, and one cannot generalise from the findings herein. Nevertheless, one can still say that within the group of teachers who participated in this study, it was not considered that disruptive behaviour is increasing in schools, neither was it felt to be decreasing.

Probably the most important and useful result which emerged from the current survey was the observation that higher incidence of disruptive behaviour occurs in the upper-age group of secondary education. This result reaffirmed the findings of the pilot study and agreed with the wider survey by the N.A.S.; one can, therefore, accept this finding with some degree of confidence. This helped to direct this investigation in subsequent chapters towards seeking recommendations to help this particular age group, thus giving focus to the research.

A more ambiguous result of the survey was perhaps the finding that a large percentage (66.9%) of the respondents indicated that they experienced no difference between the
sexes with regard to disruptive behaviour. Although this finding reaffirmed the result of the pilot investigation, it conflicted with the N.A.S. survey where it was concluded that boys are more inclined to indulge in disruptive behaviour than girls.

One can only speculate on the reasons for this apparent disparity, which is unfortunate because it is an identification point that could be of crucial importance. If the N.A.S. are correct in their view it may be that future research needs to be directed towards identifying why boys apparently differ from girls in respect of behaviour. It must be conceded that the size of the N.A.S. sample should indicate that their finding is more reliable than the writer's. However, the fact that the current study reaffirmed that of the pilot investigation could suggest that the geographical area covered by this investigation happens to reveal a trend that is different from the national. This must remain speculative and inconclusive, or await replication with further enquiries. There are a variety of avenues which future research could explore related to this. Are modern female adolescents less conforming than they once might have been, or is earlier maturation of girls an influential factor? If it is true that boys and girls differ in their behaviour, would single-sex classes be more appropriate for older children? It would be useful to ask teachers to enumerate the differences between the sexes with regard to behaviour, and perhaps to identify the behaviours they rate most troublesome. This kind of approach could possibly form the basis for an attitude scale.

Probably the clearest contradiction between the review of literature and the survey results was in relation to the methods used to deal with disruption. Whilst this work frequently emphasises the long-term ineffectiveness of punishment, it still remains the prominent method used by schools to deal with disruptive behaviour, even though the respondents to the survey often recognised its limited effect.
Of all the deterrent measures used in schools, corporal punishment is the one which arouses most controversy. Despite a considerable volume of written evidence pointing out the long-term ineffectiveness of corporal punishment, it is still considered as moderately effective by a large number (66%) of teachers who responded to this survey. This opinion is possibly derived from the fact that corporal punishment often has an immediate effect in repressing disruptive behaviour, which is a relief to the teacher under pressure.

The recent trend of movement away from the use of corporal punishment in schools, and the advent of the 1981 Education Act increasing the responsibility of the normal school for those with 'special educational need', will demand an increased commitment by schools and teachers to children with problems. It will also require similarly increased support from local education authorities (L.E.A.'s) and it would be worthwhile now to briefly summarise the form this support takes.

Most of the back-up provided by L.E.A.'s can be seen to be associated with the 'labelling' approach to 'disruptives'. Problem pupils are identified and then treated accordingly. Three main types of support have been developed by L.E.A.'s.

1. Peripatetic support teachers working in schools on an individual referral basis. Where the number of referrals are large this type of teacher can end up working as an adviser whose main purpose is to relieve staff anxiety, with limited real support for the pupil. Although this kind of support is frequently seen in primary education, the writer's experience is that it is only infrequently used in secondary education. Therefore, this aspect of support has not been included in the current work.

2. Educational psychologist services, again working on an individual referral basis. Too frequently,
perhaps due to the number of referrals involved, the educational psychologist is seen by teachers as part of the mechanism of referral rather than of constructive help in assisting to relieve the pupil of the difficulties he is experiencing.

3. Withdrawal units, where a special unit has been set up and staffed by teachers experienced and trained to deal with problem pupils. The unit may be sited within a school (on-site) or at some distance away (off-site) and serving several schools. Frequently the latter is the case, and consequently the 'disruptive' is further removed from the school, as far as curriculum and methods are concerned, than he would be if he remained within the normal school, and it is difficult to re-introduce the pupil to 'normal' schooling.

This investigation has concentrated examination of the latter two areas of L.E.A., support and methods of dealing with problem children. These will now be discussed further.

The survey question on the effectiveness of the Schools' Psychological Service (S.P.S.) (Q.7) was included for two reasons. Firstly, the writer's experience is that teachers are sceptical of the effectiveness of the service for helping with problem behaviour, and tend to look on the useful purpose of educational psychologists only from the part they play in the referral procedures. Secondly, the earlier N.A.S. survey concluded that teachers considered the service one of the least effective methods of dealing with such problems.

In the surveys detailed in this work, it was found that the teachers who responded to the questionnaire were almost unanimous in their lack of confidence in the use of the S.P.S. This view is also reflected in this work by reference to other surveys and writers. However, in general
staffroom discussion with some of the teachers involved in the survey, it was frequently found that teachers interviewed were far from conversant with the work of this service. Invariably teachers viewed the function of the educational psychologist only as one of identifying problems in the individual by interview and prescribing appropriate treatment. Very few viewed the psychologist's role as a therapeutic one. It would seem, therefore, that this particular service does need to undertake a 'public relations exercise' aimed at familiarising teachers with the function of the service in relation to individual children who have become disruptive, or who are in danger of becoming so.

In Chapter 5, attention was directed towards the observation that educational psychologists rarely see the pupil in the teaching situation in secondary schools. This does not seem to be an isolated example because Jo Daniels (1982, pp.196-197), a practising educational psychologist, states that treating children within the school environment has begun to 'materialise only recently'. In staffroom discussions, it was suggested to me by several secondary teachers that this situation occurs due to lack of confidence on the part of psychologists to make valid observations on the classroom situation. The view of one psychologist on this assertion was that he felt it more appropriate for the subject to be interviewed in 'private' so that the psychologist is not seen by the child to be associated with the situation which may be the source of the child's behaviour problems.

Whilst there appears to be some substance in the latter argument, it does seem that if a sound judgment is to be made, whereby teachers also make a constructive contribution towards solving the child's problems, it could be beneficial for the psychologist to see the child in the teaching context. It is perhaps not surprising that so many teachers express a lack of confidence in the S.P.S. (in this investigation 78.1%). This situation could certainly be improved by increased contact between teachers and educational psychologists, although the latter group would certainly question where the time would be found to realise such an ideal
Reference to child guidance services in the Education Acts has always been limited and, therefore, local authorities have largely taken the initiative in establishing such services for those children in need of particular help and advice. The number of educational psychologists that the authority decides to employ is the subject of its own discretion. Essex County Council advise the writer that they employ one educational psychologist for every 10,000 of the pupil population. It is not possible for the writer to evaluate the generosity or otherwise of this provision, but it would seem that if this ratio was improved, educational psychologists would have more time to visit schools to discuss general problems, in addition to seeing children with problems of adjustment or learning. They could then be more readily available for consultation when they could offer quickly the advice which the teachers in this sample clearly feel at present is not forthcoming.

In response to the questionnaire section related to specific provision for continuously disruptive pupils, it was found that teachers were closely divided between two of the suggested alternatives: containing the pupil within a special withdrawal unit of the school ('on-site'), or sending the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils ('off-site'). The fact that the respondents apparently rejected the third suggested alternative of classes 'guided' by an educational psychologist perhaps further underlines the lack of confidence in the S.P.S. discussed earlier.

It is interesting to note in respect of this section that there was a trend, which fell just short of statistical significance, which showed that female teachers are less inclined than male teachers to consider sending disruptive pupils to a special institution outside the normal school. Similar differences between male and female responses were commented on earlier in this chapter. A possible inference about the reasons for these apparent differences may be that female teachers are more sympathetic to children with behaviour problems, or perhaps 'maternal instinct' (i.e. a more nurturant attitude) is influential. This would be a point
worthy of investigation in future research.

7.3 Analysis of the case study investigation

Chapters 5 and 6 reported the research which evaluated some of the approaches which can be adopted to deal with disruptive behaviour.

The case studies in Chapter 5 investigated two different administrative procedures in one comprehensive school and compared their effect on two disruptive boys. One of these boys passed through his secondary education during the tenure of one of the headmasters, whereas the other boy spent part of his secondary education under one headmaster and the remainder with the other. This allowed useful comparison to be made between the differing policies of these heads.

From Chapter 5 a number of pertinent observations were drawn which can be summarised as follows:

1. Observation of the effect of a change in administration policy on a disruptive pupil indicated that the school can exacerbate problem behaviour by the management procedures it adopts, and it is possible that one boy may have been removed to a school for the maladjusted as a result of a change in administration policy. This conclusion was reached by collecting data from the several different agencies (identified earlier in this chapter) involved with the subjects chosen to investigate. Inference was further supported by the record of the progress of two boys during the different organisation periods which reflected the alternative approaches of two headmasters. In other words, a variety of variables were observed and some replication was included within the investigation.

2. It was apparent that the school can influence behavioural outcomes in spite of environmental or
personality factors. However, crucial to this possibility (and particularly in respect of the upper-secondary age group) was the need to deviate from a rigid curriculum.

3. Withdrawal facilities provided a prominent place in the case study investigation in Chapter 5 because it was seen that these can be successful and can play a decisive part in maintaining the severe disruptive in the normal school. Thoroughly planned non-examination courses were seen to make a valuable contribution to the relevant education of upper-school pupils experiencing problems and they were found to be complementary to withdrawal facilities. These courses were seen as providing the important possibility of re-integrating the withdrawn pupil back into the mainstream of the school.

4. An 'on-site' withdrawal unit was seen to have been successful with upper-secondary age pupils. It did seem that curriculum innovation played a considerable part in this success, and was probably instrumental in reducing alienation to school in some pupils.

5. Behaviour modification techniques, applied in an 'uncontrolled' manner within a withdrawal unit, were seen to be effective in raising self-esteem and improving behaviour of pupils within the unit. However, no successful cases of full re-integration into the mainstream of the school were recorded.

In summary, this part of the study showed that the school can be effective in reducing behaviour problems, especially if the pupil experiencing adjustment difficulties can be removed from the normal teaching situation, into an on-site withdrawal unit incorporating some form of specially devised education programme. There are two main criticisms
of this proposition.

1. In removing the pupil to the withdrawal unit we are guilty of 'labelling', which can create further difficulties for the child already experiencing problems.

2. Whilst the pupil is attending the unit it is difficult to maintain progress with his normal class, thus, making it hard to integrate the child back into the mainstream of the school, although the inclusion of worthwhile non-examination courses within the school curriculum has been seen to make re-integration a more viable proposition for the upper-school pupil.

These criticisms, which have been shown to be so often an encumbrance in the operation of withdrawal units could be avoided if the disruptive pupil were retained in the normal class, and some technique applied which would help to solve the problems of that pupil, and at the same time make his behaviour more acceptable to the teacher and other pupils. One of the methods revealed in the literature review as receiving credence by some researchers for being effective in this context is behaviour modification. However, there appears to be only limited evidence of successful application of this technique in the normal secondary school, and few British teachers have a clear idea of what behaviour modification entails (see Wheldall and Congreve, 1980).

In Chapter 5 of this work we saw some confirmation that application of behaviour modification techniques can be successful in the secondary school situation. However, we were also forced to observe that the techniques applied largely depended on responsible but subjective evaluation, in that they did not include following experimental procedures of measuring behavioural outcomes.
We have also discussed this earlier in this chapter when it was acknowledged that the work in Chapter 5 constituted an 'uncontrolled' study consisting primarily of 'soft-data' and was heavily dependent on informed, but subjective observation. There are sound reasons (e.g. vide McCormick, 1982) to suggest that a combination of both 'soft' and 'hard' data is preferable even though a strong case might be made for visual inspection as a crucial characteristic of the methodology (Baer, 1977). The work detailed in Chapter 6 offered the opportunity to assess the value of this recommended approach within the application of a programme of classroom experiment aimed at evaluating use of behaviour modification techniques in the classroom.

In searching for ideas for handling disruptive behaviour it would have been wrong to fail to explore the application of behaviour modification techniques following the procedures recommended by so many researchers. Apart from the fact that this approach has received considerable exposure recently, we still require demonstration that the technique can be used by the normal classteacher, and that it is effective when applied to upper-secondary school pupils. Chapter 6 investigated this possibility.

Chapter 6 related the application of a behaviour modification programme within the sphere of accepted research criteria, whilst retaining the disruptive pupil in the normal class, which avoided some of the criticisms associated with 'labelling' theory. If this application could be shown to be successful, and practicable, for the normal classteacher, even in a limited context, it was held that this would serve as recommendation for use with the age group to which this study has particularly been directed. From Chapter 6 it will have been seen that application of the technique to five subjects was considered to be a qualified success.

Implementation of the reinforcement contingency was found to have an immediate and dramatic effect on all the subjects, in that off-task behaviour was significantly reduced, and in some cases virtually extinguished. Removal of the
reinforcement procedures showed that, whilst unacceptable behaviour returned, this was not quite as frequent as it had been prior to implementation of the experiment, thus giving hope that the technique may have some enduring effect. Further implementation and extension of the reinforcer again significantly reduced off-task behaviour, demonstrating that improvement in behaviour was being brought about by the experimental procedures and not due to some confounding variable or changes that would have occurred even without the reinforcement contingency.

Whilst the experiments at first sight appear to have been successful, there are several qualifications one must take into account. They covered only the period of time the pupil spent studying one subject; they were not extended to other lessons. Discussions with other teachers who taught the pupil revealed that, even at the time when they were in the experimental class and their off-task behaviour had been significantly reduced, no appreciable difference in their behaviour was seen in other lessons. In other words, improved behaviour was only apparent in the experimental class and was not transferred to any other.

The improvements in behaviour achieved as a result of intervention were found to be unenduring. Removal of the reinforcement contingencies and further measurement of behaviour only four weeks after the conclusion of each experiment revealed that the subjects had returned to their former baseline of unacceptable behaviour. It seems likely that we 'contained' the subjects rather than 'modified' their behaviour. This was discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

Although the findings of the experiments detailed in Chapter 6 are strengthened by the fact that replication of intervention effects were recorded across five subjects, it would be right to question if we can generalise from them, and the answer must be a qualified 'no'. However, there are other well-established precedents which have demonstrated that off-task behaviour and disruption can temporarily be reduced (while reinforcement is being given).
in the secondary school (e.g. Harrop, 1977, MacMillan and Kolvin, 1977 and Wheldall and Austin, 1980). The comparable findings of other researchers such as these lend substance to the qualified perceived success of the five experiments.

What has not been answered by this or, as far as the writer can discern, any other research, is if the behavioural approach to teaching is permanently effective with this upper-age group (e.g. Harrop, 1977, also found results inconclusive with older children). Consequently reports of successful application in the secondary school tend to refer to lower-school pupils (e.g. MacMillan and Kolvin, 1977 — first year; McNamara, 1979 — first and second year; Presland, 1980 — third year). Neither has it been demonstrated that behaviour modification application can be extended in the British secondary school to include all the teachers who deal with a particular disruptive pupil.

It has been acknowledged in Chapter 6 that perhaps we cannot 'switch on' the technique for two hours in a week and expect that we will modify behaviour permanently. However we also have to recognise that this is the situation which so frequently exists in the normal secondary school. The writer has related many of the limitations experienced in administering the experiments, and these would be further increased (if not impossible to overcome) if we were to try to extend the experimental procedures to all the teachers involved with the chosen subject.

The latter problem has not passed unrecognised and the Schools Council have already funded a research project (The Behavioural Approach to Teaching, 1981-1983, Dr. K. Wheldall, University of Birmingham) which includes examination of application of behaviour modification techniques by

a) the same teacher teaching different classes

and

b) the same class taught by different teachers

in a comprehensive school. The project is still in process
and, therefore, conclusions cannot yet be drawn, but eventual publication could partly answer some of the questions posed here related to behaviour modification.

If one can make qualified observations on the experiments related in Chapter 6, it would seem that they were only of limited success because of the perceived un-ending effect; they may have been successful in eliminating this criticism with further extension. But it has been argued that this was not possible. In addition, references in Chapter 6 indicated that it has not yet been conclusively proven that extended withdrawal facilities make retention of desired behaviours any more reliable. This being so, there remain arguments for identifying disruptive pupils and withdrawing them to a separate unit, even though this procedure can be seen to be guilty of 'labelling' the pupil. It is suggested that even the application of a behaviour modification programme results in 'labelling' the subject. For example, if we identify the problem child and 'reward' appropriate behaviour, we are in effect drawing attention to the fact that the child has problems by treating him differently from other pupils. The often impracticable alternative is to reward the whole class. The research carried out in Chapter 6 attempted to reach a compromise between these contrasting alternatives.

In spite of the reservations expressed related to the long-term effectiveness of the experimental work, there are many aspects of it which allow useful observations to be made. Positive reinforcement in the manner applied could be seen to be dramatically effective in that the behaviour of all the subjects immediately became more acceptable. This improvement was maintained in the lessons used all the time the reinforcement contingencies were in effect, and experimental control was demonstrated, and generalisability was supported through replication of the experimental procedures with five individual subjects in different settings.

Whilst it has been commented that the long-term effect of the experiments was questionable considering that
withdrawal of treatment resulted in re-emergence of poor behaviour, it is possible to argue that extension of the experiments could have eventually resulted in more beneficial long-term effect. However, it has been suggested here that, working within the limitations of the normal school situation, this was not possible. It may be that the eventual publication of the findings of the aforementioned Schools Council Project will render this contention unfounded.

Returning to the discussions in Chapter 2 related to psychodynamic theory, and the desirability of solving the underlying causes of the subject's behaviour problems, one must question whether the application of behaviour modification in this context can be seen to be instrumental in solving any underlying causes of the subject's behaviour problems. It would seem that the only conclusion we can reach in this case is that the technique was successful only in containing the pupils within the classes where the experiments took place. It may be that supporters of the behavioural approach would maintain that its purpose is to meet the presenting symptoms rather than to solve underlying causes. Although this may be seen as acceptable by some, it is not necessarily of long-term benefit to the pupil. The experimental work was also costly if we evaluate it in terms of the extent of teacher-participation and commitment which was required for implied short-term effect.

In summary the survey established, among other things, that teachers were not confident in the effectiveness of methods or procedures generally used to deal with disruptive behaviour; it also gave direction to the research by identifying the upper-age group as the more difficult to handle and the need for suggestions of appropriate and practicable methods of dealing with such children. Withdrawal units and behaviour modification were considered by teachers to be useful means of dealing with aberration, but the Schools Psychological Service was not. The case study research in Chapter 5 showed two contrasting administrative approaches for dealing with disruptive pupils, and particularly illustrated the constructive part that a withdrawal
unit and specially designed non-examination courses can play with respect to older pupils. The experimental work in Chapter 6 demonstrated that behaviour modification techniques can be effective with the upper-secondary pupil, although from this inquiry it has not been shown that application of the technique changes behaviour permanently, but it is suggested that this is the effect that is needed in the classroom if the teacher is to get on with the job of teaching.

It has also been argued here that the effort and commitment required to apply behaviour modification techniques following accepted research criteria is very demanding for the busy classteacher who must also consider the interest of the remainder of the pupils in the class. It was concluded that, in respect of upper-school severe disruptives, rather than attempt to deal with the pupil in the normal classroom, it is preferable to withdraw the problem child to an on-site withdrawal unit where the application of procedures to deal with disruption can be more successfully applied.

The following concluding section summarises the arguments derived from this study which support withdrawal of problem pupils to an on-site withdrawal unit, and then proposes a basis for a strategic model for dealing with them drawn from the experiences reported in Chapter 5 and 6 for adaptation to alternative contexts.

7.4 A suggested model for dealing with disruptive pupils

The supposition is that dealing with serious disruption in the normal classroom situation not only demands resources beyond those of most teachers, but may actually exacerbate the problem. A possible explanation for this is that the child who is experiencing difficulties of adjustment, learning or low self-esteem feels rejected by busy teachers whose concern for other pupils' learning prevents them from giving the attention and experiences appropriate for children with severe problems. It is suggested that the
large group-size of normal classes make it all the more difficult for such a child to obtain the support he requires and consequently he resorts to attention-seeking disruptive behaviour to compensate for his feelings of frustration and inadequacy. Such behaviour is effectively rewarded, and so perpetuated, by the teacher using conventional methods (i.e. coercive means of control) to deal with aberration, maintain classroom control, and 'saving face' in front of the remainder of the pupils. Where a child's problems are transient the teacher may satisfactorily cope with difficulties that arise, but long-term problems require more specific arrangements,

Two major problems are caused by the disruptive classroom situation. Firstly, the learning of other pupils is adversely affected; even when the teacher can control the situation, he could teach more effectively without disruption. Secondly, the teacher may personally be badly affected by the disruption which he sees as a personal challenge to his authority, the consequence of which can be less effective teaching. This generates tension and elicits further disruption which can become self-perpetuating. Somehow this vicious circle has to be broken, and this study has concluded that withdrawal of the severe disruptive from the normal class is the first recommended step in helping the problem child, the teacher, and other pupils. This investigation, like so many others, maintains that on-site withdrawal units are preferable to off-site ones.

There are two major and contrasting strategies which tend to be adopted for dealing with the severe disruptive: 'coercion' or 'incorporation' (Reynolds and Sullivan 1981, p.55). Coercive strategy is dependent on threats (perhaps implicit) whereas the alternative and preferable approach incorporates pupils within the classroom by engaging their participation, and the development of interpersonal rather than impersonal relationships between teachers and pupils. It is argued here that 'incorporation' of the severe disruptive is more practicable outside the normal classroom as demonstrated in Chapter 5.
In removing the problem child from the normal class, it is important that he is moved into some form of specially devised educational programme incorporating techniques which increase the opportunity for academic success, raises self-esteem, and improves personal relationships. Part of the reason for this beneficial effect is that the pupil's self-concept is improved by engaging his own co-operation in the improvement. This was seen to be true in the limited context of the study described in Chapter 5.

Withdrawal units can provide excellent opportunities and incentive for experimental approaches to be carried out. It has been argued in this work that the experimental approach to behaviour modification can be more easily applied in the environment of a unit where generous staffing provision and curriculum flexibility make such strategies more practicable.

Even allowing for the most generous of staffing allowances, withdrawal units cannot, in the long-term, be expected to keep upper-school pupils fully astride of normal lessons, and it is also questionable that they should provide an education alternative to that provided in the mainstream school. It has been suggested here that in the case of upper-secondary pupils with identified long-term problems, the unit should be directed towards providing pastoral care and a teaching approach which is sympathetic with each pupil's individual predicaments. This does not imply that the unit should be devoid of educational objectives, but they should be more flexible than the specific exam-orientated objectives of the upper-school, which are generally recognised as sources of failure and frustration for many pupils who resort to disruption.

The nature of the educational provisions of the unit are seen as follows in relation to the conclusions drawn from Chapter 5:

1. Staffing of the unit should be generous and selective. Teaching time allocation needs to
be generous to keep pupil/teacher ratio to the minimum thus allowing maximum opportunity for individual attention, close contact and counselling time. High calibre teachers who have an affinity for working with problem pupils should be appointed to staff the unit in key positions, and these teachers can be supplemented with specialist subject teachers from the mainstream school. The unit should be awarded sufficient capitation necessary to achieve its objectives, and to do so in a school with many problem pupils may demand funding from central sources as an alternative to proving a drain on general school capitation.

2. Pupils need to develop systematic patterns of working. This is to be achieved in the unit through the generous teacher/pupil ratio allowing considerable individual attention. Work and lessons should be highly structured to increase the possibility of success, and attention should be given to exploring every opportunity to praise genuine effort and co-operation i.e. emphasising effort and participation as opposed to attainment. This is likely to be effective particularly where it is believed that low achievement is a source of disruptive behaviour. We can see here one of the reasons for the suggestion in Chapter 5 that an association between the unit and the remedial department can be beneficial. Attention was also drawn to the possibility of using parents and teachers from outside the unit to praise and reinforce the work of pupils. It is suggested that, similar to the example described in Chapter 5, mainstream school teachers would willingly contribute teaching time to the unit with the realisation that its existence relieved them of some of the difficulties they face in the classroom.
3. The aim of the unit should be to return the pupil to normal schooling if possible, but the time a child remains in the unit could vary considerably, and it should be anticipated that, in the case of upper-school pupils with severe problems, some may never return to normal classes. The likelihood of this occurring would seem to be higher with upper-school pupils where it is more difficult for unit staff to provide the range of skills and specialist teaching to keep the pupil abreast of normal lessons where work for CSE and 'O' level examinations is already well advanced, and where in this inquiry teachers expressed the opinion that this age group is the most difficult to deal with in respect of problem behaviour. It has been argued herein that with upper-school pupils a priority of the unit should be to improve social relationships in preparation for participation in adult society and existing in co-operation with others.

This suggested emphasis on improving personal relationships and social skills should not be misinterpreted as the primary aim of the unit. The unit should be primarily concerned with successfully eliminating the problem behaviour. The combined effect of the aforementioned 'secondary' aims may have this effect, but it may be that more specific and elaborate measures would be required to effectively influence consistent working habits.

In his discussion of the role of units in providing social training and the development of consistent working habits, Crowther (1979) recommended that teachers should use behaviour modification techniques. Crowther argued that this strategy has had 'demonstrable success' in both laboratory and natural settings. We have seen in this work that the technique is not always as easy to acquire or administer as Crowther implies, a fact also recognised by Merrett and
Wheldall (1978). However, we did find in Chapter 6 that this approach can be used successfully at least to 'contain' the older disruptive pupil, although it was questioned whether the normal classteacher has the time to apply this procedure following accepted research criteria. Either we relax these criteria by reducing the need for strict observance of measuring techniques (which would mean that we would be less sure that improvement in behaviour can be related to intervention effect; this is a possible criticism of the work in Chapter 5), or we create an alternative environment where the technique can be thoroughly applied and outcomes measured. Hence, a further argument for withdrawal arrangements. It is argued that the application of behaviour modification techniques together with other strategies adopted by the unit approach can provide a contribution to a sound educational programme for severe disruptives.

Within the unit behaviour modification can be applied by carefully manipulating a pupil's circumstances, particularly in terms of what he finds rewarding, to break down old habits and behaviour and new more appropriate ones built up (Daines, 1979, p.105). We have seen from Chapters 5 and 6 some of the different forms that application of this methodology can take; informal and flexible (Chapter 5) but difficult to evaluate, or specific and quantifiable (Chapter 6). We have also seen some evidence that both approaches can be effective within limited contexts with upper-secondary school pupils. However, we also saw that successful adjustment to the unit does not necessarily mean that the pupil has readjusted to school in general. No successful reintegrations were reported in Chapter 5, and Daines (1979) also found in a survey of two northern counties that problem behaviour reappeared in 60% of re-integrated pupils. Hence, the earlier warning that we should recognise that some of these older pupils with severe problems may never return to the normal classroom and we should, in respect of these children, concentrate on providing the type of socialisation programme described in Chapter 5 which aimed at improving personal relationships rather than trying to keep the child astride of normal classes.
Central to the application of behaviour modification techniques is the provision of suitable reinforcement contingencies. Chapter 6 included discussion and experiment to identify and evaluate rewards for use in reinforcing appropriate behaviour with the upper-age group of pupils. This revealed a source of dilemma. Disruptive children of this age do not necessarily respond positively to intrinsic reinforcement. Consequently, one is forced to resort to extrinsic reward, and there is some empirical evidence (e.g. Smith and Pitman, 1978) that tangible rewards can have the effect of lowering interest in the activity itself. It also has to be recognised that simple material rewards such as sweets or comics etc., will be scorned by the older pupil, but at the same time economic restraints prevent the use of more tangible reinforcers.

Chapter 6 identified the following as desired qualities for reward to be effective and acceptable to all the parties involved. It must be:

a) within economic reach of the school
b) recognised as of value by the pupil
c) acceptable to the whole school

The experimental work in Chapter 6 identified a reward that met all these criteria, and demonstrated that it could be successfully applied. In that Chapter, as part of the operation of a token economy, disruptive pupils (in a normal class) were awarded points for on-task behaviour, with the accumulated points being exchanged for periods of time out of school. This scheme was made acceptable to the remainder of the school in that the time out of school was used on field work, and the field work was specially constructed to make it attractive to the pupil, and coupled with travel in the school mini-bus which the pupils particularly enjoyed.
There are some important questions frequently posed related to the operation of withdrawal units, and these must be faced in the light of the experience of this inquiry.

Firstly, 'does problem behaviour disappear in units because their circumstances are different from those of the mainstream school?' (Daines, 1979, p.55). This question is central to the arguments put forward in this work supporting withdrawal facilities. The fact that the unit can offer facilities that are different, and specific techniques for managing pupils' behaviour, increases the possibility for success. It has been argued that organisational pressures prevent similar circumstances from being created for older children in the normal classroom. These differences between the main school and the unit mean that the latter is in a better position to help the type of pupil to whom this study is directed.

Secondly, we must ask if in the operation of withdrawal facilities the school is avoiding the responsibility for its problems? Superficially, the answer is 'no' in the case of the application of an on-site unit as proposed here, because the school has responsibility for the unit and what takes place there. However, the unit should not be seen as a punitive institution, 'sin bin' or place where the school 'dumps' unwanted pupils, in which case the remainder of the school would be avoiding part of its responsibility. The conclusion drawn from this study is that the unit should be for children with chronic problems of adjustment rather than those experiencing difficulties arising out of transient crises. The unit is also seen in the light of a 'sanctuary' rather than a 'sin bin'. A place where the reasons for the pupils' behaviour are explored and the work of the unit then organised in relation to the identified problems.

It was significant that so many (78.1%) of teachers in the survey sample expressed dissatisfaction with the S.P.S. because this mistrust by teachers eliminates one of the possible areas where the development of measures to deal
with disruptive behaviour could be further refined to provide constructive help. The implied criticism of the S.P.S. by teachers may or may not be completely justified, but this service does need to seriously consider how it can achieve a closer and more fruitful relationship with teachers. There is an important part for educational psychologists to play in the classroom by offering teachers constructive guidance on how to help problem pupils. According to this research, educational psychologists are rarely seen in the secondary school teaching situation.

We have seen in this work that although emphasis was not particularly directed towards curricular provision, one has been continually forced to recognise the important part this can play in relation to problem behaviour. Appropriate curriculum is essential for effective discipline, and discipline is necessary for curricular aims to be achieved. This dictum applies both in the withdrawal unit and the mainstream school.

Discipline in schools is necessary for the achievement of curricular aims because pupils' attitudes and behaviour are affected by the content and methods of teaching they receive, and discipline itself depends largely on the curriculum. This is particularly true in the case of the older age range of disruptive pupil who will often have had unsatisfactory learning experiences in the main school, and perhaps have begun to question the relevance of some school subjects.

The extent to which pupils are willing to learn and respond and co-operate with teachers is likely to be influenced by the extent to which they can achieve success. It is, therefore, important for pupils to be aware that their academic achievements are recognised in relation to the pupils' own abilities and potential. Whilst it is desirable that teachers should encourage pupils to make full use of their potential it must be recognised that where pupils believe the expectations are unattainable, they are likely to suffer anxiety and frustration. Therefore, teachers'
interpretation of the curriculum must reflect an awareness not only of their pupils' potential, but also of pupils' estimations of their own ability. This represents a further argument for departure from normal curriculum to a situation whereby circumstances can be individually tailored in the light of the problems the disruptive pupil is experiencing.

In view of the current increasing emphasis on the importance of examination success and the consequent recognition of the more able pupil, there is a danger that the achievement of others passes without acknowledgment, and those who are not recognised are likely to experience alienation from school and teachers. This can be particularly felt by pupils who are unable to fit into the school examination option scheme and those who attend the non-examination courses or withdrawal units referred to in Chapter 5 of this work.

We have already acknowledged that the school can play a valuable part in offering this recognition by allowing these types of pupils to express themselves by actions outside the academic sphere. However, in an era when academic qualifications have become more openly important, more tangible recognition is required. The writer feels that there are two ways in which tangible recognition can be given to the achievements of these pupils where they are involved in upper-secondary school education.

Firstly, a certificate could be awarded internally by the school. The administration and design of the certificate should be considered carefully if it is not to be disregarded as worthless by the pupil and those to whom it is presented as a recommendation. The certificate could be awarded for participation in courses which are not a part of the normal examination system, but which are considered worthwhile contributions to the education of the pupil. This could include areas of study such as consumer education, community studies or social work which were discussed in Chapter 5. The award should be graded, and this grade should be based on the pupil's participation level (effort) rather
than academic attainment. It will be important to the recipients that the certificate has the appearance of a document comparable with a public examination certificate and, therefore, it should be printed rather than duplicated. An example of the kind of certificate envisaged is shown in Appendix G.

Secondly, the writer suggests that extra-curricular activities (ECA) can be more usefully employed than they are at present in British schools to cater in a constructive way, not only for the less able, but for all school pupils. It was demonstrated in Chapter 5 that ECA can play a valuable part in improving self-concept of pupils withdrawn from normal lessons.

Whilst many comments have been made by writers testifying to the high standard of ECA provided by comprehensive schools (e.g. Chetwynd, 1960; Ross, 1967; King, 1969; Simmons and Morgan, 1969 and Benn and Simon, 1970), little written evidence appears to exist suggesting ways in which ECA could be employed in a manner which less able or disruptive pupils might see as relevant or useful for their future. One of the ways that the writer suggests this can be done is by linking ECA to the examination system. A detailed explanation of how this can be achieved is to be found in Whitcomb (1979, b). The suggestion is that ECA should allow accumulation of points for participation and achievement, and the accrued points should qualify for the award of one G.C.E. 'O' level or C.S.E. pass grade, in accordance with a predetermined schedule of qualifying points. This kind of application of ECA is a familiar feature of education in some foreign countries (e.g. Singapore), and a system such as that outlined could do much to enhance the British examination system, especially for the less able pupil, if adopted here.

Schools should give serious and careful consideration to the formation of meaningful, useful and interesting non-examination courses for upper-school pupils who are unable to fit into the normal examination option scheme either because
of low ability or due to unacceptable behaviour or attitude to school. Non-examination courses can make two useful contributions to withdrawal facilities:

1. They can provide the basis of specific, useful and relevant learning programmes within the unit.

2. If such courses are operated in the main school, pupils from the unit can attend them thus obtaining a useful 'bridge' between the unit and mainstream classes, perhaps facilitating return to normal classes.

Chapter 5 offered description of the form these courses might take, and emphasised that they should be given at least the same share of resources and thought as examination courses, and sufficient varied courses should be available to allow some choice for pupils.

7.5 Overview

In this study attention has been drawn to a purported gap between researchers' recommendations and what teachers see as their requirements. A further common response by teachers to research findings is that it seems a tremendous amount of hard work to show what they know from experience. Is the effort really justified? It might be felt that the same applies to this study. After all, it is scarcely surprising that disruptive behaviour is a source of stress to teachers, or that they place little faith in the methods currently used to deal with disruption in classes. Most teachers are only too aware of this from their everyday experience in the classroom.

Research into practical issues rarely comes up with findings that are totally unexpected. On the other hand, it is always helpful to offer ideas which can be shown to have constructive application, albeit in a limited context. The present study of disruptive behaviour in secondary schools has just such a contribution to make.
This final chapter has tried to go further in considering what underlying implications might be derived from this investigation. Some of these conclusions drawn have of necessity been based on subjective opinion. However, this more speculative part of the work is also supported by many firmer research findings. It is appropriate to end this study by summarising the most important of these.

Firstly, this investigation has shown that teachers in the sample surveyed do not consider that disruptive behaviour is increasing, or that there is any difference between male and female with regard to disruptive behaviour. It is the upper-age group which secondary teachers find particularly difficult to handle, and they are not confident of the effectiveness of currently predominantly-used methods of dealing with disruption in schools. There was some evidence that male and female teachers differ in some of their opinions of the methods which should be used to deal with disruptive pupils.

Secondly, it was found that a very high proportion of the teachers surveyed expressed dissatisfaction with the Schools' Psychological Service as a means of helping to deal with problem behaviour in the secondary school.

Thirdly, it has been concluded that an adequately staffed and resourced on-site withdrawal unit has much to offer in helping severe disruptives to overcome their adjustment problems, and this type of unit is preferable to an off-site unit. Special curriculum arrangements were seen as essential to the success of such a unit.

Fourthly, behaviour modification techniques applied to five upper-secondary school disruptive pupils in different settings under experimental conditions were found to be dramatically effective in reducing off-task behaviour whilst reinforcement contingencies were in effect. However, we were left with the unanswered question of whether application of the technique had in fact 'contained' the subjects as opposed to modifying their behaviour. This
doubt was raised by the apparent unenduring effect of the experiments, and the observation that behaviour changes were not carried over to classes outside those used for experimentation. It was concluded that extension of the experiments (withdrawal procedures) may have influenced outcomes more effectively in the long-term, but this remains speculative even in the light of other recent research. It has also been suggested here that application of this kind of experimental approach is more likely to prove effective and practicable when the disruptive pupil is withdrawn from the normal class to a special on-site withdrawal unit.

Finally, it has been stressed that research into areas such as that to which this work has been addressed must involve teachers. Ideally, such research should not involve complete withdrawal of the teacher from the classroom if the eventual findings are to be seen as relevant to everyday life in schools. This research has been carried out with such a principle in mind.

7.6 Recommendations

1. The Schools' Psychological Service need to seriously consider ways to make teachers more familiar with the role of the service. There is a case for increased contact between secondary school teachers and educational psychologists, and the latter should go into classrooms of secondary schools more frequently. To realise this recommendation may well require the employment of a greater number of educational psychologists.

2. Before it is decided to send severe disruptives to a separate educational institution, all possible avenues for dealing with them in the normal school should have been exploited. It should be recognised that in respect of upper-secondary pupils this may mean that in some cases it should be anticipated that a severe disruptive may need to be permanently
withdrawn from normal classes for his own benefit, or in the interest of his classmates, and special arrangements will need to be made to help such a pupil.

3. Special 'on-site' withdrawal units are preferable to 'off-site' facilities but these should not be considered as 'sin-bins' or the 'Cinderella' of the school. They should be staffed by teachers with an affinity for this type of work and who support a policy of care as opposed to one of punishment or containment. A withdrawal unit should be capitalisation funded as generously as any other major department of the school. However, where a school or an educational area is required to handle an excessive number of problem cases, there should be some additional financial contribution from central funding to assist in provision of adequate resources.

4. Changing societal values; recent movement away from use of corporal punishment in schools, and apparent lack of confidence shown by teachers in the currently used coercive methods of dealing with disruptive behaviour in schools, has increased the need to establish alternative ways of dealing with continuous aberration. Behaviour modification is still in its infancy in British schools, and although studies relating to the upper-secondary age range are still too few, evidence is accruing testifying its usefulness for dealing with problem behaviour. This investigation has shown that this technique does have a place for dealing with this age of pupil, in spite of reservations in this study regarding long-term effect. It is a recommendation of this work that, in the case of the older child, application of the technique is more practicable when he is withdrawn from the normal class. It is also suggested that out of school fieldwork, if carefully formulated, can provide a reinforcement contingency which is effective with the older subject, and also acceptable by
the remainder of the school.

5. Disruptive behaviour is a major source of stress to teachers. Research should continue to seek methods which can be used by schools to deal with disruptive behaviour, and this research must involve teachers who are faced with the problem. It is recommended that there should be a movement towards part-secondment of teachers, which would allow them to participate in research without losing contact with the reality of the classroom situation. It is further recommended that collaboration between a University lecturer and a school teacher could provide a worthwhile basis for future investigation of disruptive behaviour. This will help to combine the excellence of research criteria and the reality of everyday classroom experience.

6. This investigation has recognised that schools and teachers have an important part to play in solving behaviour problems. Their participation should be in the form of in-service research and innovation in the form of classroom experiment. This development will require adequate provision of finance and teachers to allow release of teachers to participate in in-service education.

7.7 Suggestions for further research

1. Future research might usefully be concerned with applying the questionnaire (incorporating the recommended amendments) survey used herein with a larger sample. Investigation could be further extended by comparing the results of the survey carried out in contrasting geographical areas. This will help to establish if the findings of this investigation can be seen to have a wider application.
2. A further possibility would be to examine the proposition which emerged from this work that male and female teachers differ in their attitudes to the provisions which should be made for disruptives, and in respect of the considered causes of problem behaviour. If it is shown that this difference is statistically significant it might lead to further extension to examine whether the sex of teacher has any association as a factor causal to disruptive behaviour.

3. This work has lead to the recommendation that on-site withdrawal units have a valuable part to play in helping children to overcome adjustment problems, and reducing alienation to school. However, it was recognised that crucial to the success of such units is the design of an appropriate curriculum model. This work has made some progress in this direction, but extension of this contribution could profitably be the subject of future research.

4. Since there is some concern that in removing the child from the normal classroom we can be guilty of 'labelling', we still need demonstration that the severe disruptive pupil can be retained in normal classes, without this being to the detriment of other pupils and at the same time making some progress in solving the underlying problems of the disruptive pupil.

Further application of behaviour modification techniques observing the criteria followed in this work may suggest that the experiments recorded here did not fully exploit all the possibilities available and that the technique can be successfully applied to upper-secondary school pupils with long-term enduring effect. Investigation of this possibility could include organisation of a
programme whereby all teachers involved with a disruptive pupil co-operate in the application of a behaviour modification programme.

5. There is a dearth of studies of the application of behaviour modification techniques in British secondary education, and of those that do exist, few have been directed to the older child in the normal classroom. This work has attempted to make a contribution to remedy this situation. However, there is a need for further research to demonstrate the value of behaviour modification for dealing with the disruptive upper-secondary school pupil. Future research designs could usefully be directed towards exploring alternative withdrawal designs as ways of terminating interventions with this age group without loss of the desired behaviour. In addition, whilst the experiments in this study incorporated some variation in reinforcement contingencies, it is acknowledged that alternative designs may have been more effective in the long-term. A further research possibility would be to examine whether variable interval and variable ratio schedules give rise to more enduring results with the older child than those recorded in this work.
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Pilot Study Questionnaire

For each question where a choice of answer is offered, please choose the appropriate answer and put a circle round the number which corresponds to it.

1) Are you male or female?
   1   2

2) How long have you been teaching?
   1 Less than one year
   2 1 - 5 years
   3 More than 5 years

3) Which sex do you experience greater discipline problems with?
   Male   Female   No difference
   1   2   3

4) Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems? You may circle more than one year group.
   a) in boys
      Year   1   2   3   4   5   0 none more than others
   b) in girls
      Year   1   2   3   4   5   0 none more than others

5) Would you say that incidence of behaviour problems in your school occur
   1 Often
   2 Sometimes
   3 Rarely

6) Do you believe that incidence of behaviour problems in your school are
   1 Increasing
   2 Decreasing
   3 Not changing
7) How effective do you think the Schools Psychological Service is in helping your school to handle discipline problems?

Completely effective  Moderately effective  Ineffective

1  2  3

8) Which of the following would you prefer as a method for handling continuously disruptive pupils?

(Circle the number of your choice)

1 Contain the pupil in normal classes but teacher guided by regular professional advice, e.g. educational psychologist, how best to handle situation to bring about behaviour modification.

2 Contain pupil within a special unit of the school staffed by teachers operating a programme of behaviour modification.

3 Send the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils

9) Which age group do you teach?

(Circle all appropriate years)

Year  1  2  3  4  5

10) Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following as contributory causes of discipline problems in schools.

1 - high contribution  2 - some contribution  3 - no contribution

a) lack of early intervention

b) poor home background

c) decline in general standards demanded by society

d) size of school

e) inexperience of some teachers

f) modern teaching methods

g) basic characteristics of child's personality

h) inadequate social services

i) inadequate support by senior staff of schools

j) inadequate local authority support

k) low intelligence
11) Please write down here your own personal definition of maladjustment.

12) Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

0 - not used    1 - completely effective
2 - moderately effective    3 - ineffective

a) Corporal punishment
b) Detention
c) Temporary exclusion from school
d) Permanent exclusion from school
e) Temporary exclusion from normal classes
f) Consultation with parents and pupils
g) Loss of privileges
h) Referral to other teachers
i) Referral to Head Teacher
j) Calling in a specialist (psychologist social worker etc)
k) Organised monitoring of pupil
l) Ignoring behaviour problems
m) Small group teaching
n) Mobilising pupil opinions
o) Imposition of extra work
p) Verbal rebuke
Dear Colleague,

I am a practising teacher carrying out part-time Ph.D. research on disruptive behaviour in secondary schools. I should be grateful if you would assist me in my research by completing the attached questionnaire.

As you are aware, opinions as to the causes and possible solutions to discipline problems vary widely, and therefore, it is your own personal answers to the questionnaire that would be most helpful to me, rather than as a result of discussion between colleagues.

I am aware of the possible ambiguity of questionnaires and therefore you are invited to attach an additional sheet with any comments should you desire.

The information will be completely anonymous and therefore, I do not require your name or the name of your school.

I should be grateful if you would complete the questionnaire and return it to your Head Teacher within one week of issue.

I thank you in anticipation of your co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

ALAN WHITCOMB
For each question where a choice of answer is offered, please choose the appropriate answer and put a circle round the number which corresponds to it.

1) Are you male or female?
   1   2

2) How long have you been teaching?
   1 Less than one year
   2 1 - 5 years
   3 More than 5 years

3) Which sex do you experience greater discipline problems with?
   Male   Female   No difference
   1   2   3

4) Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems? You may circle more than one year group.
   a) in boys
      Year  1  2  3  4  5  0 (none more than others)
   b) in girls
      Year  1  2  3  4  5  0 (none more than others)

5) Would you say that incidence of behaviour problems in your school occur
   1 Often
   2 Sometimes
   3 Rarely

6) Do you believe that incidence of behaviour problems in your school is
   1 Increasing?
   2 Decreasing?
   3 Not changing?

7) How effective do you think the Schools Psychological Service is in helping your school to handle discipline problems?
   Very effective   Effective   Ineffective
   1               2               3
8) Which of the following would you prefer as a method for handling continuously disruptive pupils? (Circle the number of your choice)

1. Contain the pupil in normal classes but teacher guided by regular professional advice, e.g. educational psychologist, how best to handle the situation to bring about behaviour modification.

2. Contain pupil within a special unit of the school staffed by teachers operating a programme of behaviour modification.

3. Send the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils

9) Which age group do you teach? (Circle all appropriate years)

Year 1 2 3 4 5

10) Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following as contributory causes of discipline problems in schools.

1 - high contribution  2 - some contribution  3 - no contribution

A) lack of early intervention (by the school)  A
B) poor home background  B
C) decline in general standards demanded by society  C
D) size of school  D
E) inexperience of some teachers  E
F) modern teaching methods  F
G) basic characteristics of child's personality  G
H) inadequate social services  H
I) inadequate support by senior staff  I
J) inadequate local authority support  J
K) low intelligence  K
11) Please write down here your own personal definition of maladjustment.

12) Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

0 - not used 1 - very effective 2 - effective 3 - ineffective

a) corporal punishment
b) detention
c) temporary exclusion from school
d) permanent exclusion from school
e) temporary exclusion from normal classes
f) consultation with parents and pupils
g) loss of privileges
h) referral to other teachers
i) referral to Head Teacher
j) calling in a specialist (psychologist, social worker etc.)
k) organised monitoring of pupil
l) ignoring behaviour problems
m) small group teaching
n) mobilising pupil opinions
o) imposition of extra work
p) verbal rebuke
### Key to abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>Relative Frequency Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD.F%</td>
<td>Adjusted Frequency Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C1. Q.1 Are you male or female?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined response
3 schools

#### C2. Q.2 How long have you been teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years +</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined responses
3 schools
C 3. Q.3 Which sex do you experience greater discipline problems with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference(3)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 4. Q.4 Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems? You may circle more than one year group.

a) in boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) in girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Combined Totals | 2 | 7 | 73 | 75 | 39 | 24 |

\(\chi^2\) (none more than others)
C 5. Q.5 Would you say that incidence of behaviour problems in your school occur
1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often (1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (2)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 6. Q.6 Do you believe that incidence of behaviour problems in your school are
1. Increasing
2. Decreasing
3. Not changing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing (1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changing(3)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 7. Q.7. How effective do you think the Schools Psychological Service is in helping your school to handle discipline problems?
Completely effective    Moderately effective
1                        2
Ineffective              3

No responses were made indicating completely effective and therefore response is recorded only on a 2 point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderately eff (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective (3)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C 8. Q.8 Which of the following would you prefer as a method for handling continuously disruptive pupils? (Circle the number of your choice)
1 Contain the pupil in normal classes but teacher guided by regular professional advice e.g. educational psychologist, how best to handle situation to bring about behaviour modification.
2 Contain pupil within a special unit of the school staffed by teachers operating a programme of behaviour modification.
3 Send the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guided classes (1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special unit (2)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate unit (3)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 9. Q.9 Which age group do you teach? (Circle all appropriate years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1. Male Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2. Male Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3. Male Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 10 and 12 included allowance for no response (coded 9) facilitating production of an adjusted frequency percentage (AD.%%) when the no response figures were omitted.
Response - combined response of 3 schools

C 10. Q.10 Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following as contributory causes of discipline problems in schools.

1 - high contribution
2 - some contribution
3 - no contribution

A) Lack of early intervention
B) Poor home background
C) Decline in general standards demanded by society
D) Size of school
E) Inexperience of some teachers
F) Modern teaching methods
G) Basic characteristics of child's personality
H) Inadequate social services
I) Inadequate support by senior staff of schools
J) Inadequate local authority support
K) Low intelligence
(No response coded 9)
C 11. Q.10A Lack of early intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 12. Q.10B Poor home background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 13. Q.10C Decline in general standards demanded by society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 14. Q.10D Size of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 15. Q.10E Inexperience of some teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C 16. Q.10F Modern teaching methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 17. Q.10G Basic characteristics of child's personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 18. Q.10H Inadequate social services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 19. Q.10I Inadequate support by senior staff of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 20. Q.10J Inadequate local authority support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C 21. Q.10K Low intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.22. Q.11 (no computer analysis)

Please write down here your own personal definition of maladjustment
C 23 Q. 12 Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

0 - not used 1 - moderately effective 2 - moderately effective 3 - ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Temporary exclusion from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Permanent exclusion from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Temporary exclusion from normal classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Consultation with parents and pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Loss of privileges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Referral to other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Referral to Head Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) Call in a specialist (psychologist, social worker etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) Organised monitoring of pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) Ignoring behaviour problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) Small group teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) Mobilising pupil opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) Imposition of extra work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) Verbal rebuke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No response coded 9)
### C 24. Q.12A Corporal punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADF%</strong></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 25. Q.12B Detention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADF%</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 26. Q.12C Temporary exclusion from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADF%</strong></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 27. Q.12D Permanent exclusion from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADF%</strong></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 28. Q.12E Temporary exclusion from normal classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADF%</strong></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C 29. Q.12F Consultation with parents and pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 30. Q.12G Loss of privileges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 31. Q.12H Referral to other teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 32. Q.12I Referral to Head Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 33. Q.12J Calling in specialist (psychologist, social worker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C 34. Q.12K Organised monitoring of pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 35. Q.12L Ignoring behaviour problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 36. Q.12M Small group teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 37. Q.12N Mobilising pupil opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C 38. Q.12O Imposition of extra work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C 39. Q.12P Verbal rebuke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Study Questionnaire:
crosstabulations of questions
significant at the 5% level

('No' responses omitted to give adjusted frequency where
appropriate)

Key to abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>Relative Frequency Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D 1. Crosstabulation of question 7 (effectiveness of
Schools Psychological Service)
by question 1 (Male or female respondent)
(there were no completely effective responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Male Teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female Teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>RF%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>RF%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.4409 \quad 1 \text{DF} \quad \text{SIGNIFICANCE} = 0.0197 \]
### D 2. Crosstabulation of question 10B (poor home background) by question 1 (Male or female respondent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1OB</th>
<th>(1) Male Teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) high contribution</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) some contribution</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) no contribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.5151 \quad 2DF \text{ SIGNIFICANCE} = 0.0086 \]

### D 3. Crosstabulation of question 12B (Detention) by question 2 (Teaching experience)

(there were no completely effective responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12B</th>
<th>(1) less than 1 year</th>
<th>(2) 1-5 years</th>
<th>(3) 5 years +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Moderately effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.7469 \quad 2DF \text{ SIGNIFICANCE} = 0.0343 \]
### D 4. Crosstabulation of question 121 (referral to Head Teacher) by question 1 (Male or female respondent)

**Q1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q121</th>
<th>(1) Male Teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately effective</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.4599 \] 2DF  SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0240

### D 5. Crosstabulation of question 12K (Organised monitoring of pupil) by question 2 (Teaching experience)

**Q2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12K</th>
<th>(1) less than 1 year</th>
<th>(2) 1-5 years</th>
<th>(3) 5 years +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.1103 \] 4DF  SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0386
D 6. Crosstabulation of question 120 (Imposition of extra work) by question 2 (Teacher experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q120</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>(1) less than 1 year</th>
<th>(2) 1-5 years</th>
<th>(3) 5 years +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>moderately effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 24.5134 \quad 4DF \quad \text{SIGNIFICANCE} = 0.0001 \]
Questionnaire returns: analysed by single dimension

Key to abbreviations:

- **Q** = Question
- **AF** = Absolute Frequency
- **RF%** = Relative Frequency Percent
- **AD.F%** = Adjusted Frequency Percent

### E1. Q.1 Are you male or female?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E2. Q.2 How long have you been teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Less than one year</th>
<th>2 1 - 5 years</th>
<th>3 More than 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined response 6 schools
E 3. Q.3 Which sex do you experience greater discipline problems with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 4. Q.4 Which age group(s) do you consider shows greater incidence of behaviour problems?
You may circle more than one year group.

a) in boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) in girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E 5. Q.5 Would you say that incidence of behaviour problems in your school occur
1 - often
2 - sometimes
3 - rarely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often (1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (2)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (3)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 6. Q.6 Do you believe that incidence of behaviour problems in your school is
1 - increasing?
2 - decreasing?
3 - not changing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing (1)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing (2)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changing (3)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E7. Q.7 How effective do you think the School Psychological Service is in helping your school to handle discipline problems?

1 - very effective
2 - effective
3 - ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective (2)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective (3)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E8. Q.8 Which of the following would you prefer as a method for handling continuously disruptive pupils?

(Circle the number of your choice)

1 Contain the pupil in normal classes but teacher-guided by regular professional advice, e.g. educational psychologist, how best to handle the situation to bring about behaviour modification

2 Contain pupil within a special unit of the school staffed by teachers operating a programme of behaviour modification

3 Send the pupil to a separate institution for problem pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>RF%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guided classes (1)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special unit (2)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate unit (3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E 9. Q.9** Which age group do you teach?  
(Circle all appropriate years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Combined Male/Female Total | 144 | 157 | 165 | 171 | 166 |
E 10. Q.10 Tick the appropriate boxes to rate the following contributory causes of discipline problems in schools.

1 - high contribution
2 - some contribution
3 - no contribution

A) Lack of early intervention (by the school)  
B) Poor home background
C) Decline in general standards demanded by society
D) Size of school
E) Inexperience of some teachers
F) Modern teaching methods
G) Basic characteristics of child's personality
H) Inadequate social services
I) Inadequate support by senior staff of schools
J) Inadequate local authority support
K) Low intelligence

('No' responses coded 9)

Combined response of 6 schools

E 11. Q.10A Lack of early intervention (by the school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E 12. Q.10B Poor home background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 13. Q.10C Decline in general standards demanded by society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 14. Q.10D Size of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 15. Q.10E Inexperience of some teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 16. Q.10F Modern teaching methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E 17. Q.10G Basic characteristics of child's personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 18. Q.10H Inadequate social services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 19. Q.10I Inadequate support by senior staff of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 20. Q.10J Inadequate local authority support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E 21. Q.10K Low intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E 22. Q.11  Please write down here your own personal definition of maladjustment.

(No computer analysis)

E 23. Q.12  Will you please indicate by placing a tick in the appropriate boxes, the methods which are used in your school to deal with disruptive behaviour. You should indicate how effective you think they are (on a 3 point scale) in maintaining good order and discipline in the school as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) temporary exclusion from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) permanent exclusion from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) temporary exclusion from normal classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) consultation with parents and pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) loss of privileges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) referral to other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) referral to Head Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) calling in a specialist (psychologist, social worker, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) organised monitoring of pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) ignoring behaviour problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) small group teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) mobilising pupil opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) imposition of extra work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) verbal rebuke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

('No' responses coded 9)

Combined response of 6 schools
### E 24. Q.12A Corporal punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 25. Q.12B Detention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 26. Q.12C Temporary exclusion from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 27. Q.12D Permanent exclusion from school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 28. Q.12E Temporary exclusion from normal classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E 29. Q.12F Consultation with parents and pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 30. Q.12G Loss of privileges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 31. Q.12H Referral to other teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 32. Q.12I Referral to Head Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E 33. Q.12J Calling in a specialist (psychologist, social worker, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E 34. Q.12K Organised monitoring of pupil**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E 35. Q.12L Ignoring behaviour problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E 36. Q.12M Small group teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E 37. Q.12N Mobilising pupil opinions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E 38. Q.12O Imposition of extra work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E 39. Q.12P Verbal rebuke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crosstabulations of questions
significant at the 5% level

('No' responses omitted to give adjusted frequency where appropriate)

Key to abbreviations:

- **Q** = Question:
- **AF** = Absolute Frequency
- **RF%** = Relative Frequency Percent
- **DF** = Degrees of Freedom

**F 1. Crosstabulation of question 10K (Low intelligence as a contributory cause of discipline problems) by question 1 (Sex of respondents)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10K</th>
<th>(1) Male Teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) high contribution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.5 RF%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) some contribution</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50 AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>62.5 RF%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) no contribution</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16 AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>20.0 RF%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80 AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>45.2 RF%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 11.05419 \quad 2 \text{ DF SIGNIFICANCE} = 0.0040 \]
F 2. Crosstabulation of question 12B (Detention, as an effective method of maintaining discipline) by question 1 (Sex of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12B</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Male Teacher</td>
<td>(2) Female Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) not used</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>RF%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>RF%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) effective</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>RF%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ineffective</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>RF%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 10.87373$  3DF  SIGNIFICANCE 0.0124

1 out of 8 (12.5%) of the valid cells have expected cell frequency less than 5.0
Crosstabulation of question 12B (detention) by question 1 (sex of respondent) after elimination of 'not used' responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12B</th>
<th>(1) Male Teacher</th>
<th>(2) Female Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) very effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) effective</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ineffective</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 8.17616 \) 2DF SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0168

* The 12 missing observations are accounted for by 2 no responses and elimination of 10 responses which indicated 'not used in school' - alternative (0)
Essex County Council

THE SWEYNE SCHOOL

Pearens Avenue • Rayleigh • Essex • SS6 9PD

Internal Leaving Certificate

awarded to

for the completion of a non examination course in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very good
B good
C satisfactory
### APPENDIX H

Data sheets to record baseline observations

Session number 3  
**10.45 - 11.00 a.m.  15 minutes**

**Setting: Classroom 37**  
**Activity: Consumer Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Duration (Minutes/Seconds)</th>
<th>Antecedent event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>drops pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>asks irrelevant question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>general distraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>request to visit toilet (denied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>talks to another pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>staring out of window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
12.31

**Total time off-task:**  
12 minutes 31 seconds

**Total time on-task:**  
2 minutes 29 seconds, split into several very short periods.
Inter-observer agreement (Figures 17 and 18)

Source: Gelfand and Hartmann (1975, pp. 208 - 211)

The treatment session was divided into 15 one minute periods and the observers simultaneously made a tick on a prepared chart to indicate the occurrence of off-task behaviour during that period. This recording was carried out on three different days.

Session 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage agreement was then calculated using the following method advocated by Gelfand and Hartmann (p.209).

Summarise the foregoing data by collapsing the two-by-fifteen table into a two-by-two table. The method of collapsing the data is as follows:

1. Count the number of observation intervals for which both observers agreed that the target behaviour occurred. Enter this number in cell B.

2. Count the number of observation intervals for which both observers agreed that the target behaviour did not occur. Enter this number in cell C.

3. Count the number of observation intervals for which Observer 1 indicated that the target behaviour occurred while Observer 2 indicated that the target behaviour did not occur. Enter this number in cell A.

4. Finally, count the number of observation intervals for which Observer 1 indicated that the target behaviour did not occur while Observer 2 indicated that the target behaviour did occur. Enter this number in cell D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 8</th>
<th>Percentage agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Percentage agreement} = \left( \frac{(B+C)}{(A+B+C+D)} \right) \times 100
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{(12+2)}{(2+12+1+0)} \right) \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{13}{15} \times 100
\]

\[
= 86.67\%
\]


### Session 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage agreement**

\[
\frac{(B+C)}{(A+B+C+D)} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{(8+4)}{(1+8+4+2)} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{12}{15} \times 100
\]

\[
= 80.0\%
\]

### Session 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage agreement**

\[
\frac{(B+C)}{(A+B+C+D)} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{(1+12)}{(0+1+12+1)} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{13}{15} \times 100
\]

\[
= 86.67\%
\]
Inter-observer agreement (Figures 19 to 26)

Inter-observer reliability during the five major phases of the experiments (expressed as a percentage) - summary of following detailed recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>Baseline (A1)</th>
<th>1st Treatment (B)</th>
<th>Reversal (A2)</th>
<th>2nd Treatment (A2)</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INITIAL</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>not measured</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>not measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 8
**Experiment W** *(Figures 19 & 20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 <em>(Teacher)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 <em>(Independent)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((8+5)/(1+8+5+1)\times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%\)

### Session 12
**Experiment W** *(Figures 19 & 20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 <em>(Teacher)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 <em>(Independent)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((1+11)/(1+1+11+2)\times 100 = \frac{12}{15} \times 100 = 80.00\%\)

### Session 17
**Experiment W** *(Figures 19 & 20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 <em>(Teacher)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 <em>(Independent)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((3+8)/(2+3+8+2)\times 100 = \frac{11}{15} \times 100 = 73.33\%\)

### Session 20
**Experiment W** *(Figures 19 & 20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 <em>(Teacher)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 <em>(Independent)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((6+8)/(1+6+6+0)\times 100 = \frac{14}{15} \times 100 = 93.33\%\)
### Session 8

**Experiment W (Figures 19 & 20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{9+4}{1+9+4+1}\times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%\)

### Session 8

**Experiment X (Figures 21 & 22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{8+6}{1+8+6+0}\times 100 = \frac{14}{15} \times 100 = 93.33\%\)

### Session 12

**Experiment X (Figures 21 & 22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{3+10}{0+3+10+2}\times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%\)

### Session 17

**Experiment X (Figures 21 & 22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{5+7}{0+5+7+3}\times 100 = \frac{12}{15} \times 100 = 80.00\%\)
### Session 20  
**Experiment X**  
(Figures 21 & 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{2+9}{1+2+9+3} \times 100 = \frac{11}{15} \times 100 = 73.33\%\)

### Session [3]  
**Experiment X**  
(Figures 21 & 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{10+3}{2+10+3+0} \times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%\)

### Session 8  
**Experiment Y**  
(Figures 23 & 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{9+3}{1+9+3+2} \times 100 = \frac{12}{15} \times 100 = 80.00\%\)

### Session 12  
**Experiment Y**  
(Figures 23 & 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \(\frac{8+3}{2+8+3+1} \times 100 = \frac{11}{15} \times 100 = 73.33\%\)
### Session 17: Experiment Y (Figures 23 & 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \( \frac{4+10}{24} \times 100 = \frac{14}{15} \times 100 = 93.33\%

### Session 20: Experiment Y (Figures 23 & 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \( \frac{1+12}{15} \times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%

### Session 23: Experiment Y (Figures 23 & 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \( \frac{1+9}{15} \times 100 = \frac{10}{15} \times 100 = 66.67\%

### Session 8: Experiment Z (Figures 25 & 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 (Teacher)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2 (Independent)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \( \frac{13+1}{15} \times 100 = \frac{14}{15} \times 100 = 93.33\%
### Session 12

**Experiment Z (Figures 25 & 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement 100%

### Session 17

**Experiment Z (Figures 25 & 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((8 \times 5)/(2 + 8 + 5 + 0) \times 100 = \frac{13}{15} \times 100 = 86.67\%\)

### Session 20

**Experiment Z (Figures 25 & 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement 100%

### Session [3]

**Experiment Z (Figures 25 & 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 1 (Teacher)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer 2 (Independent)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage agreement \((9 + 3)/(2 + 9 + 3 + 1) \times 100 = \frac{12}{15} \times 100 = 80.00\%\)