Effective Classroom & Behaviour Management

# Introduction

In order to address the question of effective classroom and behaviour management, we must first interpret it. Classroom management can be seen as how the physical environment of the classroom is laid out, how the children are arranged in groups, what resources are available in the room, as well as the management of the people within the classroom through sanctions and rewards and behaviour routines. The term ‘management’ in this context is also ambiguous. It could suggest controlling of pupils with aim of achieving compliance through intervention (Porter, 2004) or it could mean the guidance of pupils to facilitate learning to intervene before controls are necessary. When we talk about effective behaviour management, how do we quantify good behaviour? For whom is the desired behaviour required – the teacher or the pupil? What limits do we put on pupils by modifying their behaviour in this way?

We must then look at the term ‘effective’ in relation to this. When looking at effective behaviour and classroom management, what are we hoping to be effective in? As suggested by Bill Rogers (2006) are we looking for compliance? Trying to get pupils to shut up? Getting the work done? We need to look at the goals of a behaviour management programme in order to address this.

The role of a teacher is not limited to the delivery of her subject. More and more the teacher is also seen as the main provider of guidance in relation to behaviour and social development. As stated by Porter (2004), teachers also have to promote order to facilitate effective learning and achieve the goals set out in the Every Child Matters programme to prepare pupils for the world after school.

Setting up a framework for behaviour management can help teachers to address this vital aspect of teaching allowing them to provide clear, consistent and considered guidance on acceptable behaviour

This essay is intended to address the above and define effective classroom and behaviour management in relation to current theory and practice to enable the delivery of the two objectives of the teacher stated above.

Firstly, I will give a brief overview of some of the many approaches to this that are in current use, followed by a more detailed analysis of two of the most popular approaches in schools today, namely Bill Rogers’ positive behaviour management approach and the approach used in School X, which is largely based on Canter & Canter’s Assertive Discipline approach.

Following the above, I will select an approach I feel is the most effective at classroom and behaviour management and analyse this further in relation to a specific pupil group, namely SEN pupils. This in turn will lead to the development of my own focus for block teaching experience one and the priorities I will set for effective behaviour management in the classroom.

As can be seen from this initial discussion in defining ‘effective classroom and behaviour management’, the subject is a complex, wide-ranging and diverse one. Many theorists from have put forward views on effective behaviour management, from which many approaches have been written from many different angles. Examples include Skinner’s behaviourism theory suggesting that reinforcement of good behaviour through rewards leads to repetition of that behaviour, Glasser’s Choice theory which suggests that rather than controlling pupils we should give them choices in their work as well as behaviour, Dreikurs’ democratic theory suggesting logical consequences for actions that enable redirection.

Many theories are based upon a structured plan for behaviour management and most offer some kind of rewards (be they physical rewards, reinforcers or positive feedback) and sanctions (be they prescribed, chosen or consequential).

There are a great number of theories and approaches surrounding classroom and behaviour management. They range from (cognitive to behavioural?) covering a wide variety of psychological theories of learning. The two that I have chosen to address in this assignment, although at first glance very similar in nature, are those which are used most often in schools (from my observation and conversation with colleagues) but which have subtle differences in their application. That is not to discount the other approaches and their relevant theories. Indeed, much of what they say is relevant and could be considered an improvement on the approaches currently used in schools and these points will be brought into the critical analysis of this essay.

# Analysis of Two Approaches to Classroom and Behaviour Management

The first approach I would like to consider is the positive behaviour management approach put forward by Bill Rogers (2007, 2006). The approach was developed after years as a teacher and teacher-mentor providing guidance and advice in the UK and Australia. It is aimed at enabling teachers to ‘establish more co-operative classrooms where rights and responsibilities work together to the benefit of all’ (Rogers, 2006 p.4). The theories that it can be said to derive from are therefore numerous. The approach does not fit neatly into one category of approach. Some components of the approach appear to follow a behaviourist model of encouraging appropriate behaviour through the use of reward (Skinner). Other components address the more humanist aspect of choice in relation to actions (Glasser), while still other components reflect the cognitive approach of changing behaviour through giving people the skills needed to interact with others in ways that are mutually beneficial (???). Classification of the approach is made more difficult as various commentators on the subject appear to place the approach in different categories. Perhaps it is inherent in a practical and useful approach that this be drawn from a number of effective principles and practices, hand-picking those elements which combine to provide a useful and comprehensive approach.

The approach is intended as a whole-school approach which focuses on a behaviour agreement establishing common rights which in turn lead to the stipulation of rules to protect those rights and the responsibility of pupils to uphold those rights for themselves and for others. This approach using a behaviour agreement relates to Vygotsky’s social constructivist theory of learning (in Jarvis, xxxx) which states that people learn through social interaction through (among other things) psychological tools of thinking and problem solving passed on by older members of the community. He also states that peer tutoring can be useful but only if the goal is understood. It encourages collaboration and co-operative learning. The teacher is the psychological tool that passes on information about correct behaviour and effective social interaction by way of teaching the behaviour agreement and implementing this in lessons. This structured view of behaviour helps pupils to construct their own meaning. Students can help in adding to the behaviour agreement, thus taking ownership of it, but it must be made clear that some rules are non-negotiable.

The behaviour agreement focuses on the fundamentals of the positive learning community such as the right to learn, safety, respect and getting along. The elements of the behaviour agreement are expressed through positive behaviour management and the use of positive language, giving rule reminders, choices and choice of deferred consequences thus aiming to redirect potentially disruptive behaviour before negative behaviour occurs. It also focuses on behavioural consequences as inevitabilities for unacceptable rather than punishments that have nothing to do with the behaviour itself. Piaget’s (in Jarvis, xxxx) theory states that we are agents of our own learning and we need to understand the rules by which the world operates in order to increase our own reasoning. By providing reasons and direct consequences for behavioural actions, pupils will be able to form their own links between their behaviour and its outcomes.

It also suggests the positive feedback has a far greater effect than physical rewards. Rogers asserts that feedback is the best reward that can be give, a view backed up by Hook and Vass (2005 quoted on Interactive Behaviour Management CD ROM) who state “Emotional feedback is the most effective form of reward.” However, humanists reject punishments and rewards as they stop children from considering what is right and put the focus on what will happen to them (Porter xxxx). Kohn (XXXX) in his review of rewards and negative effects these may have states that rewards, even as simple as praise and feedback, are used to control and “our attention is properly focused… not on ‘that’ (the thing desired) but on the requirement that ‘one must do this in order to get that’.” p.4. Thus a reward can detract from the intrinsic nature of learning and mean that focus shifts from the lesson to an attempt to gain a reward (i.e. praise) from the teacher. The question here is also raised of what it is we are trying to award, whether that is really an increased effort on the part of the student or merely short-term compliance to unable us to finish the lesson. Are we really enabling pupils in this way to go out into the world as confident adults capable of integrating into society? As suitable as positive feedback may seem in the classroom, how will self-esteem then be effected when as adults, they are not praised daily for their efforts and when indeed in the ‘real world’ the reward for good work is not a credit or a word of praise but more work? Kohn suggests that the effect of rewards an be minimised by giving them as a surprise so children are not working towards them and making the reward as similar as possible to the task to ensure that the reward can be linked back to the action. As alternatives to punishment, Porter (xxxx) suggests: Point out a way students could be helpful, express disapproval with behaviour without attacking character, state expectations in positive terms, offer a choice of how to meet expectations, let students experience natural consequences of actions (or logical consequences as a last resort). This reinforces Rogers’ approach.

Rogers emphasises the importance of being a reflective practitioner. The aim is to address behaviours and actions in their own right, not to let emotion cloud judgement and to respond in a reasoned and calm way to any conflicts that may arise.

The approach also considers environments in which children learn best. As cited in Rogers (2006), Kyriacou (1986) states “Pupils like teachers who can keep order, are fair and can explain clearly, give interesting lessons, are friendly and patient.” The effective teacher must teach according to the values we aspire to of respect, fairness and safety. Rogers asserts that building positive relationships with pupils is crucial to achieving a classroom environment conducive to learning. He also points out the importance of rebuilding relationships that may have been damaged through misbehaviour and the inevitable use of sanctions following this. It is further important to let students know that their engagement is expected, as Piaget (in Jarvis) states, children work alone in gaining knowledge but social interaction is a source of experience and information. The child may build his own interpretation of a task or an answer but this can be helped by working with others although children will still build their own interpratations. Rogers agrees with this stating that it is the pupil’s job to control their own behaviour. The teacher will lead, guide and support the pupil to manage themselves.

It is important to be enthusiastic in your teaching to guide pupils through learning, addressing the range of abilities in the class and leading pupils to take control of their own behaviour. Rogers empahsises the role of the teacher-pupil relationship in effective classroom and behaviour mangement. Vygotsky backs this up (in Jarvis, xxxx) – he believes that whole class interactive teaching with as much time as possible interacting with the teacher is an effective way to learn. The teacher gives instructions (initiates the task), the pupils respond and the teacher provides feedback to build on their learning. Piaget (in Jarvis) takes this further stating that learners need to be presented with tasks that put them at disequilibrium and that figuring out how to solve the task will bring them back into equilibrium but that pupils can only cope with reasoning and fully logical thought post age 11. This has been disputed by other theorists who state that Piaget’s stages were early. The National Curriculum at level 3, therefore, does not include any formal reasoning but aims to introduce concepts to children at an age when they can cope with them. However, this does not challenge the brightest pupils in the class. Porter (xxxx) asserts that the children learn when curricula are relevant and teachers are personally involved. She also states that teachers gain status from being skilled at their job, not from having power. Students and teachers have an equal right to have needs met but they occupy different roles.

Recognising the efforts of those who are struggling to understand a behaviour rule through positive feedback and encouragement can also contribute to learning. As Kohn (xxxx, p.20) states, “A child’s misbehaviour is best construed as a ‘teachable moment,’ a problem to be solved together rather than an infraction that requires a punitive response.” This is also true when rules are broken in that Rogers believes the consequences for the broken rule must be linked to the behaviour. This is simple to address if the behaviour involved a physical act such as making a mess, this can be cleaned up. However, if the child teased someone or called out, the link would be more subtle. For example, the behaviour could be linked to a detention in which the child explores the reasons for their behaviour through a questionnaire or a discussion with the teacher. If these points are addressed, pupils will know that the teacher cares about them and their learning and will see the teacher is treating them as adults. This is reinforced by Mercer’s Intermental Development Zone which suggests that there is not a gap between learner and teacher but a shared communicative space in which the understanding and purpose can be passed to the learner, leading to a sense of ownership of the rules. Although not explicit in his work, Rogers emphasises this through the need to guide pupils through teaching and addressing a wide range of ability using a variety of teaching approaches. Porter (xxxx) states that authoritarian responses provoke disruptive student behaviour. And children naturally make mistakes. Sometimes they are overwhelmed emotionally. Rogers’ more democratic approach ensures that mistakes are not punished but built upon.

It is now generally agreed (Jarvis, xxxx) that learning is a social process in which an experienced tutor provides understanding to the learner. This is extremely important in the establishment phase of the behaviour agreement in which the teacher integrates the plan into the system and teaches it to pupils. This establishment phase also addresses the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky cited in Jarvis, xxxx) which is the gap between what the childe understands and what he can then understand through interaction with the teacher. The rules and establishment phase of the behaviour agreement can help provide the scaffolding to help the child across the ZPD.

Rogers distinguishes between primary and secondary behaviours. The primary behaviour is the actual behaviour that broke a rule. The secondary behaviour is the (often unconscious) behaviour such as muttering, sulking, etc. that can follow any reprimand or attempt to redress the situation. The secondary behaviours are those that can cause teachers the most frustration but are those that should be ignored, focussing instead on the actual behaviour issue.

Finally, Rogers emphasises that a teacher cannot control the behaviour of others but can control their own reaction to a situation. Kohn (xxxx) states that it is not possible to make somebody be motivated to work and that motivation is not simply manipulation of behaviour, therefore it is important to note that if you cannot control or manipulate effectively, you need to learn for yourself how to alter your reaction from an emotional one to a calm, considered and reflective one. The aim should then be to guide pupils through the teacher’s effort to communicate respect and care (Rogers). As Kohn (xxxx p. 199) puts it, we need to give pupils a reason to think about what kind of person they want to be, “the job educators is neither to make students motivated not to sit passively: it is to se up the conditions that make learning possible.” We should not be asking how we can control the class but how we can be more effective as teachers and leaders in guiding pupils, rather than controlling them. Controlling suggests intent to harm or shame pupils. What we need to do is show them that we are enabling them to take responsibility for their own actions (Rogers). Porter further confirms this by stating that the purpose of discipline is to develop autonomous ethics, emotional regulation, cooperation and integrity. Burnard (xxxx, p.4) states that “Behaviour programmes start with the adults looking at their own behaviour and how they can control it to help a child develop strong positive responses to social situations.”

Classroom environment? As in posters on walls, etc.

Porter (on humanism): Lacks scientific riguour (according to Skinner) but Caumrind (1967) differentiated authoritarian, authoritative and laissez-faire styles supplies convincing data on superiority of democratic methods. Efficiency – students may not respond immediately but may ‘test’ the negotiation process but will come to accept approach over time (Gordon, 1970).

Evaluate the approach (how good it is)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strengths of Rogers (adapted from Porter) | Weaknesses of Rogers (Adapted from Porter’s weaknesses of humanism). |
| Preventive focus | Requires teacher to take a step back and not react emotionally |
| Positive view of individuals | May not be easy to integrate consistently at first. Must be reinforced. |
| Promotes self –responsibility | Requires teachers to have sophisticated communication skills |
| Enhanced learning | Students need competent verbal skills |
| Addresses underlying causes of student behaviour |  |

### Approach 2 – Limit-setting approach (Assertive Discipline) – SCHOOL POLICY

The second approach I will evaluate is the approach used in school X, which appears to be largely based on Canter and Canter’s limit setting approach. This approach is again based on years of observation and work as consultants in a school setting, rather than on empirical study. It is a skills-based approach (Porter, xxxx) and shares many commonalities with Bill Rogers’ positive behaviour management but focuses more on the discipline side than Rogers.

The approach also has its roots in positive behaviour management and effective communication and relies on a classroom discipline plan to reinforce behaviour. The approach asserts that teachers have the right (and responsibility) to impose order and that students need adults to make it clear what is expected of them. That the teachers act as managers in ensuring order in the classroom. The discipline plan clearly lays out the positive and negative consequences for individuals and the group to ensure that students comply with expectations.

The approach is an authoritarian approach that seems to be most closely linked with behaviourism – that positive behaviour will lead to positive consequences and negative behaviour to negative consequences, reinforced through rewards and sanctions clearly defined in the discipline plan. However, pupils are encouraged to choose the correct behaviour, which suggests elements of cognitive behaviourism

Porter (2004) summarises this approach saying that homes lack stability, support and discipline so children in turn lack the self-esteem and self-control needed to choose responsible behaviour. Teachers in turn lack the confidence to be clear about expectations and consequences. However, the classroom belongs to the teacher and the teacher has a right to determine expectations and consequences for students. Whereas Rogers emphasises a whole school approach, Canter and Canter focus on a classroom discipline plan that suits the teacher. The plan is intended to “teach pupils how to exercise control over themselves, although no specific approaches are recommended for transferring control back to the students” (Porter xxxx p23). This does however suggest a fit with Vygostky’s ZPD in that the teacher is providing reasons for the rules filling the gap between what the child can learn alone and what the teacher can help with. The classroom discipline plan contains three parts – rules which must be followed, supportive feedback for students for following the rules and corrective actions (not punishments) that are used consistently for any deviance from the rules. This makes students ‘agents of their own learning’ (Piaget, in Jarvis xxxx) and gives information on operations of the world and how it works. However, Kohn again here would argue that this takes the focus away from the actual aim of the rule or thing being learned, making students focus on the reward of supportive feedback. Rules should not be confused with goals such as ‘treat each other with respect’. These goals are open to interpretation. The discipline plan enables teachers to be consistent, protect pupils’ rights (by not relying on history but being fair and equal and addressing the behaviour as it happens) and increases the likelihood of parental and management support as it shows you that you care about the child and about teaching positive behaviour. As with Rogers, Canter and Canter advocate including pupils in providing suggestions for the rules stating that pupils can often be more strict than teachers. However, it is a good idea to make sure that you have an idea rules you would like to include before asking. This approach gives pupils ownership of the rules. When they are broken it is possible to relate this back to the pupils and point out that the rules are rules that they set for themselves, once again putting the responsibility on the student.

Canter and Canter note that supportive feedback is not the same as praise. Praise can be evaluative and judgemental. The aim of assertive discipline is to enable students to make choices for their own sake rather than for your approval (own thought – but rewards do not follow this!). Teachers should plan positive feedback into their lessons and aim to give feedback to a student at least once a day. But Kohn (xxxx) may argue here what are we trying to reward? Is it really more effort or is it simply compliance of the rules whether they have internalised the meaning behind these rules or not? Positive behaviour management should be integrated into day-to-day teaching – into transitions, small group activities (through monitoring redirection and corrective actions), in class discussions (by circulating, standing by inattentive students, making eye contact). As noted on the Interactive Behaviour Management CD Rom, “Good planning reduces the opportunity for behaviour problems to occur. Give timings to pupils for activities.” Positive feedback can help contribute to that and raise self-esteem. Own thought – do these sentences all fit together? How can choice and positive feedback be linked? By nature, the feedback is controlling so does not give free choice in the democratic sense. Canter and Canter also assert that positive feedback gives the ‘good’ pupils the most attention. But how do we know that pupils who are displaying better behaviour are trying? Kohn (xxxx) suggests that there is an incorrect underlying assumption that deserving people will be rewarded.

As with Rogers, Canter & Canter’s discipline plan helps to avoid hasty, emotional and hostile responses to students. Perhaps in this way it can be seen more as a tool for the teacher than to instil rules in students. The plan also enables the teacher to gain support from parents and management as they are able to see the structure followed and the ensuing consequences. It also encourages building positive relationships and states that children grow when they have consistent, positive behaviour limits, self-discipline and caring individual relationships. Supportive feedback encourages appropriate behaviour and reduces problem behaviour, which further emphasises the need to plan positive behaviour. Greeting students by name at the door of the classroom and complementing them on work the previous day, stopping a child for a chat in the corridor and attending activities they are involved in, all show that you care about the individual. However, Kohn (xxx) suggests that rewarding pupils in this way (providing positive feedback on work the previous day) is easier than getting to the root of the problem. Promoting positive discipline through rewards does not address the reason for the problem behaviour in the first place. In this way teachers have no more control than they do over motivation.

Proactive responses are aimed at getting everyone back on task and giving the pupils guidance to choose more appropriate behaviour in the future. The responsibility is placed on the student. Canter and Canter believe that the overuse of corrective actions can create a negative environment so supportive intervention is necessary before sanctions are required. This fits with Vygotsky’s theory (Jarvis, xxxx) that individuals learn through social interaction mediators such as psychological tools (thinking and problem solving skills transmitted by older members of society). Giving pupils responsibility for their own behaviour and learning through the use of adults fits with the social constructivist theory. However, this does not quite fit with Kohn’s (xxxx) idea that giving a reward is much easier than getting to the root of the problem. Rewards discourage risk-taking. Pupils are less likely to notice or remember things that are not immediately relevant to the reward, we do what is necessary to get the reward and no more. For example, if we are rewarded for reading books, we would read short, simple books to get rewards. We learn for tests doing what we need to maximise grades but otherwise may challenge ourselves more. They undermine the intrinsic motivation to learn.

In addition to positive feedback, Canter and Canter advocate the use of rewards such as notes to parents, phone calls, awards such as certificates, special privileges, and tangible rewards. Verbal recognition is still considered the most meaningful and they consider that tangible rewards should be used sparingly and appropriately, as a result of behaviour and not as a bribe. There needs to be interest in the reward for it to be effective, such as a reward of a film with popcorn for the whole class at the end of term if they collect enough points. Kohn (xxxx) advocates the above saying that you can minimise the damage of rewards by offering them afterwards as a surprise. Kohn also states that the size of the reward is arbitrary. It usually has no link to the behaviour so you should therefore make them as similar as possible to the task (e.g. a book as a book-reading prize rather than a film with popcorn). The reward turns learning into a prerequisite for a prize rather than for the intrinsic value of knowledge. There is a fear in abolishing rewards as they are used to control behaviour in the classroom.

Again, the rules must be taught and Canter and Canter advocate using a lesson to do this. They suggest talking to pupils about why rules are needed, teaching the rules, checking for understanding, explaining supportive feedback you will use, explaining corrective actions you will use and why, and again checking for understanding. Vygotsky (Jarvis, xxxx) supports this approach stating that we can use language as a tool by getting pupils to repeat instructions back to internalise them. Canter and Canter (xxxx) p.64 “Corrective actions must be seen as natural outcomes of inappropriate behaviour.” It is fundamental to self-management to give students the choice of and responsibility for their actions. The added bonus is that the teacher is no longer the bad guy. Corrective actions do not need to be severe. They are most effective when used consistently. But it must be clear what we are trying to reward otherwise they correct the behaviour at the point but are not shown to have any long-term effect. Canter and Canter maintain it is important to choose the minimal and most immediate action possible as this gives you scope, should the behaviour persist. It is also important not to make assumptions about behaviour but to give clear rules and directions. Jarvis (xxxx) asserts that it is generally accepted now that learning is a social process in which the learner takes on understanding from an experienced tutor.

The approach also calls for immediate, specific and genuine, positive recognition. As this may be difficult for older pupils to accept without embarrassment, group rewards can help to alleviate peer pressure.

They emphasise that the approach does not punish but has consequences that are meaningful. Consequences are applied on a step-by-step basis in a structured order that pupils are aware of. It is important to be consistent with corrective actions and be firm but calm. Refocus students who are tryingot argue with you and give positive feedback as soon as possible after the corrective action. However, Kohn argues that this does not necessarily change behaviour. They are quick-fixes that undermine the prosocial values we are trying to teach (Kohn xxxx).If I t is not possible to deal with the problem straight away, pupils need an outlet for their feelings so it is possible to give them an outlet such as a note they can write as an escape mechanism.

In applying the plan, teachers must be assertive but also try to be positive and supportive. Although the plan should be followed as much as possible, there are also occasions where behaviour cannot follow the plan. A severe clause must be included in the plan that enables the teacher to remove the student from the situation immediately to avoid potential harm to students or the teacher. Individualised behaviour plans detailing specific improvements required and meaningful corrective actions are also possible.

In addition to the classroom discipline plan, different instruction settings (individual work, group work, etc.) will require specific guidelines and procedures. These should be followed each time work is carried out in that setting through clear, concise procedures. Teach what, how and why you are going to do what y you will do and again, plan this into your lesson. Explain the rationale for each direction and check for understanding. Behavioural narration can help to reinforce posistive behaviour “Jim has got his books out, well done…” and addresses a variety of learning styles as other pupils can see and hear the positive behaviour.

The approach emphasises that learning requires order and provides teachers with the skills to manage inappropriate behaviour through the discipline plan. The goal of discipline appears to be obedience of orders. “Learning is a change in observable behaviour” (p.11 Learning theories for Teachers, Bigge and Shermis). Pupils are accountable for their academic and also their social conduct. Although the approach is largely authoritarian, students have the power to make choices about their behaviour. Canter and Canter state that it is ok to incorporate other approaches into the assertive discipline plan as practitioners see fit. For example, stimulus-response theories of behaviour and reward (behaviouristic theories).

* Define the strengths and weaknesses
  + Own thoughts on assumptions
    - Adults to exercise control – what happens when adults not there?
    - External controls will help children to exercise self discipline – but what happens when that adult is not there? Are they still disciplined or following the rules for that teacher?
    - Assertive good when not aggressive. Makes pupils believe in your authority.
    - Positive recognition – worthwhile to show that not always bad behaviour that gets the attention althought naïve to think that some pupils will be good because they have heard others be recognised.
    - Negative sanctions – necessary but perhaps a bit wishy-washy? Positive in their administration means perhaps pupils will miss the point.
    - Praise must be meaningful – disagree with heaping praise on simple tasks?
  + Refer to literature & journals:
    - Porter (in relation to behaviourism but principal can be applied to assertive discipline: punishment can increase undesirable behaviour – Jones&Jones 1998 – increased punitive control raised misbehaviour from 9% to 31%. Punishment has limited effect on learning. Hard to do consistently. Can make pupils fearful and fursturated. Makes pupils more careful, not more honest or responsible. Cannot be good all the time – praise can therefore be counter=productive, teachers need a high level of expertise to use praise well.
    - Burnard (2005?) – Burnard asserts that used incorrectly, rewards can cause a negative behaviour to continue. Inappropriate behavioural occurrence -> Positive reinforcement -> Sustains inappropriate behaviour.
* Evaluate the approach (how good it is)
  + Porter:
    - Effectiveness – little research evidence verifying effectiveness (charles, 1999).
    - One study showed assertive discipline achieved a decline in of-task behaviour from 12.5& to 7.5% (Canter, 1989) but findings from other studies less positive when schools did not already have serious behavioural problems in which case any plan would have improved matters.
    - Studies found either neutral effects or increased referral rates for behavioural difficulties, detentions and truancy (Emmer & Aussiker, 1990), with some studies reporting increases in negative behaviours, attitudes to school and lowered morale.
    - Efficiency – Canter claims it produces quick results so allows you to get on with teaching. But critics say any worthwhile learning is slow and requires teachers to take more risks – should be true of teaching self-discipline skills.
    - Canter’s defence is that the programme is harsh only when implemented improperly but critics say that at best it is open to misuse, at worst it violates the students’ emotional and social needs. ‘Realistically, the only choice assertive discipline offers is, “Behave, or else!”’
    - Skills focus gives teachers tools to use but too much control can limit learning. And you are constrained by it – no use of discretion (although the book does advocate using professional judgement).
    - No educational theory to guide its use. Imposing solutions on students but fails to teach them how to think about and solve problems.
    - Effectiveness defined in terms of whether the teacher’s management methods allow him or her to dominate the flow of activities in the classroom – this can provoke behavioural difficulties as students attempt to seize back some of the autonomy that is being denied them.
    - If controlling approaches work, why do they have to be used throughout the school years?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| Practical recommendations | Authoritarian |
|  | Some recorded negative effects on students |
|  | Not based on pedagogical theory. |
|  | Rewards can detract from own natural motivation – i.e. will only behave when rewards are evident but not inherently be good. |

Other thoughts in response to above theories:

* Outline the approach – Bill Glasser – Leadership approach - Choice theory (from Porter:)
  + Individuals behave as they do out of choice. They believe their chosen behaviour will help meet their needs.
  + Therefore, you must make it possible for students to make better choices so that their behaviour meets their own needs without violating the rights of others.
  + Show pupils how to control their own lives and learning.
  + Porter, 2004: humanist tradition plus cognitive theory.
    - Differs from humanism as it has implied emphasis on need for order in schools.
    - Adds a counselling intervention to the humanist communication skills.
    - Places emphasis on converting a whole school to the systematic application of his methods.
    - We choose everything we do (like humanism) rather than external events dictating our behaviour.
    - Because the only person we can control is ourselves, nobody can know what is right for anyone else, even children.
    - Conditions necessary for learning to occur:
      * Survival (Maslow related?) – basic needs must be met first.
      * Love and belonging.
      * Power – need to choose for ourselves.
      * Freedom – from control by others.
      * Fun – experienced from satisfaction of other needs.
    - Purpose of discipline – enables students to make rational not emotional decisions but that do not interfer with needs of others.
    - Behavioural disruptions occur because school work does not meet students’ needs in terms of what they are being asked to do and how teachers relate to them.
    - Teacher-student status is democratic. Coercion is destructive. Students do absolute minimum of what they have been asked.
    - Role of teacher is to show that doing high-quality work in school will add to their quality of life meaning that work meets their needs. Build caring relationships with students so they gain the strength to take responsibility for themselves.
    - Meet students’ need for power - pupil choice. Lead management not boss management. Negotiation of minimal rules with clear cause and effect relationship to behaviour. Emphasise high-quality work – “There is no power in doing something useless” (glasser 1998b, 34, cited in Power). Offer relevant curricula (change to learning streams for new KS3?). Concurrent evaluation, temporary grades (to be improved upon as otherwise little point in assessing), voluntary homework to improve grades – advise about extra work they could do at home.
    - Teach choice theory to students. To give control over lives and skills to solve problems. Total behaviour (acting, thinking , feeling and a biological response). If you want to feel better, you need to act and think more effectively.
    - Immediate intervention to solve problems – provide time out, resolve the problem, offer counselling.
    - In order to promote feelings of power, you must expect and support responsible behaviour and high-quality work through relevant curriclum and leading rather than managing students. If students are disuprtive, solve the problem with the student (collaboratively) as soon as student is calm enough to contribute to the process. All must have faith in each other to make responsible decisions from management to teachers to pupils.
    - Motivation: all individuals are motivated to meet their needs, therefore when not motivated, it is to do the particular task as it does not meet their needs rather than unmotivated in general.
    - Motivation comprises (Cole&Chan,1994, DiCintio&Gee,1999, Glasser, 1998a and Jones &Jones 1998 in Porter):
      * Expectation of success which required optimal degree of challenge
      * Assessment of benefits that success will bring in temrs of fulfuilling personal needs.
      * Extent to which environmental climate meets the physical, emotional and social needs.
    - Limit competition as this creates tensions between students. – cooperative games rather than competitive.
* Define the strengths and weaknesses
  + - Weaknesses – can be difficult to communicate with students about their behaviour without resorting to controlling methods or imposing own solutions and to avoid responding in a way that allows students to make excuses for their behaviour (Edwards 1997).
    - Students’ own authoritarian ideas can undermine the effectiveness of Glasser’s interventions (Lewis, 1997).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| Promotes self-responsibility | Requires teachers to have sophisticated communication skills |
| Takes context into account | Students need competent verbal skills |
| Removes heat from student-teacher conflicts |  |
| Wide applicability |  |
| Adds counselling intervention to a humanist base |  |
| Living democracy |  |
| Effective whole-school approach. |  |

* Evaluate the approach (how good it is)
  + Porter ,2004:
    - Emmer and Aussiker’s (1990) study found more positive attitudes to school and disciplinary issues when teachers were trained in choice theory. Made fewer referrals for behavioural difficulties. But research limitations make it difficult to know whether fewer problems occurred or teachers simply felt better equipped to cope, or because of whole-school approach. Strongest findings for individual students who have displayed chronic behavioural difficulties. Immediate positive results in terms of fewer peer disputes, reduced absenteeism and improved on-task rates.
    - Thompson and Rudloph (1996) – reduced recidivism rate at one school from 90% to 20% in a short period of time. They conclude theory works well when the whole school and parent population endorse its philosophy and provide practical support.
    - Those pupils with severe intellectual difficulties may not be able to be involved in counselling and goal-setting elements of approach but Glasser reports it has been used with people with moderate disablities with no major changes.
    - Efficiency: Theory requires overhaul of curriculum and in-depth training of teachers and personnel so takes time to implement. Efficient once in place though.
    - Still need rights and responsibilities. Although Glasser states that most rules come down to courtesy so most guidelines could come under this single heading.

# Section 2

* Determine with justifications which is the most effective approach
* State preferred approach

# Section 3

* State choice of pupil group:
* Give examples of how the chosen approach can promote effective learning for this group based on examples seen.
* Justify choice through these examples

# Section 4

* Define the principle elements of the school behavioural policy
* Define and outline the areas of the policy I intend to focus on
  + Reference key QTS
  + Define priorities
* Justify choices made
* Outline a strategy for implementation.
  + Including weekly slots and mentor targets
  + Record and evaluate events.
  + Observation – Of skilled teachers vs. not so skilled using ABC (antecedent, bevhaiour, consequence) (Burnard, 2005). Of individual children seeing how different teachers deal with their behaviour and how child reacts in different settings i.e. group work, pair work, whole class work (shadow an SEN pupil for a day).
  + Task analysis of inappropriate behaviour – break it down and then reconstruct ‘correct behaviour’ so child understands it and has control. Focuses on individual child’s needs (Burnard, 2005).
  + Set targets – helps pupils feel you are concerned and belong. Be specific. (Burnard, 2005 and Rogers).
  + Plan in behaviour management into lessons. How will I react if the class does not settle down? (Rogers and Canter both suggest this).
  + Build in strategies to address needs of all learners (link to psychology) so that their needs are met (as suggested in choice theory).

# Conclusion

* Summary

For the purpose of this assignment, I have interpreted ‘effective classroom and behaviour management’ to mean using appropriate routines, rules and responsibilities within the classroom to facilitate effective teaching and learning. The physical classroom environment also plays a part in classroom management but will not be focussed on in great detail here. We are aiming to create a calm, focused environment in which pupils feel safe and where learning can take place.