Behaviour in Scottish Schools

Education

BEHAVIOUR IN SCOTTISH SCHOOLS

Anne Wilkin; Helen Moor; Jenny Murfield; Kay Kinder and Fiona Johnson
National Foundation for Educational Research

Scottish Executive Social Research
2006

The Scottish Executive is making this research report available on-line in order to provide access to its contents for those interested in the subject. The Executive commissioned the research but has not exercised editorial control over the report.

This web only report is accompanied by the Insight document "Behaviour in Scottish Schools", available both on-line and in printed form.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

1.   Pupil behaviour in schools has been an issue of concern for many years and the subject of extensive research. *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001) recognised the challenges that teachers and other professionals face, and acknowledged the wide-ranging causes of indiscipline. In light of this, funding was made available across Scotland for the implementation of the report's 36 recommendations.

2.   As a result of the recommendations, the Scottish Executive committed to supporting a range of initiatives, as well as making resources available for professional development purposes. The *Policy Update on Behaviour in Scottish Schools* (Scottish Executive, 2004a) concluded that progress had been made in implementing the recommendations of the former report and recommended developing further approaches to prevent, and respond to, pupil-on-pupil violence or aggression. The Scottish Executive committed to instituting 'regular major surveys of teachers' and pupils' experiences and perceptions of behaviour and discipline in schools' (Scottish Executive, 2004a).

3.   The main aims of the current study were: to provide clear and robust information on the nature and extent of behaviour (including positive behaviour) in publicly funded schools in Scotland; to examine what is effective in preventing and responding to indiscipline; and to examine what is effective in promoting positive behaviour.

4.   The study was designed to build on previous work conducted by Edinburgh University, but to expand its scope. Thus, in addition to the views of headteachers and teachers, this study now also sought those of education authority representatives, additional support staff and pupils. It had 3 strands: telephone interviews with a representative of each of the 32 local authorities in Scotland; questionnaire surveys to headteachers, teachers and additional support staff in primary and secondary schools; a questionnaire survey to pupils in 4 primary and 3 secondary schools, as well as pupil focus groups and a contextual staff interview in those 7 schools; and 8 regional focus groups with school staff.

Overview

5.   Overwhelmingly, the headteachers surveyed considered pupils to be generally well behaved in the classroom, as did the majority of teachers, additional support staff and pupils, (although all were less emphatic than headteachers). Positive behaviour was much more frequent in primary schools than at secondary level.

6.   Headteachers thought that indiscipline was less serious a problem than teachers and additional support staff. Secondary school staff were consistently more likely than their primary counterparts to identify indiscipline as a serious problem. Comparing the percentages of staff rating the problem as 'very serious' with the findings from the Edinburgh University study (Munn *et al*., 2004), the figures are not vastly different. Primary and secondary teachers' perceptions of the problem as very serious have increased very slightly since 2004, while secondary headteachers' perceptions have decreased.

7.   The more positive headteachers, teachers and additional support staff were in their ratings for their school's overall ethos, quality of leadership and collegiality, the less serious a problem they thought indiscipline was. The more supported teachers and additional support staff felt, the less serious a problem they thought indiscipline was in their school.

8.   Indiscipline was thought to occur predominantly in the 'school playground or yard', 'outside school precincts' or on 'corridors and stairs'. Secondary headteachers were more likely than primary headteachers to identify the 'classroom'.

9.   P6 and P7 and S2-S4 were identified by staff and pupils as being the most difficult year groups (again, largely in line with the 2004 Edinburgh University study) with the individuals usually causing the indiscipline being: boys; pupils from dysfunctional homes; and those with behavioural/developmental difficulties.

10.   Better Behaviour – Better Learning appears to have affected practice at a local authority level and, to a lesser extent, at school and classroom level. School staff felt generally aware of BB-BL and evidence from the school staff survey showed support for a number of the recommendations being implemented in schools and classrooms.

PART ONE: BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

Positive behaviour in the classroom

11.   There were acute differences in perceptions of positive behaviour depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type. Pupils themselves were most negative, then additional support staff, followed by teachers and finally the headteachers.

12.   The specific types of positive behaviours that were reported to occur most frequently in lessons included 'pupils arriving promptly for classes', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils listening to the teacher respectfully'.

13.   Analysis by school sector revealed that positive behaviours occurred much more frequently at primary level than they did in secondary schools.

14.   The more confident teachers felt with regard to responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the more likely they were to report positive behaviour as frequently occurring. Similarly, teachers and support staff who felt supported by their school recorded more incidences of positive behaviours.

Negative behaviour in the classroom

15.   Secondary headteachers were more likely than their primary counterparts to report that 'a few', or 'some' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom. The tiny number of headteachers (2 per cent) who reported that 'most', or 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom were primary headteachers. Factors affecting this might include: the small size of the school; higher levels of deprivation; or higher levels of special educational need.

16.   Teachers, additional support staff and pupils were generally less positive than headteachers about pupil behaviour in lessons. Additional support staff and pupils were more likely than teachers to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'some' or 'most' lessons. Teachers and additional support staff in primary schools were more likely than their secondary colleagues to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'none/almost none' of their lessons.

17.   The classroom behaviours encountered by school staff (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) most frequently within a typical week of teaching were low level, in particular 'talking out of turn', 'making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise', 'hindering or distracting others' and 'pupils leaving their seat without permission'. More serious indiscipline, such as physical violence or aggression, was far less likely to occur on a daily basis, and was hardly ever directed at school staff. These findings are very much in line with those of the 2004 Edinburgh University study.

18.   The very few incidents of racist or sexist abuse towards staff, and physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported in the survey, occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary. Increasing numbers of 3- and 4-year olds were reported to be entering mainstream education with often complex difficulties, or a lack of basic social skills, which quite often resulted in behavioural problems.

19.   Additional support staff in the survey were consistently more likely than teachers to identify low-level behaviours as happening in lessons several times daily. This could well be related to the perception, which is borne out by additional support staff comments in focus groups, that pupils can be less inclined to do as they are asked by support staff.

20.   The low-level indiscipline identified so frequently on a daily basis by teachers and additional support staff in the school survey was far less likely to referred on to, or directly encountered by, headteachers.

21.   As identified in the previous Edinburgh University study and reported by staff in the focus groups in the current study, it is the constant "drip, drip effect" (Munn *et al*., 2004) of low-level bad behaviour that grinds school staff down and contributes to a lowering of morale. Analysis revealed that the more confident teachers felt in responding to indiscipline in the classroom, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour. At the same time, teachers and additional support staff who reported feeling more supported in school, were also less likely to report incidents of negative behaviour in the classroom.

22.   Pupils also identified low-level indiscipline as the type of behaviour they observed in most of their lessons. The classroom behaviours they reported as occurring several times daily emerged as broadly similar to those reported by teachers and additional support staff. Pupils did report incidents of being rude to teachers and of being rowdy more frequently than staff.

23.   The most challenging classes for school staff were identified as P7 and P6 in primary schools, and S4, S3 and S2 in secondary schools, although S2 was identified as more of a problem by teachers than by headteachers. However, the secondary teachers in the sample reported that they could cope with the behaviour of the majority of their classes.

24.   Most teachers in the survey, especially those in primary schools, did not find any of the behaviours they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. Headteachers and teachers reported that it was the low-level behaviours identified most frequently by school staff (in particular, talking out of turn), that had the greatest negative impact on teaching. Staff focus group participants noted that dealing with such behaviour "wasted" teachers' time and hindered teaching and learning. It was also said to be unfair to other pupils and could have a detrimental effect on their behaviour because they saw poor behaviour being "rewarded" through increased teacher attention.

25.   Pupil comments from their focus groups echoed those of school staff. They reported that negative behaviour in the classroom disrupted lessons and slowed down the learning process. Such behaviour was said to be "annoying" and unfair when "bad" pupils received all the teacher's attention. Some pupils noted that negative behaviour could escalate, especially if not contained by the teacher.

PART TWO: BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Positive behaviour around the school

26.   The vast majority of the school staff surveyed indicated that 'all/almost all' or 'most' of the pupils they encountered around the school were generally well behaved. Headteachers were the most positive, followed by teachers and then support staff. Pupils were most negative in their assessment of their peers' behaviour around the school.

27.   Headteachers were consistently more positive than teachers in their appraisals of the frequency of positive behaviours evident around the school. Primary school staff reported seeing the positive behaviours more often than their secondary colleagues.

28.   The more confident teachers felt themselves to be with regard to responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the more likely they were to report observing positive behaviours around the school. Similarly, the more supported teachers felt by their schools, the more likely they were to register encountering positive behaviours around the school.

Negative behaviour around the school and within the local community

29.   Headteachers were generally more positive than teachers about the behaviour of their pupils around school. Teachers were more than twice as likely as headteachers to report that 'some' or 'most' pupils were badly behaved around school.

30.   Negative behaviour around school was identified as more of a problem in secondary schools than in primary schools. Secondary staff in the focus groups identified off-site locations at breaktimes and lunchtimes as particularly problematic in terms of behaviour.

31.   As with negative behaviour in the classroom, the tiny number of headteachers who reported that 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved around school, were primary headteachers.

32.   The types of behaviour around the school encountered most frequently by headteachers and teachers were: 'running in the corridor'; 'unruliness while waiting'; 'persistently infringing school rules'; 'cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses'; 'showing a lack of concern for others'; 'loitering in 'prohibited' areas'; 'general pupil rowdiness or mucking about'; and, to a lesser extent, 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils'. Teachers were more likely than headteachers to identify these behaviours as ones they encountered on a daily basis. More serious incidents such as physical aggression or violence towards staff were rare.

33.   Incidents of negative behaviour around school were reported more frequently (i.e. at least daily) in secondary schools, which is perhaps not surprising given the greater opportunities for such behaviour afforded by moving from lesson to lesson. Secondary school staff in the focus groups particularly referred to corridors and stairs as locations for negative behaviour outside the classroom.

34.   The very few incidents of physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported around school occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary.

35.   The more confident staff felt in responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour around school. At the same time, those teachers who identified a greater level of support available to them in school were less likely to report incidents of negative behaviour around school.

36.   Most teachers, particularly in primary schools, did not find the negative behaviour around school they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. Secondary teachers were more likely than their primary counterparts to identify some degree of difficulty in dealing with negative behaviour around school.

37.   Complaints were not frequently received by headteachers from the general public, local community or the media about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises. Secondary headteachers were more likely than primary headteachers to report receiving complaints. The most common basis for a complaint was, for primary headteachers, 'verbal abuse' and 'cheeky or impertinent remarks to members of the public', while for secondary headteachers, it was' general rowdiness/horseplay' and 'anti-social behaviour'.

38.   Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff did not perceive pupil violence to be a particular problem in their school. Teachers were the least positive of the 3 groups, with just over a third reporting that they thought it was a problem. Pupil violence was considered to be more serious by secondary school staff, particularly secondary teachers.

39.   Primary headteachers surveyed in the current study in 2006 perceived pupil violence to be less of a problem than those primary headteachers surveyed in the Edinburgh University study in 2004, while secondary teachers surveyed in 2006 perceived it to be more of a problem than those secondary teachers surveyed in 2004.

40.   Staff reporting pupil violence as a problem in their school were most likely to cite 'pupil-to-pupil verbal abuse/aggression'. A higher percentage of teachers and additional support staff identified verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers than did headteachers. Physical violence towards teachers was reported to be rare.

41.   Analysis showed a significant relationship between experience of violence and the length of time headteachers had been in that role, but not for either of the other two staff groups (teachers and additional support staff). That said, however, far fewer teachers who had been in role for 3 years or less had experienced a violent incident compared with the proportion who had been teaching for 4 years or more.

42.   The majority of school staff who had experienced violence against them had reported it. Headteachers were most likely to report violent incidents to the local authority, and teachers and primary additional support staff to the headteacher. Secondary support staff were more likely to refer incidents to their line manager in school and SMT before the headteacher. Secondary headteachers also reported referring incidents to the police when appropriate.

43.   Local authority interviewees confirmed that most authorities operated a centralised system for schools to report incidents of violence by pupils to them. Incidents were typically recorded on a form within the school and logged onto a database by the local authority for termly or annual review. Follow-up after a serious or violent incident had been recorded included: identifying schools in need of additional support; offering direct support and counselling to staff; and (for very serious incidents) instigating risk assessments to look at what can be put in place to minimise the risks to staff and other pupils (e.g. de-escalation/physical intervention training).

PART THREE: EFFECTIVE PRACTICE IN MANAGING BEHAVIOUR

Approaches to managing behaviour

44.   Local authorities were rolling out, and piloting, a range of initiatives/strategies (e.g. Staged Intervention/Framework for Intervention (FFI); Solution-Oriented Schools; and Restorative Practices).

45.   The majority of schools operated a school-wide behaviour/discipline policy; used a range of rules and reward systems; had a school uniform; and were involving parents and pupils in school-wide issues. Pupil support bases; home-link workers; integrated support teams; pupil councils and buddying/mentoring schemes were used to a lesser extent.

46.   Referral to a key member of staff was a much reported strategy for managing behaviour: over three-quarters of headteachers and teachers 'frequently' or 'sometimes' employed it in their school. A third of both headteachers and teachers stated that they 'frequently' or 'sometimes' made a referral for an exclusion.

47.   Pupils thought schools could do more by: rewarding well behaved pupils; punishing (more severely) badly behaved pupils; a fairer treatment by teachers; removing badly behaved pupils; and making lessons more enjoyable.

48.   The 'top-five' individuals included by headteachers in whole-school discussion were: teachers; pupils; learning support staff; parents; and educational psychologists. However, pupils involved in the survey and focus groups felt that they had not been included in deciding school rules or devising an anti-bullying policy.

49.   School staff identified the key factors in developing a whole-school approach to behaviour as: consistency; involvement of parents and pupils; SMT support; school staff consultation; and flexibility.

50.   The vast majority of teachers already felt confident in their ability to promote positive behaviour and deal with indiscipline in their classroom. Understanding individual pupils' learning styles and motivations was the approach thought by teachers to be most likely to increase their confidence (personal safety training was deemed least likely).

51.   Local authority interviewees considered approaches such as Staged Intervention/FFI to be effective means of responding to indiscipline at a local authority level, as well as a comprehensive CPD menu; integrated working amongst agencies; a clear inclusion policy; and inclusion training. Effective approaches at a school and classroom level were: pupil support bases; alternative, flexible and appropriate curriculum; additional support/behaviour support staff; and Assertive Discipline.

Support available for staff

52.   A diverse range of CPD opportunities was on offer in local authorities. School staff requested more training in general that was of a practical and proactive nature. An absence of supply cover was highlighted as an issue.

53.   Nearly three-fifths of headteachers had received some CPD since being in their current post, which was predominantly provided by the local authority. The majority of teachers had been involved in some kind of development activity related to behaviour in the last year.

54.   Three-quarters of headteachers had received local authority support for trying new initiatives for promoting positive behaviour. Most primary headteachers received this support in the form of advice and consultancy, whilst most secondary headteachers received additional funding or support staff.

55.   Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff all indicated that the education authority worked, to a moderately satisfactory level, with schools to promote positive behaviour. Headteachers were the most positive, followed by additional support staff then teachers. Primary staff were consistently more positive than secondary staff.

56.   School staff who gave higher ratings of how the education authority worked in partnership with the school, also felt more supported by their school.

57.   All school staff felt generally supported in their school (as measured by the level that staff could openly talk to colleagues; senior staff would help colleagues; and awareness of confidential support and counselling in the school). Headteachers agreed the most, followed by additional support staff and then teachers. Secondary school staff felt less supported than their primary equivalents.

58.   Teachers had access, to a reasonable degree, to a number of supports to help them with a difficult class. Primary teachers had access to additional support staff, both in terms of

whole-class and individual pupils, but had less access to support provided by senior management within their school, than did secondary teachers.

Conclusion

59.   The majority of pupils were reported to be generally well behaved, both in the classroom and around school. Low-level negative behaviour continues to be the most prevalent form of indiscipline encountered in schools. Yet, focus group discussions would suggest that these are also the most wearing for staff. Headteachers continue to be more optimistic than their staff about indiscipline, whilst the overall picture remains more positive at primary level than at secondary. In the intervening period since the earlier research by Edinburgh University, there has been no real decline in standards of behaviour nationally. However, it may be that addressing the common pattern of low-level indiscipline needs greater attention, particularly given its reported de-motivating effect on school staff.

60.   The very tiny number of schools where 'most' or 'all/almost all' children were said to exhibit negative behaviour were actually in the primary sector and the very few incidents of physical aggression and violence towards staff also occurred more frequently in primary school responses. These findings were corroborated by local authority staff and in staff focus group discussions, suggesting that cohorts of very young children are embarking on their school careers with often complex difficulties, or a lack of basic social skills, which can result in behavioural problems.

61.   The report suggests that there are various 'world views' of indiscipline issues which co-exist within schools and which are dependent on an individual's status and role within the institution. Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff all have differing experiences of the degree and frequency of the positive behaviours and indiscipline they encounter. Recognising these differences and understanding the perspective of others may be an important component of any training and professional development in this area.

62.   Additional support staff consistently appeared to be more negative than other school staff. Their focus groups identified an increasing lack of confidence in their ability to deal with indiscipline, and this may well indicate the need for further support and training for such staff, especially where they rely on personal experience rather than a professional skill base to handle discipline issues. At the same time, additional support staff in the survey indicated that they were not regularly involved in whole-school discussions and training relating to behaviour. There may be value in schools giving greater consideration to fully integrating additional support staff into whole-school behavioural issues.

CHAPTER ONE   INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1   Pupil behaviour in our schools has been an issue of concern for many years and is one that has been the subject of extensive research in recent decades. In December 2000, the then Minister for Education, Europe and External Affairs, established a Discipline Task Group in response to concerns regarding indiscipline in Scottish schools. The remit of that group was to provide recommendations to the Scottish Executive of strategies focused on ensuring 'purposeful and orderly' conditions in schools that would enable all those involved in education 'to participate positively and appropriately in the processes of learning and teaching' (Scottish Executive, 2001).

1.2   The report produced by the Discipline Task Group, *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001) recognised the challenges that teachers and other professionals face in delivering education to young people and acknowledged the wide-ranging causes of indiscipline, stating that 'there is no single overall solution which can solve all problems'. It noted that young people are more likely to engage positively with learning when the factors that impinge on it are taken into consideration. Similarly, Kinder *et al.*, (1995; 1999), in the course of their research on pupil disaffection, observed that the reasons young people do not engage with school can be 'highly complex and multi-faceted' and highlighted the influence of school factors (curriculum, ethos and relationships with teachers), individual factors relating to the young person themselves, and family or community factors.

1.3   In the light of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001), funding was made available to local authorities across Scotland for the implementation of the recommendations made in the report, and to produce action plans as to how this would be achieved. The 36 recommendations to the Scottish Executive, local authorities and schools, aimed to promote positive behaviour through the provision of a range of strategies to support the needs of young people, and by effectively targeting support and resources to help teachers in delivering education.

1.4   As a result of the recommendations, the Scottish Executive committed to supporting a range of initiatives, as well as making resources available for professional development purposes. Local authorities were asked to prioritise the establishment of in-school support bases and the innovative use of additional support staff (for example, classroom assistants and home-school link workers). Other strategies introduced to promote positive behaviour and create a positive school ethos included: increased multi-agency working; the development of whole-school discipline policies; reward and praise systems; and a focus on involving pupils, for example through pupil councils and buddying schemes.

1.5   In addition, the Executive supported the piloting and subsequent development of a range of behaviour schemes or approaches in Scottish schools. For example, a number of schools have been involved in the Staged Intervention (FFI) scheme, which promotes peer support amongst school staff. A member of staff is trained as a behaviour coordinator to provide support to colleagues to manage behaviour in the classroom more effectively. Other schemes have included: 'Cool in School', a resource pack for teachers and pupils to use together to help pupils manage their feelings and develop their communication skills;

'solution-oriented schools', a whole-school approach where headteachers work with staff teams to develop problem solving within the classroom and throughout the school; 'the motivated school' which is aimed at developing a systematic profiling system to aid early intervention within an ethos of self-motivation; and restorative practices, which include peer mediation and circle time.

1.6   Three years after *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001), the *Policy Update on Behaviour in Scottish Schools* (Scottish Executive, 2004a) reviewed the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the former report, in order to decide if the current policy direction and priorities were appropriate. The *Policy Update* drew on a range of survey evidence and research findings relating to behaviour in school, including a Scottish Executive commissioned survey conducted by Edinburgh University in 2004, which had been previously conducted in 1990 and 1996. The 2004 survey found that most indiscipline encountered by teachers constituted low-level, 'irritating' behaviour that the majority do not find difficult to deal with. However, the survey did show some areas where perceptions of the seriousness of indiscipline, as well as the time spent in dealing with it, had increased since the 1996 and 1990 surveys. At the same time, teachers in the 2004 survey expressed concern about the level of pupil-on-pupil aggression (Scottish Executive, 2004a).

1.7   The *Policy Update on Behaviour in Scottish Schools* (Scottish Executive, 2004a) concluded that progress had been made on implementing the recommendations of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001) and on introducing a range of behavioural strategies in schools. However, it recommended that further approaches to prevent, and respond to, pupil-on-pupil violence or aggression be developed. Furthermore, following a review of data collection, *Violence and Anti-Social Behaviour in Scottish Schools* (Scottish Executive, 2004b), the Minister for Education and Young People expressed concern that information on indiscipline in schools was 'not sufficiently robust' to provide a clear enough picture of what was taking place in Scottish schools. As a result, after consultation, the Scottish Executive committed to instituting 'regular major surveys of teachers' and pupils' experiences and perceptions of behaviour and discipline in schools' (Scottish Executive, 2004a).

The study

Aims

1.8   The overall aim of the current study was to provide clear and robust information on behaviour (including positive behaviour) in publicly funded schools in Scotland. The study also addressed the following objectives associated with behaviour in schools, to:

- provide evidence on the nature and prevalence of indiscipline
- provide evidence on the extent of positive behaviour
- examine what is effective in preventing and responding to indiscipline
- consider what is effective in promoting positive behaviour.

Methodology

1.9 The study was designed to build on the previous work conducted by Edinburgh University, but to expand its scope by providing a wider picture of behaviour than that provided by teachers and headteachers alone. Thus, in addition, the study also sought the views of education authority representatives, additional support staff and pupils, and comprised 3 complementary strands:

Strand One: Telephone interviews with local authority representatives
Strand Two: Questionnaire surveys to school staff in primary and secondary schools
Strand Three: Fieldwork (comprising a questionnaire survey to pupils in 7 schools, pupil focus groups and a contextual staff interview in these 7 schools, and 8 focus groups with school staff).

Strand One: Telephone interviews with local authority representatives

1.10   Letters were sent by the Scottish Executive to Directors of Education in all 32 local authorities in Scotland that explained the research and asked them to participate. In addition, Directors of Education were informed of the number of schools in their authority to be contacted in connection with the school staff survey. Telephone interviews were then conducted with a representative of all 32 local authorities, the majority of whom had a remit for additional support for learning, inclusion and/or pupils with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties.

1.11   Interviews focused on local authority perceptions of the nature and prevalence of indiscipline in primary and secondary schools within their authority, as well as how incidents of violence or bullying in schools are monitored and the extent of off-site provision within the authority for pupils with behavioural difficulties. Interviewees were also asked to identify examples of effective practice in responding to indiscipline and of effective practice in promoting positive behaviour. In addition, views were sought on the extent to which the recommendations of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001) have been useful in managing discipline, and the progress made to date towards reviewing and developing written policies and guidelines (e.g. to include care, behaviour and inclusion policies) into a single framework. Interviewees were then asked to highlight the CPD on offer within their authority on behaviour/classroom management and, finally, to identify what they perceived to be the key factors in effective behaviour management.

Strand Two: Questionnaire surveys to school staff

1.12   A national sample of 580 schools (250 secondary schools and 330 primary schools) was drawn by the Scottish Executive to be representative of schools in Scotland in terms of the following (in order of stratification): local authority (LA), entitlement to free school meals, school size, and urban/rural location.

1.13   Three instruments were devised for the staff survey:

- headteacher questionnaire
- teacher questionnaire
- additional support staff questionnaire.

1.14 The headteacher and teacher questionnaires were each 12 pages long and the additional support staff was four pages in length.

1.15 The instruments were piloted in early January 2006 in five schools, identified by the Scottish Executive, comprising two primary and three secondary schools. The survey instruments were then re-drafted in the light of comments received from these five schools.

1.16 In early February of 2006, packs containing headteacher, teacher and additional support staff questionnaires, together with covering letters and pre-paid envelopes, were sent out to headteachers in the sample of 580 schools by NFER's survey administration department, Research Data Services (RDS). Headteachers were asked to complete their own questionnaire, and to pass on 4 teacher questionnaires (3 in the primary schools) to teachers currently teaching in their schools whose names appeared first in the alphabet, and 2 additional support staff questionnaires (one in the primary schools) to additional support staff of their choice.

1.17 In early March 2006, reminder letters with replacement questionnaires were sent out to the headteachers of schools where the full complement of questionnaires had not been received, and another letter encouraging a response was sent to non-responding schools in mid-March. Follow-up telephone calls were then made at the end of March 2006.

1.18 Table 1.1 below presents the responses of school staff to the survey.

Table 1.1: **Response rates to the NFER survey of school staff**

Instrument type	Number despatched	Number returned	Percentage returned
Headteacher	580	384	66
Classroom teacher	2040	1080	53
Additional support staff	830	501	60

Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Strand Three: Fieldwork

1.19 The fieldwork strand of the study involved:
- the administration of a questionnaire survey to pupils in 7 schools (4 primary and 3 secondary)
- qualitative contextual work alongside the pupil survey, including pupil focus groups and a short interview with a key member of staff
- eight focus groups with school staff (headteachers, classroom teachers and support staff) drawn from across local authority boundaries and from both primary and secondary schools.

1.20 The 4 primary and 3 secondary schools involved in the pupil survey were selected by the sponsor to include a range of regions and locations in Scotland, as well of approaches to behaviour management and promoting positive behaviour. The intention was to include 8 schools in this strand of the research. However, it proved impossible to gain an eighth school's agreement within the timeframe for this phase of the research, and thus the decision

was made, in conjunction with the sponsor, to include 7. The pupils to be involved in the survey included P6 and P7 pupils in the 4 primary schools and all pupils in the 3 secondary schools.

1.21   Given the wide age range of the pupils to be involved, a 4-page questionnaire was designed to cover: pupils' experiences of school in general; their perceptions of the extent, nature and frequency of positive behaviour in the classroom; their experience of the extent, nature and frequency of indiscipline in the classroom; and their views on the effectiveness of strategies/approaches to promote positive behaviour and prevent indiscipline (including school rules, sanctions and reward systems). The pupil questionnaire was piloted in the 2 primary schools and 3 secondary schools that were piloting the staff questionnaires and revisions were made in the light of the comments received.

1.22   Following the piloting phase, the 4 primary schools and 3 secondary schools to be involved in the pupil survey were contacted to elicit headteacher support and to identify the number of pupils to be involved in each school. The pupil questionnaires, together with a covering letter and guidance on administration, were then sent out by the research team to all 7 schools at the beginning of March. The questionnaires were administered by school staff, with the offer of support from the Executive's Regional Communication Team, if needed. The response rate achieved for the pupil survey is displayed in Table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2:   **Response rates to the NFER survey of pupils**

Instrument type	Number despatched	Number returned	Percentage returned
Pupils (primary)	309	296	96.0
Pupils (secondary)	1775	1165	66.0
Pupils (overall)	**2084**	**1461**	**70.0**

Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

1.23   Visits were subsequently made to each of the 7 pupil survey schools to conduct up to 2 pupil focus groups and a contextual interview with a key member of staff. It was recommended that the focus groups include separate groups of P6 and P7 pupils in the primary schools, and separate groups of S1 to S3 and S4 to S6 pupils in the secondary schools. In total, 14 pupil focus groups were conducted. Thirteen of these involved 6 pupils and one group comprised 8. Two of the groups, held in a very small secondary school, involved S1 to S6 pupils.

1.24   Pupil participation in the focus groups was voluntary and, where requested, information letters and/or request forms for parental permission were provided for schools to send out. The focus groups invited pupils to talk about their own and their peers' experiences of behaviour, in particular when and where indiscipline takes place; the effect indiscipline has on pupils and the way they learn; what happens when pupils misbehave; what works to prevent indiscipline and help pupils behave well; and finally pupil involvement, for example, in devising school rules or behaviour policies. The interviews with a key member of staff involved either the headteacher or the deputy headteacher and sought information about behaviour within each school, in order to provide a context for the pupil survey and focus group results.

1.25   In line with the Scottish Executive's wish to gain a wider perspective on the issues relating to behaviour in and around school, a series of 8 focus groups was conducted with

school staff (including 2 groups of headteachers, 4 groups of teachers and 2 groups of additional support staff) from primary and secondary schools across local authority boundaries. These focus groups took place in 4 different locations across Scotland and included 62 participants, as shown in Table 1.3 below:

Table 1.3:   **Staff focus group participants**

Participants	Number attending
Primary headteachers	6
Secondary headteachers	7
Primary teachers	15
Secondary teachers	14
Primary additional support staff	11
Secondary additional support staff	9
Total	**62**

1.26   Discussion topics for the staff focus groups included: the nature of behaviour (both positive and negative) and key patterns of poor behaviour observed; the effect that negative behaviour has on both staff and teaching and learning; approaches to, and support for, managing behaviour; and the experience and confidence of staff in dealing with behaviour.

Data analysis

1.27   All interviews and staff focus groups conducted over the course of the research were taped and summarised. Analysis of the local authority and school staff contextual interviews was completed using MaxQDA (a qualitative research package, which involves the development of comprehensive coding frames which are then used to ascribe codes to segments of text). This allowed comparative analysis of the different policies on, and approaches to, behaviour management taking place in schools in Scotland. The data, from all stages of the research, were then written up thematically, according to the foci of the interview schedules (examples of the local authority and the school staff schedules, as well as the school staff and pupil focus group schedules, can be found in Annex 1).

1.28   The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data was undertaken by NFER's Statistics Research and Analysis Group (SRAG). The data were analysed using SPSS. The basic frequencies for each questionnaire type were produced and following this, the data were disaggregated by school sector. Further, for the teacher survey, teachers' ratings of their confidence in dealing with indiscipline in the classroom was correlated with other items included in their questionnaires. Additionally, for the headteacher, teacher and support staff surveys, correlations were carried out between each respondent type's perceptions of the support available for staff in their schools and other questions on their questionnaires. For all correlations, tests to measure the statistical significance were conducted[1]. Where the results of the correlations are reported in this document, the associations are all statistically significant to $p=0.05$ or less. Examples of the questionnaires for school staff (including

---

[1] We can calculate a significance value to go with Pearson correlation coefficients. This depends on the size of the correlation and the number of cases over which it is calculated. We test the null hypothesis that the correlation is equal to zero using an expression that follows the t-distribution.

headteachers, teachers and classroom assistants/support staff) and for pupils can be found in Annex 2.

1.29   Although the current survey comprised a different sample, in terms of size, to that of the earlier longitudinal Edinburgh University study, and thus was not strictly comparable, some interesting parallels with that survey did emerge. These have been included in the text of this report where appropriate.

The report

1.30   The report draws on the data from all 3 strands of the research and, following an overview in Chapter Two which outlines the perceived seriousness of the problem of indiscipline, any trends and patterns related to indiscipline, and the influence of national policy, is divided into 3 parts. It should be noted that, in the chapters that follow, where pupil survey responses are reported, they are not strictly comparable with school staff survey responses, as the former was administered to pupils in only 7 schools.

Part One: Behaviour in the classroom
- Chapter Three focuses on positive behaviour in the classroom, in particular how well behaved pupils are in lessons and the type of positive behaviour exhibited.

- Chapter Four presents a picture of negative behaviour in the classroom. It considers how badly behaved pupils are in lessons, the type of poor behaviour exhibited, how typical that behaviour is and whether some classes are more challenging than others. Finally, the chapter examines the impact poor behaviour in lessons has on staff, on pupils and on the learning experience.

Part Two: Behaviour around the school and within the local community
- Chapter Five looks at positive behaviour around the school, particularly how well behaved pupils are when moving around the school and the sort of positive behaviour encountered outside the classroom environment.

- Chapter Six then considers negative behaviour around the school and within the local community, in particular the extent of negative behaviour, the type of poor behaviour encountered, how typical that behaviour is, as well as the impact such negative behaviour has on staff and pupils. The chapter then moves on to discuss the frequency and nature of any complaints to headteachers about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises. Finally, this chapter ends by examining perceptions of the extent and type of pupil violence.

Part Three: Effective practice in managing behaviour
- Chapter Seven focuses on the approaches used to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour (at local authority, school and classroom level). It considers the involvement of the school community in developing these approaches and strategies, as well as their effectiveness, and ends with a discussion of the level of support provided by parents.

- Chapter Eight discusses the support available to school staff in managing behaviour and focuses on local authority support, including continuing professional development (CPD), and support provided at school level.

1.31 Chapter Nine concludes the report by drawing out the implications from the above chapters for policy and practice.

CHAPTER TWO   OVERVIEW

Introduction

2.1   This initial chapter of the report provides an overview of current behaviour in Scotland's schools. The chapter begins by illustrating how serious a problem indiscipline is in schools, followed by an account of current trends and patterns, including where and when indiscipline is most likely to occur. Finally, the influence of national policy on approaches taken to managing behaviour is discussed, with particular attention being paid to the impact of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* (Scottish Executive, 2001). Data collected from all stages of the research (both qualitative and quantitative) are used throughout this chapter.

How serious a problem is indiscipline?

2.2   Chapter Three, which focuses in more detail on positive behaviour in the classroom, notes that, overwhelmingly, the headteachers surveyed considered pupils to be generally well behaved in the classroom. This was also the case for the majority of teachers, additional support staff and pupils, although they were less emphatic than headteachers. The types of positive behaviour reported to occur most frequently included 'pupils arriving promptly for classes', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils listening to the teacher respectfully'. Analysis by school type revealed that positive behaviour occurred much more frequently in primary schools than at secondary level.

School staff and pupil perceptions of how serious a problem indiscipline is in schools

2.3   In the survey of school staff, headteachers, teachers and additional support staff were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, how serious a problem they thought indiscipline was in their respective schools. Table 2.1 overleaf shows that the most positive response to whether indiscipline was a serious problem came from headteachers, nearly three-quarters (70 per cent) of whom made a rating of 4 or 5 (not a serious problem). In contrast, the responses of teachers and additional support staff were much less positive, with fewer than half (45 per cent) of teachers and just over two-fifths (41 per cent) of additional support staff making the same rating. More than a quarter of teachers (27 per cent) and a fifth (22 per cent) of additional support staff indicated that the problem was serious by making a rating of 1 or 2, compared with only 6 per cent of headteachers.

2.4   Analysis by school sector revealed that secondary school staff were consistently less positive about the seriousness of indiscipline in their school. Two-fifths (40 per cent) of secondary teachers made a rating of 1 or 2, indicating that the problem of indiscipline was serious in their school, compared with 14 per cent of primary teachers. Almost a third (32 per cent) of secondary additional support staff indicated the problem was serious (by making a rating of 1 or 2) compared with one in 10 (10 per cent) of primary support staff.

2.5   When the percentages of primary and secondary headteachers and teachers giving a rating of 1 ('very serious') in the current 2006 survey are compared with the findings from the Edinburgh University survey (Munn *et al*., 2004), the figures do not really emerge as different at all. One per cent of primary headteachers and 3 per cent of primary teachers rated

the problem very serious in 2004, compared with one per cent and 4 per cent respectively in 2006. Three per cent of secondary headteachers and 10 per cent of secondary teachers rated it very seriously in 2004, compared with one per cent and 13 per cent respectively in 2006. Thus, primary and secondary teachers' perceptions of the problem as 'very serious' have increased very slightly since 2004, while secondary headteachers' perceptions have decreased. There are no data on additional support staff from the 2004 survey with which to compare the responses of additional support staff in the current survey.

2.6   Staff in the 7 pupil survey schools indicated in the contextual interviews that, on the whole, the majority of pupils in their school were well behaved. However, some did indicate that there were "small pockets" of indiscipline amongst certain individuals.

Table 2.1   Headteacher, teacher and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how serious a problem indiscipline is in their own school

Rating of how serious a problem indiscipline is in school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
Very serious 1	3	1	2	1	1	1
2	18	5	5	2	13	8
3	92	24	34	16	58	34
4	161	42	81	38	80	47
Not serious at all 5	108	28	91	43	17	10
No response	2	1	2	1	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	215	100	169	100
Teacher						
Very serious 1	89	8	21	4	68	12
2	202	19	54	10	148	27
3	297	28	124	24	173	32
4	299	28	175	33	124	23
Not serious at all 5	180	17	151	29	29	5
No response	13	1	5	1	8	1
TOTAL	1080	100	530	100	550	100
Additional support staff						
Very serious 1	26	5	5	3	21	7
2	87	17	12	6	75	24
3	166	33	39	21	127	40
4	117	23	57	31	60	19
Not serious at all 5	89	18	68	37	21	7
No response	16	3	6	3	10	3
TOTAL	501	100	187	100	314	100

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

2.7   In assessing the factors that might be contributing to the responses given by school staff as to how serious a problem they perceived indiscipline to be in their school, staff in the survey schools were asked to rate the overall ethos, the quality of leadership and the levels of collegiality in their school.

2.8   Most school staff indicated that the **overall ethos** in their school was 'good' or 'very good' (headteachers: 94 per cent; teachers: 69 per cent; and additional support staff: 68 per cent). Once again, secondary school staff, particularly secondary teachers, were less positive than their primary counterparts. Headteachers, perhaps not surprisingly, gave the most

positive rating for the **quality of leadership** in their school (94 per cent giving a 'good' or 'very good' rating), compared with teachers and additional support staff (60 and 67 per cent respectively giving a 'good' or 'very good' rating). Although there was little difference in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers, secondary school teachers were less positive than primary colleagues. Most school staff surveyed indicated that **levels of collegiality** in their school were 'good' or 'very good'. Headteachers were more positive than teachers and additional support staff and, as evident throughout, secondary school staff were less positive than their primary counterparts.

2.9   When the above factors, together with teachers' confidence in dealing with indiscipline and the level of support they felt was available to them in school, were correlated with perceptions of the seriousness of the problem of indiscipline, the following associations were revealed:

- the more positive headteachers, teachers and additional support staff were in their ratings of the overall ethos, quality of leadership and collegiality of their school, the **less serious** they perceived the problem of indiscipline in their school to be
- the more confident teachers felt in their ability to respond to indiscipline in the classroom, the **less serious** they thought the problem of indiscipline was in their school
- the more supported teachers and additional support staff felt, the **less serious** they perceived the problem of indiscipline in their school to be.

2.10   It should be noted though, that although relationships between the above factors and the reported seriousness of the problem of behaviour were evident, this analysis does not establish direction of causality. Taking overall ethos as an example, this analysis does not determine whether teachers perceived the problem of indiscipline as less serious because they rated the overall ethos of their school highly; or whether they rated the overall ethos highly because they perceived the problem of indiscipline to be less serious.

2.11   Pupils completing the questionnaire in the 7 pupil survey schools were also asked to provide a rating of how serious a problem they thought bad behaviour was in their school. Pupils were provided with a 3-point response scale as opposed to the 5-point one used for the school staff survey. Table 2.2 overleaf provides the details.

Table 2.2 Pupil (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how serious a problem bad behaviour is in their own school

Rating of how serious a problem bad behaviour is in school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Very serious 1	121	8	16	6	105	9
Quite serious 2	686	47	156	54	530	47
Not serious 3	620	42	115	40	505	44
No response	34	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1461	100	213	100	169	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

2.12   Nearly half (47 per cent) of pupils stated that they thought the problem of indiscipline was 'quite serious' within their own school. A further two-fifths (42 per cent) stated that they thought indiscipline was 'not serious'. A higher proportion of primary pupils (54 per cent) than secondary pupils (47 per cent) stated that they thought bad behaviour was 'quite serious' within their school.

2.13   Participants in the pupil focus groups were asked if pupils in their school were generally well behaved or not. In each of the 14 groups, participants stated that pupils were generally good, most of the time, but that a minority of pupils was not.

2.14   Representatives from all 32 local authorities were asked about the prevalence of discipline problems in their authority. Eleven of the 32 local authority interviewees gave a direct assessment of the scale of the problem within their authority. The majority of these indicated that they felt discipline was generally good and presented only a moderate challenge. A minority suggested that the issues within their authority were similar to those faced nationally. Low-level disruption was said to be most prevalent in schools, while more serious incidents of pupil aggression and violence were felt to be far less frequently encountered. A number of local authority interviewees suggested that the perception of indiscipline was possibly higher than the actuality.

2.15   In relation to perceptions of trends in pupil behaviour, local authority interviewees were in broad agreement that the nature of the problem was changing, both in terms of the types of behaviour being encountered in schools and the methods used by schools to challenge indiscipline. Recurring issues in the comments of interviewees included:

- changes in the age profile of pupils causing the most severe problems: schools were reported to be experiencing dramatic rises in the numbers of early years pupils with significant behavioural problems
- an increase in the numbers of pupils with identifiable disorders and physical and mental health issues which contribute to their poor behaviour.
- a perceived increase in the extent to which social problems outside school, such as deprivation, family breakdown and drug and alcohol use are being manifested in schools.

The nature of indiscipline

2.16   Chapter Four discusses in depth the issue of negative behaviour in the classroom. The key finding is that the classroom behaviours encountered by school staff (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) most frequently within a typical week of teaching were low level (e.g. 'talking out of turn', 'making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise', 'hindering or distracting others' and 'pupils leaving their seat without permission'). More serious indiscipline, such as 'physical violence or aggression', were far less likely to occur on a daily basis, and were hardly ever directed at school staff.

Time spent undertaking activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour

2.17   As part of the questionnaire survey, headteachers and teachers were asked to indicate how much time they had spent, in the last full teaching week, undertaking specific activities

in their school to promote positive ethos and behaviour. Table 2.3 overleaf presents their responses.

Table 2.3 The time headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) spent undertaking activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour in the last full teaching week

Time spent	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	**%**	**(N)**	**%**	**(N)**	**%**
Headteacher						
No time spent	4	1	3	1	1	1
Under an hour	95	25	59	28	36	22
An hour to 3 hours	217	57	129	61	88	53
More than 3 hours	63	16	21	10	42	25
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	212	100	167	100
Teacher						
No time spent	178	17	24	5	154	28
Under an hour	407	38	205	39	202	37
An hour to 3 hours	397	37	249	48	148	27
More than 3 hours	86	8	44	8	42	8
No response	12	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	522	100	546	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

2.18   Table 2.3 shows that, the majority of headteachers (82 per cent) and teachers (75 per cent) had spent up to 3 hours undertaking specific activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour. Almost a fifth (17 per cent) of teachers stated that they had not spent any time on this, compared with only one per cent of headteachers. Analysis by school sector reveals that primary headteachers, and particularly teachers, reported spending more time undertaking activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour than did secondary headteachers and teachers. Conversely, a quarter (25 per cent) of secondary headteachers reported spending more than 3 hours a week on such activities compared with one in ten (10 per cent) of primary headteachers.

Time spent dealing with indiscipline

2.19   Headteachers and teachers were also asked in the questionnaire survey to indicate how much time they had spent, in the last full teaching week, dealing with indiscipline and planning or providing behaviour support to individual pupils. These questions aimed to provide another measure of how serious a problem indiscipline is for schools on a regular basis. Tables 2.4 and 2.5 present the results.

2.20   Table 2.4 overleaf shows that the majority of headteachers (71 per cent) and teachers (84 per cent) had spent up to 3 hours dealing within indiscipline in the last full teaching week. A fifth (22 per cent) of headteachers stated that they had spent more than 3 hours dealing within indiscipline: a proportion nearly twice than that for teachers (12 per cent). A predominant difference by school sector is that secondary staff reported spending more time dealing within indiscipline than primary staff. Over half of secondary teachers reported

spending under an hour a week on discipline issues compared to just over a third of primary teachers.

Table 2.4 The time headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) spent dealing within indiscipline in the last full teaching week

Time spent	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
No time spent	20	5	19	9	1	1
Under an hour	109	28	81	38	28	17
An hour to 3 hours	166	43	90	42	76	45
More than 3 hours	86	22	23	11	63	38
No response	3	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	213	100	168	100
Teacher						
No time spent	46	4	33	6	13	2
Under an hour	556	52	322	61	234	43
An hour to 3 hours	346	32	138	26	208	38
More than 3 hours	127	12	35	7	92	17
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	528	100	547	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

2.21   In relation to time spent providing or planning behaviour support to individuals, Table 2.5 below shows that the highest proportion of headteachers (75 per cent) and teachers (62 per cent) spent between under an hour to 3 hours in the last full teaching week. A third (32 per cent) of teachers, however, did not spend any time planning or providing behaviour support, compared with under a fifth (18 per cent) of headteachers. Once again, analysis by school sector showed that secondary school staff spent more time providing or planning behaviour support than primary school staff.

Table 2.5 The time headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) spent planning or providing behaviour support to individuals

Time spent	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
No time spent	68	18	42	20	26	15
Under an hour	161	42	90	42	71	42
An hour to 3 hours	127	33	70	33	57	34
More than 3 hours	26	7	11	5	15	9
No response	2	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	213	100	169	100
Teacher						
No time spent	350	32	159	30	191	35
Under an hour	488	45	267	51	221	40
An hour to 3 hours	183	17	85	16	98	18
More than 3 hours	54	5	17	3	37	7
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	528	100	547	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Trends and patterns

When indiscipline is most likely to occur in schools

2.22   As part of the school survey, headteachers were asked to indicate **when** indiscipline was most likely to occur in the school context. Table 2.6 below shows that by far the highest proportion of headteachers stated that indiscipline predominantly occured during lunchtimes (83 per cent); a finding consistent with the Edinburgh University survey (Munn *et al*., 2004). This is supported by results from the staff focus groups and contextual staff interviews in the 7 pupil survey schools, in which lunchtime was described as the "pinch-point" when indiscipline is most likely to occur. In addition, comments from these data sets also support the finding shown in Table 2.6 below that afternoon classes were perceived to be a time when indiscipline within school hours is most likely to occur (stated by just under two-fifths of headteachers (39 per cent) in the school survey).

Table 2.6   When indiscipline is most likely to occur in school, as identified by headteachers

When most likely to occur	Overall		Primary headteachers		Secondary headteachers	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Before the school day begins	34	9	30	14	4	2
During morning classes	17	4	7	3	10	6
Morning break	118	31	81	38	37	22
Lunchtime	317	83	180	84	137	81
During afternoon classes	148	39	50	23	98	58
Afternoon break	8	2	5	2	3	2
After the end of the school day	118	31	81	38	37	22
No response	13	3	9	4	4	2
TOTAL RESPONSES	773		443		330	

Notes to table Multiple response question: headteachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

2.23   Although, the highest proportions of both primary and secondary headteachers indicated that lunchtime was the most likely time for indiscipline to occur, there are a number of key differences in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers. Table 2.6 shows that primary school headteachers typically stated contexts in which pupils were outside of the classroom as times when indiscipline was most likely to occur (i.e. 'before the school day begins', 'morning break' and 'after the end of the school day'). In contrast, a notably higher proportion of secondary school headteachers (58 per cent) than primary headteachers (23 per cent) stated that indiscipline was most likely to occur 'during afternoon classes'. This, in fact, was rated the second highest 'flash point' after lunchtimes.

Where indiscipline is most likely to occur in schools

2.24   Headteachers were also asked in the school survey, to indicate **where** indiscipline was most likely to occur in school. Table 2.7 overleaf reveals that responses of primary and secondary headteachers to this question differed quite considerably. Of most interest is that nearly two-fifths (56 per cent) of secondary headteachers stated that 'corridors and stairs' was where indiscipline was most likely to occur, whereas only 10 per cent of primary headteachers stated the same. This may well be due to the increased opportunities for indiscipline provided in secondary schools by pupils moving from lesson to lesson. Just over two-fifths (42 per cent) of secondary headteachers identified the 'classroom' as the place where indiscipline was most likely to occur, compared with less than a fifth (17 per cent) of primary headteachers. In addition, secondary headteachers were more likely than primary headteachers to identify 'outside school precincts' and 'school buses' as places in school where indiscipline is most likely to occur.

2.25   In contrast, the vast majority (85 per cent) of primary headteachers stated that indiscipline was most likely to occur in the 'school playground or yard': a proportion nearly twice that found for secondary headteachers (44 per cent). In addition, primary headteachers were more likely than secondary headteachers to identify 'toilet areas' and the 'dining hall/queue' as places in school where indiscipline is most likely to occur.

Table 2.7 Where indiscipline is most likely to occur in school, as identified by headteachers (overall, primary and secondary)

Where most likely to occur	Overall		Primary headteachers		Secondary headteachers	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Corridors and stairs	117	31	22	10	95	56
School playground or yard	256	67	182	85	74	44
Classrooms	108	28	37	17	71	42
Toilet areas	81	21	56	26	25	15
Dining hall/queue	44	12	38	18	6	4
School buses	80	21	30	14	50	30
Outside school precincts	123	32	53	25	70	41
Other	6	2	2	1	4	2
No response	13	3	9	4	4	2
TOTAL RESPONSES	828		429		399	

Notes to table Multiple response question: headteachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

2.26   Pupils in the 14 focus groups were also asked when they thought indiscipline was most likely to occur. In answering this, pupils typically drew a distinction between the different types of behaviour and where they took place. Specifically, the classroom was identified as being the main place that low-level indiscipline took place. In turn, outside in the school yard/playground was cited as being the dominant place for more serious incidents of indiscipline, such as fighting. Aside from this, however, pupils showed agreement with the results shown above in Table 2.7, as participants in 5 groups stated that corridors were common places for indiscipline to occur.

2.27   It is perhaps not surprising that interviews and focus groups with school staff and pupils showed that supply/substitute teachers were perceived to contribute to an increase in indiscipline. Specifically, participants in 5 staff focus groups stated that negative behaviour became more pronounced during lessons delivered by a supply teacher. Furthermore, participants in 10 out of 14 pupil focus groups stated that pupil behaviour, often including their own, changed when a supply teacher took the lesson, as illustrated in the quotation below:

> "*It is adapting to new teachers. You think, oh, we're never going to see this teacher again so it doesn't matter really*" (P7 pupil focus group).

Particular year groups / classes or individuals

2.28   As part of the staff and pupil focus groups and during the contextual interviews, specific attention was paid to whether indiscipline varied according to year group/classes or individuals. (Please see Chapter Four for a fuller discussion of challenging classes.) In relation to the school staff interviews and staff focus groups, staff stated that, in primary, P6 and P7 were the most badly behaved (although P4 and P5 were also identified by a group of additional support staff) and in secondary it was S2 –S4. In addition, a number of individuals stated that it was difficult to pinpoint one particular year group as indiscipline was more to do with the composition of pupils than year groups *per se*. These findings are largely consistent with Munn *et al* (2004) where the later stages of primary (P6 and P5) and S2-S4 in secondary were perceived to be the most difficult year groups.

2.29   Results from the pupil focus groups show strong concordance with the school staff focus group results, as participants in 8 out of the 14 pupil groups named pupils in P5-P7 as being the year groups most likely to cause negative behaviour. In addition, participants in 3 pupil focus groups stated S3-S4 pupils were the most badly behaved secondary year group.

2.30   In terms of particular individuals typically involved in indiscipline, responses provided by school staff (in the 8 focus groups and the 7 contextual interviews) and by pupils in the 14 pupil focus groups, confirmed that boys were perceived to be more disruptive than girls by both staff and pupils.   However, there was some acknowledgement that the indiscipline displayed by boys and girls was different and that, in some instances, girls could be worse than boys, for example girls could be more personally hostile to each other. School staff touched on the issue of home life affecting a pupil's behaviour and also highlighted that many disruptive pupils had behavioural or developmental disorders.

Differences between schools

2.31   In relation to the prevalence of behavioural problems in primary and secondary schools, half the local authority representatives (16) interviewed felt that, overall, the problem was greater in secondary schools than in primary schools. None suggested that primaries had more difficulties overall (although several mentioned that they were facing increasing problems in the early years). Many interviewees were keen to stress that the problems facing primary and secondary schools were very different. Variations emerging related to age and maturation differences between primary and secondary pupils, and the increased influence of social and peer group pressures amongst secondary school pupils.

2.32   There was some variation across the cohort of local authority interviewees as to whether the location of a school (e.g. rural or urban) had a bearing on behaviour. Most commonly, local authority interviewees suggested that there were other factors (often linked to school location) which were of greater significance than a rural/urban location *per se*. Two factors which emerged strongly were, perhaps inevitably, school size, and deprivation/affluence within the school catchment area.

Violence in school

2.33   The issue of pupil violence, raised as a concern by teachers in the Edinburgh University study (Munn *et al*., 2004), is discussed in depth in Chapter Six. Of note, however, is the fact that headteachers, teachers and additional support staff did not perceive pupil violence to be a particular problem in their school. Teachers were the least positive of the three groups, with just over a third reporting that they thought it was a problem. Pupil violence was considered to be more serious by secondary school staff, particularly secondary teachers. Almost all staff who reported that pupil violence was a problem in their school cited pupil-to-pupil verbal abuse/aggression.   A higher percentage of teachers, and particularly of additional support staff, identified verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers than did headteachers. Physical violence towards teachers was reported to be rare.

Influence of national policy

Implementation of Better Behaviour – Better Learning (BB-BL)

2.34   During the consultation with all 32 local authorities, interviewees were asked to elaborate on the extent to which the recommendations of BB-BL had been implemented at a local authority level and then at a school and classroom level. In relation to the impact at local authority level, the majority of interviewees stated that the recommendations had been implemented and had been effective, although varying degrees of implementation were apparent. Specifically, interviewees pointed to the focus which the document afforded local authorities, allowing them a framework in which to work and take initiatives forward.

> "*It has been a huge impact. The fact that it has been backed up by a stream of funding made my job so much easier to take forward. It gave me a set of goalposts to work to. It's an absolute Bible in my view in terms of trying to manage behaviour*" (local authority interviewee).

2.35   This positive impact of BB-BL at a local authority level is further evidenced by the fact that the vast majority of interviewees held the view that various steps had been taken towards developing written policies into a single framework, whilst others reported that they were only at the very beginning of the process.

2.36   In the minority of authorities that were reported to be rather less advanced in their implementation of the recommendations, this was perceived to be either due to the authority's response to BB-BL, or to the document itself. In the case of the former, interviewees either felt that their authority had not started work on the recommendations as quickly as other authorities and was therefore perceived to have "missed the boat" to some extent, or that they were moving forward in a slightly different way, for example, by "clustering" the recommendations to take forward. Two interviewees referred to the document itself, one identifying it as "a good try" but stating that the recommendations "lacked substance", while another felt that, in terms of the implementation of the recommendations, "the pay back was minimal" for the effort that had been put in. That said, however, progress towards implementation of BB-BL was reported to be ongoing in each of these authorities:

> "*We are on the journey … and the culmination of that journey will be a refreshed and invigorated learning and teaching policy for the authority … but we are taking* [schools] *on a series of steps to get there*" (local authority interviewee).

2.37   In considering the extent to which the recommendations had been implemented at a school and classroom level, local authority interviewees' views were more mixed. Fifteen respondents felt that the recommendations had been effectively implemented by the vast majority of schools through, for instance, providing guidance on behaviour policies. Eleven interviewees, however, stated that implementation at this level had occurred only to some extent. It was felt that there was still a long way to go at the school and classroom levels. Specifically, it was felt that teachers may not be aware that it was implementation of the BB-BL recommendations that was causing the changes in the classroom. Support for this finding is derived from the 8 school staff focus groups, in which the majority of participants considered themselves to be "generally aware" of BB-BL and other school-based initiatives, but felt they lacked knowledge of specific detail. In these focus groups, it was reasoned that school staff were likely to be more aware if their school was involved in specific initiatives

introduced as a result of BB-BL such as Staged Intervention or Restorative Practices. Where authorities were identified by LA interviewees as being rather less advanced in terms of implementing the BB-BL recommendations, there was evidence of some relationship with the extent to which both headteachers and teachers in schools in those LAs reported using three particular approaches: rules and reward systems; school uniform; and buddying/mentoring.

2.38   Overall, evidence presented in subsequent chapters of this report indicates that good progress has been made in terms of the implementation of some of the 36 recommendations cited in BB-BL. Indeed, Chapter Seven presents evidence which shows that the majority of schools involved in the survey operated, for example, a school-wide behaviour/discipline policy; a range of rules and reward systems; a school uniform; and were involving parents and pupils in school-wide issues in a positive way. Those schools surveyed indicated that they made use of/employed pupil support bases; home-link workers; and integrated support teams to a lesser extent. Similarly, pupil councils and buddying/mentoring were strategies adopted by some schools involved in the survey.

2.39   Chapter Eight highlights that there are a range of CPD opportunities available to school staff regarding behaviour management. However, many school staff (from both the survey and interviews/focus groups) called for more CPD opportunities and also more training that was both "practical" and "useful".

Summary

- Overwhelmingly, the headteachers surveyed considered pupils to be generally well behaved in the classroom. This was also the case for the majority of teachers, additional support staff and pupils, although they were less emphatic than headteachers. The types of positive behaviour reported to occur most frequently included 'pupils arriving promptly for classes', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils listening to the teacher respectfully'. Positive behaviour was found to occur much more frequently in primary schools than at secondary level.

- Headteachers thought that that indiscipline was less serious a problem than teachers and additional support staff. Secondary school staff were consistently more likely than their primary counterparts to identify indiscipline as a serious problem.

- Comparing the percentages of staff rating the problem as 'very serious' with the findings from the Edinburgh University study (Munn *et al*., 2004), the figures are not vastly different. Primary and secondary teachers' perceptions of the problem as very serious have increased very slightly since 2004, while secondary headteachers' perceptions have decreased.

- The more positive headteachers, teachers and additional support staff were in their ratings for the overall ethos, quality of leadership and collegiality of their school, the less serious a problem they thought indiscipline was in their school.

- The more supported teachers and additional support staff felt, the less serious a problem they thought indiscipline was in their school.

- The more confident teachers felt in their ability to respond to indiscipline in the classroom, the less serious a problem they thought indiscipline was in their school.

- The majority of headteachers and teachers had spent up to 3 hours in the last full teaching week undertaking specific activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour. Primary headteachers, and particularly teachers, reported spending more time undertaking activities to promote positive school ethos and behaviour than did secondary headteachers and teachers.

- The majority of headteachers and teachers had spent up to 3 hours dealing with indiscipline and planning/providing behaviour support to individuals in the last full teaching week. Secondary staff had spent more time dealing within indiscipline and planning/providing behaviour support than primary staff.

- Indiscipline predominantly occured during lunchtimes, a finding consistent with the Edinburgh University study (Munn *et al*., 2004). Primary headteachers tended to state contexts in which pupils are outside of the classroom as times when indiscipline is most likely to occur (i.e. 'before the school day begins', 'morning break' and 'after the end of the school day'), whereas secondary headteachers tended to state 'afternoon classes'.

- Indiscipline was thought to occur predominantly in the 'school playground or yard', 'outside school precincts' or on 'corridors and stairs'. Secondary headteachers stated that 'corridors and stairs' was where indiscipline was most likely to occur whereas the vast majority of primary headteachers stated the 'school playground or yard'. Secondary headteachers were also more likely than primary headteachers to identify the 'classroom'.

- P6 and P7 and S2-S4 were identified by staff and pupils as being the most difficult year groups (again, largely in line with the 2004 Edinburgh University study) with the individuals usually causing the indiscipline being: boys; pupils from dysfunctional homes; and those with behavioural/developmental difficulties.

- Better Behaviour – Better Learning appears to have affected practice at a local authority level and, to a lesser extent, at school and classroom level. School staff felt generally aware of BB-BL and evidence from the school staff survey showed support for a number of the recommendations being implemented in schools and classrooms.

PART ONE:
BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

CHAPTER THREE   POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

Introduction

3.1   This chapter focuses on the extent and type of positive behaviour within the classroom. The evidence presented is drawn primarily from the questionnaire surveys of school staff (headteachers, teachers, and additional support staff) and pupils, with some additional comment provided by the data from focus group discussions with school staff and pupils.

How well behaved are pupils in lessons?

3.2   In the survey of school staff, headteachers were asked to report, using a 5-point scale, the proportion of the school roll they considered to be generally well behaved during a lesson. Table 3.1 sets out their responses.

Table 3.1 The proportion of the school roll considered by headteachers to be generally well behaved during a lesson

Proportion of the school roll who are generally well behaved during a lesson	Headteachers (N)	Headteachers (%)
All/almost all	171	45
Most	211	55
Some	2	1
Few	0	0
None/almost none	0	0
No response	0	0
TOTAL	384	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

3.3   As Table 3.1 shows, the overwhelming majority of headteachers surveyed indicated that pupils were generally well behaved in the classroom, with 99 per cent registering that 'most' or 'all/almost all' behaved well. Just one per cent of headteacher respondents recorded that, as a proportion of the school roll, only 'some' of the pupils were well behaved.

3.4   When these responses were analysed according to school sector (see Table 3.2), headteachers from both school types were positive about behaviour, though primary school headteachers were much more likely to state that 'all/almost all' of their pupils were generally well behaved in lessons. In fact, almost double the proportion of primary headteachers answered as such compared with their secondary counterparts. That said, the tiny number of headteachers who reported that only 'some' of their pupils behaved well in class were primary headteachers. (As Chapter Four will document, this pattern also emerged when headteachers were asked to rate the proportion of the school roll who were generally badly behaved/difficult to deal with in class. On the whole, the primary headteachers were more positive than their secondary colleagues and indicated that fewer pupils were behaved badly. Yet, in the very small number of cases where headteachers had felt 'most' or 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved, they were from primary schools.)

Table 3.2 The proportion of the school roll considered by primary and secondary headteachers to be generally well behaved during a lesson

Proportion of the school roll who are generally well behaved during a lesson	Primary headteachers		Secondary headteachers	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
All/almost all	119	55	52	31
Most	94	44	117	69
Some	2	1	0	0
Few	0	0	0	0
None/almost none	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	215	100	169	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

3.5   Teachers and additional support staff were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale the number of lessons they taught, or assisted in, on a regular basis in which pupils were generally well behaved. Pupils surveyed from 7 schools were asked to state in how many of their lessons the previous week pupils had been well behaved for most of the time. Table 3.3 presents the responses of teachers, additional support staff and pupils.

Table 3.3 The proportion of lessons in which pupils are generally well behaved according to teachers, additional support staff and pupils

Proportion of lessons in which pupils are generally well behaved	Teachers		Additional support staff		Pupils	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
All/almost all	358	33	83	17	82	6
Most	515	48	253	51	737	50
Some	132	12	115	23	435	30
Few	39	4	40	8	173	12
None/almost none	3	<1	2	<1	19	1
No response	33	3	8	2	15	1
TOTAL	1080	100	501	100	1461	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff and pupils, 2006

3.6   When considering Table 3.3, what is striking is the difference in the perception of positive classroom behaviour depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type. Around four-fifths (81 per cent) of teachers compared with two-thirds (68 per cent) of additional support staff and over half of the pupils (56 per cent) indicated that pupils behaved well in 'most' or 'all/almost all' lessons. If we draw in the headteacher data here (as set out in Table 3.1), the sharp differences in perception depending on respondent type are even more acute as headteachers emerge as the most positive group of all, with 99 per cent of those surveyed recording that 'most' or 'all/almost all' pupils generally behaved well in class[2]. Thus, the pupils themselves, giving the lowest ratings, were most negative about classroom behaviour, then additional support staff, followed by teachers and finally the headteachers.

3.7   What accounts for these different world views? Pupils, as evidenced in their survey and focus groups, had a tendency to be less tolerant of their peers' indiscipline. As Chapter 7

---

[2] Note here a change in the nuance of the question. Headteachers were asked to rate the proportion of the **school roll** who were well behaved in lessons, whereas teachers, additional support staff and pupils indicated the proportion of **lessons** in which pupils were well behaved.

relays, they called for more severe sanctions (including physical punishments and humiliation) as a response to poor behaviour. In terms of support staff, close to half (44 per cent) of the sample was assigned to a particular pupil or pupils or class, and although their questionnaire did not ask specifically, this may have been on the grounds of the additional needs (one of which could be behaviour) exhibited by the pupil(s) or class.

3.8   Analysis of teacher, additional support staff and pupil responses by school sector revealed that, as was the case with the headteacher data, those from primary schools were most likely to respond positively about behaviour in the classroom (see Table 3.4). Of all respondent types, the difference in the opinion of primary and secondary additional support staff was most notable. In total, 91 per cent of support staff from primary schools registered that pupils were generally well behaved in the majority of lessons ('most' or 'all/almost all') compared with 54 per cent of their counterparts who were surveyed in secondary schools. In terms of the pupil results, the difference between the responses of primary and secondary pupils, whilst statistically significant, was the least marked of all respondent types.

Table 3.4 The proportion of lessons in which teachers, additional support staff and pupils (primary and secondary) considered pupils to be generally well-behaved

Proportions of lessons in which pupils are generally well behaved	Teachers		Support staff		Pupils	
	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)
All/almost all	43	26	36	5	5	6
Most	48	50	55	49	50	51
Some	7	18	9	32	36	29
Few	2	6	0	13	9	13
None/almost none	<1	<1	0	1	<1	2
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

What sort of positive behaviour is in evidence during lessons?

3.9   All respondent types in the school survey were asked to consider a list of 11 classroom behaviours and indicate on a 5-point scale the frequency with which each behaviour had occurred over the last teaching week. Headteachers were invited to respond from their perspective, and an extra category 'Don't know' was included on their questionnaire. Teachers, additional support staff and pupils were asked to consider all the lessons they had, respectively, taught, assisted in or been in. The phrasing of the behaviours was more child-friendly in the pupil questionnaire to take account of the age of respondents. The results are set out in Tables 3.5–3.8.

Table 3.5 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour in the classroom during the last full teaching week from the perspective of headteachers

Type of behaviour	All lessons (%)	Most lessons (%)	Some lessons (%)	Few lessons (%)	No lessons (%)	Don't know (%)	No response (%)
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	10	75	8	2	<1	1	4
Pupils following instructions	13	78	4	1	0	<1	4
Pupils settling down quickly	14	72	9	1	0	<1	4
Pupils contributing to class discussions	28	52	15	1	0	1	4
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	18	60	16	1	0	1	4
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	22	68	5	0	0	<1	4
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	10	69	15	<1	0	1	4
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	21	64	10	<1	0	<1	4
Attentive, interested pupils	13	70	13	<1	0	1	4
Pupils arriving promptly for lessons	22	62	10	0	0	1	5
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	14	72	9	0	0	<1	5

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. *Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006*

Table 3.6 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour in the classroom during the last full teaching week from the perspective of teachers

Type of behaviour	All lessons (%)	Most lessons (%)	Some lessons (%)	Few lessons (%)	No lessons (%)	No response (%)
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	9	59	20	10	2	1
Pupils following instructions	11	66	19	3	<1	1
Pupils settling down quickly	12	58	22	7	<1	1
Pupils contributing to class discussions	30	48	18	2	0	1
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	11	51	30	6	<1	1
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	19	59	19	2	0	1
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	10	62	24	4	<1	1
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	19	52	23	5	<1	1
Attentive, interested pupils	10	60	26	3	0	1
Pupils arriving promptly for lessons	21	60	15	3	<1	1
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	13	57	23	6	<1	1

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. *Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006*

Table 3.7 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour in the classroom during the last full teaching week from the perspective of additional support staff

Type of behaviour	All lessons (%)	Most lessons (%)	Some lessons (%)	Few lessons (%)	No lessons (%)	No response (%)
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	6	48	26	15	3	2
Pupils following instructions	6	56	30	6	<1	2
Pupils settling down quickly	6	45	34	13	1	2
Pupils contributing to class discussions	15	53	25	5	<1	1
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	8	39	36	14	2	2
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	10	44	35	10	1	2
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	5	45	37	12	1	2
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	10	35	35	17	2	1
Attentive, interested pupils	4	43	40	11	1	1
Pupils arriving promptly for lessons	15	54	22	7	1	2
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	7	38	35	14	3	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. *Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006*

Table 3.8 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour in the classroom during the last full teaching week from the perspective of pupils

Type of behaviour	All lessons (%)	Most lessons (%)	Some lessons (%)	Few lessons (%)	No lessons (%)	No response (%)
Pupils bringing the things they need to lessons	8	45	31	14	2	1
Pupils following instructions from the teacher	8	50	31	9	1	1
Pupils settling down to work quickly	4	31	43	18	3	1
Pupils being a part of class discussions	17	37	29	14	3	1
Pupils listening to other pupils' views respectfully	11	35	32	17	4	1
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	10	42	30	15	2	2
Pupils getting on with their work	10	49	29	10	1	1
Pupils politely asking for the teacher's help	15	39	29	15	2	1
Pupils who listen and are interested in lessons	9	38	35	14	2	2
Pupils arriving for lessons on time	19	46	23	9	1	2
Pupils behaving well and making lessons enjoyable for everyone	7	37	36	17	3	1

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. *Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006*

3.10   When examining Tables 3.5–3.8, the difference in perception depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type is once more apparent. Again, headteachers were most positive in their assessment of the frequency with which the positive pupil behaviours were evident in class, followed by teachers, then additional support staff and finally the pupils. This can be seen by looking across the 11 positive behaviours under consideration and comparing the proportion of the respondent types who indicated that each was exhibited in 'most' or 'all' lessons, as follows.

- As regards headteachers, the vast majority indicated that each of the 11 behaviours was exhibited in 'most' or 'all' lessons, with between **78 and 91 per cent** responding as such depending on the behaviour.
- The figures for teachers were a little less overwhelming, with between **62 and 81 per cent** responding thus depending on the behaviour.
- Additional support staff were less positive again and, depending on the behaviour, between **45 and 69 per cent** responded in this way.
- Between **35 and 65 per cent** of pupils responded likewise, making them the most negative group of all. In fact, for four of the 11 positive behaviours listed, it was only a minority of pupils who registered that they had seen these in 'most' or 'all' of their lessons ('pupils settling down to work quickly', 'pupils behaving well and making lessons enjoyable for everyone', 'pupils listening respectfully to others' views', 'pupils who listen and are interested in lessons').

3.11   Although there were differences of opinion between respondent types in terms of the actual proportion of lessons in which pupils exhibited positive behaviours, there was some broad agreement as regards the particular types of behaviour that occurred most frequently. Figure 3.1 illustrates the 4 highest ranking positive behaviours observed by headteachers, teachers, additional support staff and pupils. As can be seen, although their exact positioning in the ordering may vary, all groups agreed that 'pupils arriving promptly for classes' and 'pupils contributing to class discussions' were amongst the most frequently occurring of the positive behaviours listed.   In addition, 'pupils listening to the teacher respectfully' was amongst those observed most often by the school staff.   Further, 'pupils politely seeking teacher help' appeared in 2 of the rank orders (headteachers and teachers) as did 'pupils following instructions' (additional support staff and pupils).   'Pupils getting on with their work' was amongst the highest ranking positive behaviours for pupils only.

3.12   At the opposite end of the rank ordering, the positive behaviours that were observed less frequently by comparison included 'pupils listening to others' views respectfully' and 'attentive and interested pupils' as well as 'lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable'. 'Pupils arriving with the correct equipment' was one of the behaviours observed less often by headteachers and teachers, as was 'pupils settling down quickly' according to teachers and pupils. It was also noteworthy that whilst for headteachers and teachers, 'pupils politely seeking teacher help' was amongst the most frequently observed positive pupil behaviours, additional support staff expressed quite a different opinion and it was one of the behaviours they perceived least often.

Figure 3.1   Rank ordering of the types of positive behaviour: the top four behaviours in terms of frequency of occurrence[3]

Headteachers	Teachers	Additional support staff	Pupils
1. Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully 2=. Pupils arriving promptly for classes 2=. Pupils contributing to class discussions 4. Pupils politely seeking teacher help	1. Pupils contributing to class discussions 2. Pupils arriving promptly for classes 3. Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully 4. Pupils politely seeking teacher help	1. Pupils contributing to class discussions 2. Pupils arriving promptly for classes 3. Pupils following instructions 4. Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	1. Pupils arriving for lessons on time 2. Pupils getting on with their work 3. Pupils following instructions from the teacher 4. Pupils being a part of class discussions

Source: NFER survey of school staff and pupils, 2006

3.13   Analysing the staff survey data by school sector indicated that the 11 positive behaviours occurred much more frequently at primary level than they did in secondary schools. The primary headteachers, teachers and additional support staff who were surveyed observed **all** 11 behaviours in more lessons than their secondary colleagues. In particular, 'pupils arriving promptly for lessons', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils politely seeking teacher help' were much more common at primary level. In addition, 'pupils arriving with the correct equipment' and 'attentive and interested pupils' were especially frequent in primary schools based on the responses of primary teachers and support staff compared with their secondary counterparts.

3.14   An association was found between teachers' confidence and their perceptions of positive behaviour in the classroom. Teachers who indicated that they felt confident in responding to indiscipline in the classroom were more likely to report occurrences of positive behaviours. This was true of all 11 types of positive behaviour in lessons included in the study. (It should be noted though that, although a relationship between the extent of teachers' confidence and the reported incidence of positive behaviours was evident, this analysis does not establish direction of causality i.e. it does not determine whether teachers perceived positive behaviours with greater frequency because they felt more confident at dealing with indiscipline; or whether they felt more confident because they perceived positive behaviours with greater frequency.)

3.15   Similarly, analysis revealed an association between the level of support that staff identified as being available to teachers and additional support staff and their views of incidences of positive behaviour in lessons. The more supported these school staff felt, the more likely they were to report the positive behaviours as frequently occurring. For both teachers and support staff, this was the case for all 11 positive behaviours under consideration in the research. (Again, the direction of causality was uncertain.)

3.16   As part of the staff and pupil focus groups, participants were asked if, and how, teachers recognise positive/good behaviour. All staff focus groups unanimously agreed that

---

[3] The positive behaviours are ranked in terms of frequency according to mean scores. Respondents rated how often each of the 11 positive behaviours was exhibited on a 5-point scale (1 = 'all lessons'; 2 = 'most lessons'; 3 = 'some lessons'; 4 = 'few lessons'; 5 = 'no lessons'). An extra category (6 = 'don't know') was included in the headteacher questionnaire. When calculating the mean scores for headteachers, any 'don't knows' were recoded to the mid-point of the scale ('3').

teachers and, indeed, all members of school staff, recognised positive pupil behaviour, with two groups expressly stating that positive behaviour encouragement was the key to improving behaviour. In contrast, however, participants in one-third (5) of the pupil focus groups stated that they did not think teachers recognised positive behaviour or did so infrequently. Of these groups, pupils relayed how they perceived teachers sometimes "ignored" their good behaviour, and instead focused on the indiscipline of other pupils. In addition, pupils often felt that teachers rewarded the occasional good behaviour of those pupils who typically misbehaved to a greater extent than they did the pupils who were consistently well behaved. Members of the staff focus groups showed an appreciation of pupils' views on this matter and stated that there was a "fine balance" regarding praising those who always behaved and those who usually misbehaved but who had behaved well.

3.17 A range of methods to recognise positive behaviour were cited by both staff and pupils in their recipient focus groups. Examples of approaches included: celebration assemblies; use of stickers and well-done stamps; Golden time; positive referrals to other staff in recognition of good behaviour; and letters of praise sent home to parents.

Summary

- Overwhelmingly, the headteachers who were surveyed indicated that pupils were generally well behaved in the classroom, with 99 per cent registering that 'most' or 'all/almost all' behaved well. The majority of teachers, additional support staff and pupils recorded that pupils behaved well in 'most' or 'all/almost all' lessons, though they were less emphatic than headteachers.

- Indeed, there were acute differences in perceptions of positive behaviour depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type. Pupils themselves were most negative, then additional support staff, followed by teachers and finally the headteachers. As regards pupils, this difference in perception may be attributable to the less tolerant attitude they held towards their peers' indiscipline (see Chapter 7). In terms of support staff, close to half (44 per cent) of the sample was assigned to work with a particular pupil or pupils or class, possibly on the grounds of their additional needs (one of which could be behaviour).

- The specific types of positive behaviours that were reported to occur most frequently in lessons included 'pupils arriving promptly for classes', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils listening to the teacher respectfully'.

- Analysis by school sector revealed that positive behaviours occurred much more frequently at primary level than they did in secondary schools. In particular, 'pupils arriving promptly for lessons', 'pupils contributing to class discussions' and 'pupils politely seeking teacher help' were much more common at primary level.

- An association was found between teachers' confidence in responding to indiscipline and their perceptions of positive behaviour in the classroom, such that the more confident teachers felt, the more likely they were to report positive behaviour as frequently occurring. Similarly, teachers and support staff who felt supported by their school recorded more incidences of positive behaviours.

CHAPTER FOUR   NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

Introduction

4.1   This chapter focuses on the extent and type of negative behaviour within the classroom, how typical that behaviour is and whether some classes are more challenging than others. It then moves on to consider the effect that such behaviour has on staff, pupils and the learning experience. It draws primarily on the evidence from the school staff and pupil surveys, with some additional comment provided by the data from the staff and pupil focus group discussions.

How badly behaved or difficult to deal with are pupils in lessons?

4.2   In the survey of school staff, headteachers were asked to report what proportion of the school roll they considered to be generally badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom. Table 4.1 presents their responses.

Table 4.1 The proportion of the school roll considered by headteachers to be badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom

Proportion of school roll badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom	Headteachers (N)	Headteachers (%)
All/almost all	2	1
Most	1	<1
Some	78	20
Few	234	61
None/almost none	64	17
No response	5	1
TOTAL	384	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.3   As Table 4.1 shows (and has been noted in previous chapters), the majority of headteachers surveyed indicated that pupils were generally well behaved in the classroom, with more than three-quarters (78 per cent) recording that 'a few' or 'none/almost none' were badly behaved. Only one-fifth (20 per cent) of headteachers surveyed reported that 'some' or 'most' pupils were badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom.

4.4   As illustrated in Table 4.2 overleaf, when headteacher responses were analysed according to school sector, this revealed, perhaps not surprisingly, that secondary headteachers were more likely than their primary counterparts to report that 'a few', or 'some' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom. However, an interesting difference emerged. The tiny number of headteachers (2 per cent) who reported that 'most', or 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom were primary headteachers. Further analysis of the data suggests that factors affecting this may relate to:

- the small size of the school
- higher levels of deprivation (e.g. as indicated by free school meal eligibility)

- higher levels of special educational need.

4.5   However, it should also be noted that a quarter (26 per cent) of primary headteachers did report that 'none/almost none' of their pupils were badly behaved in the classroom, compared with only 5 per cent of secondary headteachers.

Table 4.2 The proportion of the school roll considered by primary and secondary headteachers to be badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom

Proportion of school roll badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with in the classroom	Primary headteachers		Secondary headteachers	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
All/almost all	2	1	0	0
Most	1	1	0	0
Some	31	15	47	29
Few	124	58	110	67
None/almost none	56	26	8	5
TOTAL	214	100	165	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.6   Teachers and additional support staff were asked to report on the number of lessons they taught, or assisted in, on a regular basis in which pupils were badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with. Pupils in the 7 schools surveyed were asked to state in how many of their lessons the previous week pupils had been badly behaved, so that it caused difficulty for the teacher and disturbed other pupils. Table 4.3 below sets out the responses of teachers, additional support staff and pupils.

Table 4.3 Number of lessons in which pupils are considered by teachers, additional support staff and pupils to be badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with

Number of lessons in which pupils are badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with	Teachers		Additional support staff		Pupils	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
All/almost all	21	2	29	6	31	2
Most	69	6	74	15	239	16
Some	348	32	202	40	519	36
Few	356	33	131	26	547	37
None/almost none	279	26	60	12	107	7
No response	7	<1	5	1	18	1
TOTAL	1080	100	501	100	1461	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff and pupils, 2006

4.7   Table 4.3 shows that teachers, additional support staff and pupils were generally less positive than headteachers about pupil behaviour in lessons, with just under a third of teachers (32 per cent), slightly more than one-third (36 per cent) of pupils and two-fifths (40 per cent) of additional support staff reporting that pupils were badly behaved in 'some' lessons. This could be related to the fact that they will be encountering pupil behaviour on a daily basis and thus, may feel it to be more of an issue than headteachers who are usually somewhat removed from the classroom situation. Interestingly, additional support staff and pupils were more likely than teachers to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'some', or

'most', lessons. Once again, this illustrates the 'world view' of the respondent type noted in Chapter Three.

4.8 As Table 4.4 shows, analysis of teacher, additional support staff and pupil responses by school sector revealed that, again perhaps not surprisingly, staff in primary schools were more likely than those in secondary schools to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'none/almost none', of their lessons. For example, almost twice as many primary teachers (35 per cent) as secondary teachers (18 per cent) stated this, while almost 6 times as many primary additional support staff (25 per cent) stated this as secondary additional support staff (4 per cent). However, of the tiny number of teachers who stated that pupils were badly behaved in 'all/almost all' lessons, the majority were from primary schools. Pupil responses at primary and secondary level showed very little difference by school sector.

Table 4.4 Number of lessons in which pupils are considered by primary and secondary teachers, additional support staff and pupils to be badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with

Number of lessons in which pupils are badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with	Teachers		Additional support staff		Pupils	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Teachers						
All/almost all	3	1	3	8	2	2
Most	4	8	6	20	15	17
Some	26	39	27	49	37	36
Few	32	34	39	19	40	38
None/almost none	35	18	25	4	7	8
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff and pupils, 2006

What sort of negative behaviour is in evidence during lessons?

The type of negative behaviour identified by school staff

4.9 Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff in the school survey were asked to consider a list of 24 classroom behaviours, largely based on the 20 used in the 2004 survey conducted by Edinburgh University (Munn *et al.*, 2004)[4]. Headteachers were then asked to indicate on a 5-point scale the frequency with which each behaviour had either been referred on to them, or encountered by them, over the last teaching week. Teachers and additional support staff were asked to consider all the lessons they had taught, or assisted in, during the last teaching week and indicate on the same 5-point scale how frequently they had to deal with each behaviour. An extra category 'Don't know' was also included for headteachers. Headteachers' responses are presented in Table 4.4 overleaf, while table 4.5 overleaf sets out the responses of teachers and additional support staff.

---

[4] The four additional classroom behaviours listed in the current survey were: physical violence (such as punching, kicking, use of a weapon) towards other pupils; physical violence (such as punching, kicking, use of a weapon) towards you (i.e. member of staff); pupils withdrawing from interaction with others/you; and pupils missing lessons (e.g. truancy).

Table 4.4 Frequency of types of pupil behaviour in the classroom referred on to, or directly encountered by, headteachers

Type of behaviour	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	Don't know (%)	No response (%)
Talking out of turn	20	10	11	29	27	2	1
Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise	10	7	10	24	44	3	2
Hindering other pupils	13	9	11	40	22	2	2
Leaving seat without permission	7	8	7	21	51	3	3
Not being punctual	8	8	10	27	44	2	2
Persistently infringing class rules	8	9	15	34	31	1	3
Eating/chewing in class	4	3	4	10	73	5	2
Calculated idleness/work avoidance	8	6	12	38	32	3	3
Cheeky/impertinent remarks or responses	8	8	13	35	33	1	2
General rowdiness/horseplay	6	6	11	37	37	1	2
Use of mobile phones/texting	2	3	6	18	67	2	2
Physical destructiveness	<1	1	2	17	76	2	2
Racist abuse towards other pupils	6	0	0	0	88	3	3
Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	<1	0	2	8	86	1	3
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	4	5	14	45	29	1	2
Racist abuse towards you	0	0	0	<1	97	1	2
Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	0	0	0	<1	97	1	2
General verbal abuse towards you	0	1	1	10	85	1	3
Physical aggression towards other pupils	3	3	9	46	36	1	3
Physical violence towards other pupils	2	2	7	43	42	1	3
Physical aggression towards you	0	<1	1	1	95	1	3
Physical violence towards you	0	0	<1	1	95	2	3
Pupils withdrawing from interaction with others/you	2	3	6	29	58	3	3
Pupils missing lessons (truancy)	4	4	8	20	60	2	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Table 4.5 Frequency of types of pupil behaviour encountered in lessons by teachers and additional support staff

Type of behaviour	Teachers						Additional support staff					
	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	No response (%)	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	No response (%)
Talking out of turn	62	12	12	13	2	<1	65	8	12	11	3	,1
Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise	38	15	9	24	13	<1	49	17	11	15	7	1
Hindering other pupils	40	16	14	23	7	1	45	18	13	16	6	2
Leaving seat without permission	26	15	11	25	20	3	39	19	11	20	10	1
Not being punctual	16	17	14	33	20	1	23	14	12	26	25	1
Persistently infringing class rules	21	11	13	29	24	1	29	13	13	24	17	3
Eating/chewing in class	28	8	6	17	41	1	37	8	8	9	37	1
Calculated idleness/work avoidance	27	19	16	28	9	<1	41	14	18	20	8	1
Cheeky/impertinent remarks or responses	18	13	11	26	31	1	39	12	13	21	15	1
General rowdiness/horseplay	15	13	12	31	29	1	33	14	15	24	14	1
Use of mobile phones/texting	8	7	6	15	64	1	12	8	7	18	55	1
Physical destructiveness	1	3	3	17	75	<1	2	4	3	21	69	2
Racist abuse towards other pupils	<1	1	<1	7	92	1	1	1	1	11	85	1
Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	1	2	13	84	1	1	2	3	18	75	1
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	9	6	12	40	33	1	16	8	14	38	23	1
Racist abuse towards you	<1	0	0	1	99	1	<1	<1	0	2	97	1
Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	<1	0	<1	2	97	1	1	1	1	6	91	1
General verbal abuse towards you	2	3	4	18	71	1	3	3	5	22	65	2
Physical aggression towards other pupils	5	5	8	35	46	1	12	6	13	36	31	1
Physical violence towards other pupils	2	3	3	21	70	1	4	3	5	30	56	2
Physical aggression towards you	<1	1	1	4	94	1	1	1	1	5	91	2
Physical violence towards you	0	<1	<1	1	98	1	<1	<1	<1	2	96	1
Pupils withdrawing from interaction (others/you)	4	4	6	33	51	1	4	5	10	36	44	2
Pupils missing lessons (truancy)	4	5	8	25	56	1	9	4	11	23	52	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.10   What immediately becomes clear when considering Tables 4.4 and 4.5 is that the classroom behaviours encountered by school staff (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) most frequently within a typical week of teaching were low-level, in particular 'talking out of turn' (by far the most common behaviour reported), 'making unnecessary (non- verbal) noise', 'hindering or distracting others' and 'pupils leaving their seat without permission'. More serious indiscipline, such as physical violence or aggression, was far less likely to occur on a daily basis, and was hardly ever directed at school staff. These findings were echoed in local authority interviewees' comments ("the old chestnut of talking out of turn still ranks as the most consistently disruptive behaviour"), and are very much in line with those of the 2004 Edinburgh University study.

4.11   The very few incidents of racist or sexist abuse towards staff, and physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported in the current study, occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary. An explanation for this could be, as staff in the focus groups reported, that increasing numbers of 3- and 4-year olds were entering mainstream education with often complex difficulties, or a lack of basic social skills, which quite often resulted in behavioural problems. Indeed, analysis revealed an association between the number of lessons in which teachers found pupils badly behaved and the proportion of pupils with additional support needs. This perception was also reflected in the comments of local authority representatives:

> "*Young children who cannot make appropriate social connections seem to be a growth area*".

> "*The area where there is the greatest increase in problems is in pre-school, in early primary. There has been a marked increase in asocial and un-socialised behaviour in very young children who can be quite violent and aggressive and who do not have the cognitive capacity to be aware, necessarily, of the nature of their behaviour and the consequences of it. That is where there does seem to be a growing problem*".

4.12   It is important to note that primary schools are often the first in a child's school career to engage with such behavioural and social difficulties. Aggression or violence towards staff may well be inadvertent (for example, as a result of a tantrum, or of a particular condition such as autism), and may represent a method, albeit an inappropriate one, of communicating with staff. Therefore, the increase in perceptions of the above types of behaviour (e.g. racist or sexist abuse towards staff, and physical aggression or violence towards staff) in primary schools is perhaps not surprising.

> "*The 2 biggies are attention deficit and autistic spectrum disorder – definitely a huge expediential growth in that population. Whether that is a function of increased diagnosis as opposed to increased frequency is another matter*" (local authority representative).

> "*I think there has been a huge knowledge spurt in the last few years and that obviously impacts on people's perceptions*" (local authority representative).

4.13   As Table 4.5 shows, additional support staff in the current survey were consistently more likely than teachers to identify low-level behaviours (particularly 'calculated idleness/work avoidance', 'pupils leaving their seat without permission', 'cheeky/impertinent remarks' and 'general rowdiness/horseplay'), as happening in lessons several times daily.

This could well be related to the perception, which is borne out by additional support staff comments in focus groups, that pupils can be more disrespectful to, and often less inclined to do as they are asked by, support staff.

4.14   School staff in the focus groups within the current study confirmed that indiscipline in lessons was mainly low level and "an irritation", with "sporadic" serious incidents, although additional support staff at secondary level felt that indiscipline was now becoming more serious and cited an increase in violence and bad language. Primary focus group participants referred to talking out of turn and cheekiness/verbal abuse as the most common low-level behaviours encountered in lessons, while secondary focus group participants referred to talking out of turn and not being focused on tasks as the most common.

4.15   Reasons given by school staff in the focus groups for poor behaviour focused mainly on the influence of the inclusion agenda. Staff felt they were having to cope with increasing numbers of pupils in mainstream schools with more serious behavioural difficulties. Catering for those needs in mainstream was not easy and often presented problems when trying to discipline other pupils. That said, it is worth noting that, in the staff survey, 65 per cent of primary teachers reported that 'none' or 'very few' of the pupils in the class they mainly taught had additional support needs, while this was the case for 57 per cent of secondary teachers when commenting on their most difficult class.

4.16   The other main factor cited in poor behaviour was the lack of respect shown by pupils, which was linked to the paucity of rules and sanctions at home, resulting in pupils "pushing the boundaries" whilst at school. It was noted that many parents were working and had little time, therefore there was perceived to be a lack of support for schools' behavioural approaches. This societal trend was also commented on by local authority interviewees.

4.17   Tables 4.4 and 4.5 show that the low-level indiscipline identified so frequently on a daily basis by teachers and additional support staff in the school survey was far less likely to be referred on to, or directly encountered by, headteachers. For example, 'talking out of turn' was identified by more than three-fifths of teachers and additional support staff (62 and 65 per cent respectively) as happening several times daily, compared with a fifth (20 per cent) of headteachers, while 'hindering other pupils' was identified by two-fifths (40 per cent) of teachers and more than two-fifths (45 per cent) of additional support staff as happening several times daily, compared with 13 per cent of headteachers. Once again, this may be due to the fact that headteachers are more removed from the daily classroom situation. At the same time, it is highly unlikely that such low-level behaviour would be referred on to them. Indeed, the three most frequently identified negative classroom behaviours for headteachers, but only as occurring once or twice a week, were more serious: 'physical aggression towards other pupils'; 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils'; and 'physical violence towards other pupils'.

4.18   What is of interest here though is that, as identified in the previous Edinburgh University study and reported by staff in the focus groups in the current study, it is the constant "drip, drip effect" (Munn *et al*., 2004) of low-level bad behaviour that grinds school staff down and contributes to a lowering of morale. Teachers in the current study referred to it as "soul destroying" and local authority representatives as "stamina sapping", the type of behaviour that "drives teachers batty". A question for consideration might be the extent to which headteachers recognise and support their staff in this, or whether it is seen as

something with which teachers and additional support staff feel they just have to cope by themselves.

4.19   Analysis revealed an association between teachers' confidence and perceptions of negative behaviour. Teachers who indicated that they felt confident in responding to indiscipline in the classroom were less likely to report incidents of negative behaviour. This was true of all types of negative behaviour in the classroom included in the survey, except for violence towards staff and, to a lesser extent, sexism towards staff (although the latter was still statistically significant). This may highlight an important CPD issue for those teachers who reported not feeling confident in dealing with indiscipline in the classroom. (It should be noted though, that although a relationship between the extent of teachers' confidence and the reported incidence of negative behaviours was evident, this analysis does not establish direction of causality i.e. it does not determine whether teachers perceived negative behaviours with greater frequency because they felt less confident at dealing with indiscipline; or whether they felt less confident because they perceived negative behaviours with greater frequency.)

4.20   At the same time, an association between the level of support that staff identified as being available to teachers and additional support staff and perceptions of indiscipline was also revealed. The more supported in school staff felt, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour. For teachers, this was true of all types of negative behaviour in the classroom included in the survey, except for racism towards other pupils, sexism towards staff, violence towards staff and, to a lesser extent, racism towards staff (although the latter was still statistically significant). For additional support staff, this was true of all types of negative behaviour in the classroom, with the exception of racism and violence towards staff and violence towards other pupils. This may indicate a significant issue for whole-school approaches to managing behaviour if staff do not feel sufficiently supported to be able to deal with certain types of serious indiscipline. (Again, the direction of causality was uncertain.)

4.21   Analysing the school staff survey data by school sector indicated that, although the same low-level indiscipline was identified by teachers and additional support staff in both primary and secondary schools, it was perceived to occur more frequently in secondary schools, particularly by secondary additional support staff. For example, 'talking out of turn' was reported by 72 per cent of primary teachers and 75 per cent of secondary teachers to occur at least daily, but by 63 per cent of primary additional support staff and by 80 per cent of secondary support staff. 'Hindering other pupils' was identified by 54 per cent of primary teachers and 59 per cent of secondary teachers to occur at least daily, but by 51 per cent of primary additional support staff and by 72 per cent of secondary additional support staff. Once again, this illustrates the 'world view' of behaviour already identified. 'Not being punctual for lessons', 'eating and chewing', and 'truancy' were behaviours identified far more frequently at secondary level, while, not surprisingly, the use of mobile phones/texting was identified almost exclusively as a secondary-level behaviour.

The type of negative behaviour identified by pupils

4.22   In the 7 schools involved in the pupil survey, pupils were asked to consider a list of 22 classroom behaviours, the majority of which were the same as those presented to school staff,

although written in more 'pupil-friendly' language in recognition of the wide age range of pupils included[5]. Pupils were invited to indicate on a 5-point scale in how many of their lessons over the previous week they had observed each behaviour. Pupils' responses are shown in Table 4.6 overleaf.

4.23   As Table 4.6 shows, in line with school staff, pupils in the 7 schools also identified low-level indiscipline as the type of behaviour they observed in most of their lessons. As with school staff, the negative behaviour observed in most lessons was 'pupils calling out, chattering' (i.e. talking out of turn), while the negative behaviour least likely to occur was being threatening to, or physically hurting, teachers. Again, in line with the school staff survey, analysis by school type reveals that 'pupils being late for lessons', 'eating and chewing' and the 'use of mobile phones/texting' were more common behaviours at secondary level than primary.

4.24   However, just under two-fifths (39 per cent) of pupils reported that they observed 'pupils being rude to teachers' (as opposed to 'being cheeky or making impertinent remarks') in most or some of their lessons. Perhaps not surprisingly, analysis by school type shows that this was slightly more the case for secondary school pupils. In contrast, teachers and additional support staff were far less likely to report 'verbal abuse towards staff' on such a regular basis, with two-fifths of teachers (40 per cent) and just under two-fifths (38 per cent) of additional support staff reporting they encountered it only once or twice a week. Analysis by school sector revealed that this was more common for additional support staff, and particularly for teachers, in secondary schools.

4.25   Comparing the 6 highest ranking behaviours observed by pupils in most of their lessons with those identified by teachers and additional staff as occurring several times daily, the types of low-level behaviours identified emerged as broadly similar. Figure 1 overleaf illustrates that 'hindering other pupils' and 'making unnecessary (non verbal) noise' rank more highly for teachers and additional support staff than for pupils. 'Eating/chewing' ranks higher in the pupils' list than that of teachers and particularly of additional support staff, although more additional support staff reported this occurring several times daily than did teachers. One additional negative behaviour (being rowdy) features in the pupil list of six, but not in those of teachers or additional support staff.

---

[5]   One of the 22 behaviours in the pupil survey (pupils not letting other pupils join in with them) was not included in the school staff surveys. Three of the behaviours included in the staff surveys (general verbal abuse towards other pupils; racist abuse towards you (i.e. member of staff); and sexist abuse towards you (i.e. member of staff)) were not included in the pupil survey.

Table 4.6 Frequency of types of pupil behaviour observed in lessons by pupils

Type of behaviour	All lessons %	Most lessons %	Some lessons %	Few lessons %	No lessons %	No response (%)
Pupils calling out, chattering	10	38	35	16	2	<1
Pupils making too much noise (non verbal)	4	19	31	32	14	<1
Pupils distracting other pupils from their work	5	18	34	32	11	1
Pupils being late for lessons	3	14	33	34	15	1
Pupils who keep breaking class rules	3	15	29	35	17	1
Pupils getting out of their seat without permission	10	25	27	26	11	2
Pupils eating/chewing in class	24	30	18	16	11	1
Pupils deliberately delaying getting on with work	5	23	32	27	12	1
Pupils being cheeky to staff	4	19	30	33	13	1
Pupils generally being rowdy or mucking about	4	19	33	33	10	1
Pupils using mobile phones/texting	6	12	18	24	39	2
Pupils breaking objects, damaging furniture	1	4	9	26	60	1
Pupils saying racist things to other pupils	1	4	6	13	77	1
Pupils saying sexist things to other pupils	2	5	9	28	55	1
Pupils pushing or being threatening to other pupils	3	7	15	31	44	1
Pupils punching, physically hurting other pupils	2	5	11	26	55	1
Pupils being rude to teachers	3	13	26	37	19	2
Pupils pushing or being threatening to teachers	1	2	5	11	80	2
Pupils punching, physically hurting teachers	1	1	2	6	88	2
Pupils not letting other pupils join in with them	2	6	16	38	36	2
Pupils who stop talking to or being with other pupils	3	6	18	33	37	2
Pupils missing certain lessons (truancy)	3	9	22	32	32	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

Figure 1   Examples of low-level behaviour identified most frequently as occurring in most lessons/several times daily

Teachers	Additional support staff	Pupils
1. Talking out of turn 2. Hindering other pupils 3. Making unnecessary noise 4. Eating/chewing 5. Calculated idleness/work avoidance 6. Leaving seat without permission	1. Talking out of turn 2. Making unnecessary noise 3. Hindering others 4. Calculated idleness/work avoidance 5. Leaving seat without permission/cheeky remarks 6. Eating/chewing	1. Pupils calling out 2. Eating/chewing 3. Delaying getting on with work (calculated idleness) 4. Getting out of seat without permission 5. Making unnecessary noise/ being cheeky/being rowdy 6. Distracting others (hindering)

Source: NFER survey of school staff and pupils, 2006

4.26   With the exception of one P6 group, in which pupils referred to behaviour in the classroom as quite serious, pupils in the focus groups were unanimous that the majority of poor behaviour in lessons was low level. More serious incidents were rare and, with the exception of climbing on furniture when the teacher was out of the room (reported by a group of P7 pupils about a small minority of pupils), tended to take place outside the classroom. Typically, these incidents included either pupil fights or incidents of bullying, although a P6 group felt it was important to distinguish between name calling and bullying. Figure 2 below illustrates the type of low-level behaviour identified by primary and secondary pupils in the pupil focus groups. Italics denote different behaviours exhibited by primary and secondary pupils.

Figure 2   Examples of low-level behaviour (pupil focus groups)

Primary	Secondary
Chattering	Chattering
Not getting on with your work	Not getting on with your work
Being silly/mucking about	Being silly/mucking about
Being cheeky to the teacher/backchat	Cheeking the teacher/talking back
Rudely interrupting the teacher by not putting your hand up/shouting out	Calling out
Laughing	Laughing
Pushing someone aside as you come into class after break	*Not doing homework*
Flicking rubbers/elastic bands	*Disobedience*
Getting out of your seat	*Play fighting*
Throwing notes behind the teacher's back	*Showing off*
Chewing gum	*Wearing trainers to school*
Calling each other names	

Source: Pupil focus groups, NFER study 2006

4.27   Several of the low-level behaviours identified were the same for both primary and secondary pupils. Apart from pushing someone aside on entering the room, exceptions in primary schools (shown in italics in Figure 2), were generally more typical of the sort of "irritating" behaviours identified by staff in the school staff survey, for example, flicking rubbers/elastic bands and throwing notes behind the teachers back. Interestingly, as noted earlier, in the staff survey, chewing gum was identified almost exclusively as a secondary school behaviour, and predominantly as such in the pupil survey, but in the pupil focus groups it only featured in the discussions with primary school pupils. Additional behaviours

identified by secondary pupil focus group participants (shown above in italics) included the sort of behaviours associated with emerging adolescence and independence, for example, not doing homework, showing off, wearing trainers to school.

How typical is the negative behaviour identified?

4.28   Headteachers in the school staff survey were asked to state whether the pattern of occurrences of different classroom behaviours (i.e. the frequency) they had identified as being referred on to them, or directly encountered by them, during the previous teaching week was typical of the general classroom experience in their school. Teachers were asked to say whether the pattern (i.e. the frequency) of classroom behaviours they had reported experiencing during the previous week's teaching was typical of the classroom experience in their particular school. If either group indicated these behaviours were not typical, they were then asked to explain why not. Table 4.7 below presents the responses of headteachers and teachers.

4.29   As Table 4.7 shows, more than three-quarters of headteachers (77 per cent) and teachers (84 per cent) reported that the pattern they had described was **typical**. Analysis by school sector showed that the responses were broadly similar in primary and secondary schools, although slightly more secondary headteachers thought it was typical than did primary headteachers, with slightly fewer primary teachers viewing it as typical than secondary teachers.

Table 4.7 Is the pattern/frequency of different classroom behaviours identified typical of the general classroom experience in your school?

Is the pattern/frequency of different classroom behaviours identified typical of the general classroom experience in your school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	**%**	**(N)**	**%**	**(N)**	**%**
Headteachers						
Yes	294	77	162	76	132	81
No	82	21	50	24	32	20
No response	8	2	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	384	100	212	100	164	100
Teachers						
Yes	911	84	427	81	484	89
No	157	15	98	19	59	11
No response	12	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	1080	100	525	100	543	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.30   Just over a fifth (21 per cent) of headteachers reported that the pattern they had described was **not typical**. Of those, analysis by school type shows that almost a quarter (24 per cent) were primary headteachers while a fifth (20 per cent) were secondary headteachers. Less than a fifth (15 per cent) of teachers (more of whom were primary teachers) reported that the pattern of behaviour they had described was not typical.

4.31   When proferring reasons for the pattern of occurrences of behaviour not being typical, some variation in interpretation became apparent. Headteachers and teachers were asked to relate their answers to the previous week's teaching, but the majority tended to relate it to their classroom experience generally.

4.32   For primary headteachers and teachers, the main reasons for the pattern of classroom behaviour they had described not being typical of the general classroom experience in their school related to the nature of their pupils. Certain individuals or classes were said to present more difficult, or persistent, negative behaviour than others, while a number of pupils were reported to have more challenging behavioural difficulties (e.g. ADHD, Aspergers syndrome).

4.33   Secondary headteachers and teachers who indicated that the pattern of classroom behaviour they had described was not typical of the general classroom experience in their school, tended to refer more to the skills of the teacher (for example, some teachers were perceived to be better at handling discipline than others), or to the type of lesson (for example, behaviour was often better in practical lessons). Secondary headteachers in particular referred to their limited view, which may be linked to the fact that they are generally more removed from the classroom situation than their primary counterparts, several of whom tend to also have a teaching commitment.

Are some classes more challenging than others?

4.34   Headteachers in the school staff survey were asked to report whether there were any particular stages of pupil causing the greatest difficulty for their staff in terms of managing behaviour. They were also offered the opportunity to state that all stages were difficult, none were particularly difficult, or that it was too variable to judge. Primary headteacher responses indicated that the year groups more difficult to deal with in terms of behaviour (identified by more than one in ten headteachers) were, in rank order:

- P7 (19 per cent)
- None particularly difficult (18 per cent)
- P6 (18 per cent)
- P5 (12 per cent)
- P4 (11 per cent).

4.35   In the pupil focus groups, P7 and then P6 were identified by primary pupils as the year groups more likely to be involved in negative behaviour. Pupils were said to "get cheekier" as they got older, with P7s particularly testing the boundaries because they were getting ready to move on to secondary school soon: "There's nobody higher than them in the school" (P6 focus group). Primary headteachers in one of the staff focus groups also identified P7 as a particularly difficult year group.

4.36   Secondary headteacher responses indicated that the year groups more difficult to deal with in terms of behaviour (identified by more than one in 10 headteachers) were, in rank order:

- S3 (31 per cent)

- S4 (26 per cent)
- S2 (24 per cent).

4.37   In the pupil focus group discussions, secondary pupils identified S3 and S4 pupils as the most difficult year groups and cited the effect of puberty as an influential factor. One focus group made up of S4 to S6 pupils did note, however, that this year group had been particularly problematic since they started in S1, so it was more to do with the characteristics of that group, rather than their age.

4.38   The above responses from primary and secondary headteachers, and focus group participants, emerged as very similar to those of primary and secondary headteachers in the 2004 Edinburgh University survey. As the *Policy Update on Behaviour in Scottish Schools* noted, primary headteachers in that study identified P6 and P7 as particularly difficult, while secondary headteachers identified S3 as the most difficult year, with S2 and S4 also perceived to be difficult (Scottish Executive, 2004)

4.39   Secondary teachers in the survey schools were asked to identify on a 5-point scale how many of the classes they taught on a regular basis they found difficult to deal with. Table 4.10 below shows that secondary teachers felt they could cope with the behaviour of the majority of their classes, with only one in 20 (5 per cent) indicating that they found 'more than half' their classes difficult to deal with, and fewer than one in 10 (8 per cent) indicating 'about half'. More than half (53 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that they found 'one or two' of their classes difficult to deal with, and just under a fifth (19 per cent) indicated that they did not find any of their classes difficult to deal with. Once again, these findings are strikingly similar to those of the 2004 Edinburgh University survey.

Table 4.8 How many of the classes they currently teach do teachers find difficult to deal with?

How many of your classes do you find difficult to deal with	Secondary teachers	
	(N)	**%**
More than half	25	5
About half	41	8
Less than half	82	15
One or two	290	53
None	102	19
No response	10	2
TOTAL	550	100

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Composition of difficult classes

4.40   Secondary teachers who responded that they found at least 'one or two' classes difficult to deal with were asked about the composition of their most difficult class.

4.41   Secondary teachers indicated that their most difficult class comprised the following year group (identified by more than one in 10 secondary teachers):

- S2 (30 per cent)

- S3 (30 per cent)
- S4 (24 per cent).

4.42   The year groups identified by secondary teachers as those making up their most difficult class were the same as those identified by secondary headteachers (see 4.33). However, S2 pupils were perceived as more problematic by teachers than by headteachers.

4.43   Secondary teachers indicated that the classes they usually taught were set by subject. When asked to indicate on a 3-point scale the attainment level of their most difficult class in comparison with other pupils in the same age range, nearly three-quarters (73 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that this class was below average. More than half (57 per cent) of the secondary teachers surveyed reported that none or very few of the pupils in their most difficult class had additional support needs. Just under a fifth (17 per cent) indicated that more than a quarter of the class had additional support needs.

4.44   When asked whether the composition of their most difficult class had been influenced by decisions about pupil discipline or behaviour problems, slightly over a quarter (26 per cent) reported that it had, while just over half (54 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that it had not. Almost a fifth (19 per cent) indicated that they did not know if it had.

What impact does poor behaviour in lessons have on staff, on pupils, on learning?

4.45   After identifying how often they were faced with different types of negative pupil behaviour in the classroom, teachers were asked to report, on a 5-point scale, how difficult they had found it to deal with those behaviours. Table 4.9 presents their responses.

Table 4.9 How difficult teachers find it to deal with the negative classroom behaviour they report

How difficult teachers find it to deal with the negative behaviour reported in the classroom	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Extremely difficult 1	42	4	18	3	24	4
2	136	13	50	10	86	16
3	227	21	82	16	145	27
4	329	31	157	30	172	32
Not difficult at all 5	336	31	218	42	118	22
No response	10	1				
TOTAL	1080	100	525	100	545	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.46   Table 4.9 shows that just over three-fifths (62 per cent) of teachers **did not** find the negative classroom behaviour they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. This was far more the case for primary teachers than for secondary teachers, with almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of primary teachers responding in this way, compared with just over half (54 per cent) of secondary teachers. Only a fifth (22 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that they had no difficulties at all with the classroom behaviour encountered, compared with

almost double the amount (42 per cent) of primary teachers. At the same time, a fifth (20 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that they **did** find the classroom behaviour they had reported difficult to deal with, compared with 13 per cent of primary teachers.

4.47   Headteachers were asked to indicate up to 3 negative behaviours in the list of 24 examples of classroom behaviours they had been presented with that had had the greatest negative impact on the teaching experience of their staff during the previous teaching week. Teachers were asked to indicate up to 3 of these behaviours that had had the greatest negative impact on their own teaching experience during the previous week. Table 4.10 presents the highest ranking negative classroom behaviours (identified by one in 10 or more headteachers and teachers).

Table 4.10 Negative behaviour reported by headteachers and teachers to have had the greatest negative impact on the teaching experience of staff during the last teaching week (from 24 possible choices)

Negative behaviour identified by headteachers and teachers as having greatest negative impact on teaching	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Headteachers						
Talking out of turn	216	56	115	30	101	26
Hindering other pupils	194	51	110	29	74	19
Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	103	27	44	11	59	15
Persistently infringing class rules	98	26	37	10	61	16
Calculated idleness or work avoidance	89	23	46	12	43	11
Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise	67	17	49	13	18	5
Not being punctual (late to lessons)	53	14	26	7	27	7
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	52	14	34	9	18	5
General rowdiness/mucking about	39	10	15	4	24	6
Teachers						
Talking out of turn	813	75	424	39	389	36
Hindering other pupils	576	53	295	27	281	26
Calculated idleness or work avoidance	356	33	168	16	188	17
Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise	269	25	169	16	100	9
Persistently infringing class rules	185	17	66	6	119	11
Cheeky or impertinent remarks	160	15	50	5	110	10
Not being punctual (late to lessons)	145	13	40	4	105	10
General rowdiness/mucking about	107	10	39	4	68	6

Notes to table Multiple response questions: school staff could select more than one option therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

4.48   The above table shows that both headteachers and teachers, and largely from both sectors (primary and secondary), were in agreement that it was the low-level behaviour that they had identified as occurring most frequently in lessons that had the greatest negative impact on teaching. This view was supported by the focus group discussions with school staff and mirrors the findings of the 2004 survey by Edinburgh University.

4.49   In the current study, 'talking out of turn' was the classroom behaviour that was reported to have had the greatest negative impact on teaching during the previous week (identified by over half (56 per cent) of headteachers and three-quarters (75 per cent) of teachers). This was followed by 'hindering other pupils' (identified by just over half of

headteachers and teachers, 51 and 53 per cent respectively). For teachers, these behaviours, together with 'making unnecessary noise', were perceived to be more problematic in primary schools, which, given the more relaxed nature of that environment, coupled with the age range of the pupils concerned, is perhaps not surprising. One extra behaviour ('general verbal abuse towards other pupils') was identified by just over one in 10 (14 per cent) of headteachers (more of whom were primary headteachers) as having had the greatest negative impact on the teaching experience in their school during the previous week. This was only identified by 6 per cent of teachers.

4.50   Staff in the focus groups reported that dealing with negative behaviour in the classroom "wasted" teachers' time and hindered teaching and learning. It was also said to be unfair to other pupils who were being "cheated" out of teaching time. One group of primary teachers noted that negative classroom behaviour could have a detrimental effect on the behaviour of other pupils, because they saw poor behaviour being "rewarded" through increased teacher attention. Secondary headteachers felt that the discipline system coped well with what they called "the day-to-day grind" of low-level behaviour, and that it was the more serious incidents that had a greater impact on the school ethos, on staff and on pupils.

4.51   Both secondary and primary headteachers reported a "wearing down" of staff, with secondary headteachers suggesting that teachers should be "empowered" to cope with discipline themselves, rather than always seeing it as a responsibility of the SMT. Teachers and additional support staff reported feeling "drained", "frustrated" and "inadequate". Staff were said to be losing confidence in their ability and, in two groups, were reported to often blame themselves for the negative behaviour. The need for more behaviour-related training for additional support staff was identified in the staff focus group discussions.

4.52   In the pupil focus groups, both primary and secondary pupils reported that negative behaviour in the classroom disrupted lessons and slowed down the learning process for other pupils. This behaviour could prevent other pupils from concentrating on their work. Equally, some teachers were reported to be more affected than others by negative behaviour (particularly when it resulted in confrontation), which also had a detrimental knock-on effect on learning. The following quotes aptly illustrate the above concerns.

Effect on learning:
"*S/he has to stop like every 5 minutes because someone does something*" (P6 group)

"*Sometimes it is quite bad because we don't get as much work done because the teacher is talking to the badly behaved pupils*" (S1 to S3 group).

"*I don't think it is affecting the way we are learning because we are still learning the same stuff, we are just getting interrupted so it is taking us longer to do our work*" (P7 group).

"*It's quite hard to just get your head down and forget about it all and just work*" (P7 group).

"*It really annoyed me that, the fact that the thing that I am getting with a teacher is being jeopardised because someone can't behave*" (S4 to S6 group).

4.53   Pupils in the focus groups also concurred with teachers about the effect the negative behaviour of others in the classroom had on them. Several reported that it was "annoying" and distracting, while a number referred to the unfairness of "bad" pupils receiving all the teacher's attention. There was felt to sometimes be a disproportionate focus on poor

behaviour. At the same time, it was reported to be unfair when the whole class was punished for the behaviour of one pupil. A few groups also noted that negative behaviour could escalate once one pupil started misbehaving, especially if the teacher failed to contain the behaviour. Once again, the following quotes illustrate pupils' comments.

Effect on you/other pupils:

"*It can make you pretty angry as well if you are trying to do your work and people are just non-stop talking or shouting out. You just get bored with it after a time*" (P6 group).

"*People that are bad get all the attention and people that are good are just left sitting there*" (P6 group).

"*We don't get anything back. They're getting praise for being bad, but we've been good all day but we don't feel like we're being praised at all*" (P6 group).

"*The good behaviour is hardly noticed, but the bad behaviour everybody seems to find out about it. It is like gossip, more of the bad things get discussed instead of the good things*" (P6 group).

"*The whole class gets into trouble for just one person. If someone throws something and it hits someone and no one owns up, then everyone gets into trouble and everyone starts playing up*" (P7 group).

"[It is like] *a flight of stairs and a rising water level. There are people at the higher stairs but the less the teacher controls it, the quicker the water rises and the people at the top get affected*" (S4 to S6 group).

Summary

- As noted previously, the majority of headteachers surveyed indicated that pupils were generally well behaved in the classroom. Secondary headteachers were more likely than their primary counterparts to report that 'a few', or 'some' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom. The tiny number of headteachers (2 per cent) who reported that 'most', or 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved in the classroom were primary headteachers. Factors affecting this might include: the small size of the school; higher levels of deprivation; or higher levels of special educational needs.

- Teachers, additional support staff and pupils were generally less positive than headteachers about pupil behaviour in lessons. Additional support staff and pupils were more likely than teachers to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'some', or 'most' lessons. Teachers and additional support staff in primary schools were more likely than their secondary colleagues to report that pupils were badly behaved in 'none/almost none' of their lessons. However, of the tiny number of teachers (2 per cent) who stated that pupils were badly behaved in 'all/almost all' lessons, most were from primary schools.

- The classroom behaviours encountered by school staff (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) most frequently within a typical week of teaching were low level, in particular 'talking out of turn', 'making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise', 'hindering or distracting others' and 'pupils leaving their seat without permission'. More serious indiscipline, such as physical violence or aggression, was far less likely

to occur on a daily basis, and was hardly ever directed at school staff. These findings are very much in line with those of the 2004 Edinburgh University study. School staff in the current survey indicated that, generally, this was typical of the classroom experience in their schools.

- The very few incidents of racist or sexist abuse towards staff, and physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported in the survey, occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary. Increasing numbers of 3- and 4-year olds were reported to be entering mainstream education with often complex difficulties, or a lack of basic social skills, which quite often resulted in behavioural problems. Aggression or violence towards staff at that age may well be inadvertent (for example, as a result of a tantrum, or of a particular condition such as autism), and may represent a method, albeit an inappropriate one, of communicating with staff.

- Additional support staff in the survey were consistently more likely than teachers to identify low-level behaviours (particularly 'calculated idleness/work avoidance', 'pupils leaving their seat without permission', 'cheeky/impertinent remarks' and 'general rowdiness/horseplay'), as happening in lessons several times daily. This could well be related to the perception, which is borne out by additional support staff comments in focus groups, that pupils can be more disrespectful to, and often less inclined to do as they are asked by, support staff.

- The low-level indiscipline identified so frequently on a daily basis by teachers and additional support staff in the school survey was far less likely to referred on to, or directly encountered by, headteachers. Again, this is most likely due to the fact that headteachers are more removed from the daily classroom situation. At the same time, it is highly unlikely that such low-level behaviour would be referred on to them.

- However, as identified in the previous Edinburgh University study and reported by staff in the focus groups in the current study, it is the constant "drip, drip effect" (Munn *et al*., 2004) of low-level bad behaviour that grinds school staff down and contributes to a lowering of morale. Analysis revealed that the more confident teachers felt in responding to indiscipline in the classroom, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour. This may highlight an important CPD issue for those teachers who reported not feeling confident in dealing with indiscipline in the classroom.

- At the same time, teachers and additional support staff who reported feeling more supported in school, were also less likely to report incidents of negative behaviour in the classroom. This may indicate a significant issue for whole-school approaches to managing behaviour if staff do not feel sufficiently supported to be able to deal with certain types of indiscipline.

- Pupils also identified low-level indiscipline as the type of behaviour they observed in most of their lessons. The classroom behaviours they reported as occurring several times daily emerged as broadly similar to those reported by teachers and additional support staff. Pupils did report incidents of being rude to teachers and of being rowdy more frequently than staff.

- The most challenging classes for school staff were identified as P7 and P6 in primary schools, and S4, S3 and S2 in secondary schools, although S2 was identified as more of a problem by teachers than by headteachers. However, teachers in the survey secondary schools reported that they could cope with the behaviour of the majority of their classes.

- Most teachers in the survey, particularly those in primary schools, did not find any of the behaviours they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. Headteachers and teachers reported that it was the low-level behaviours identified most frequently by school staff (in particular, talking out of turn), that had the greatest negative impact on teaching.

- Staff focus group participants noted that dealing with such behaviour "wasted" teachers' time and hindered teaching and learning. It was also said to be unfair to other pupils and could have a detrimental effect on the behaviour of other pupils, because they saw poor behaviour being "rewarded" through increased teacher attention. Teachers and support staff reported feeling "drained" and worn down by the constant low-level indiscipline they encountered.

- Pupil comments from their focus groups echoed those of school staff. They reported that negative behaviour in the classroom disrupted lessons and slowed down the learning process. Such behaviour was said to be "annoying" and unfair when "bad" pupils received all the teacher's attention. At the same time, it was reported to be unfair when the whole class was punished for the behaviour of one pupil. Some pupils noted that negative behaviour could escalate, especially if not contained by the teacher.

PART TWO:
BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

CHAPTER FIVE   POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL

Introduction

5.1   This chapter focuses on the extent and type of positive behaviour around the school, including how well behaved pupils are and the sorts of positive behaviour that are evident around the school. The findings are drawn from the school staff and pupil surveys.

How well behaved are pupils around the school?

5.2   In the school staff survey, headteachers, teachers and additional support staff were asked to identify, on a 5-point scale, how many pupils they found to be generally well behaved around the school. Table 5.1 shows that, for all members of staff, the vast majority indicated that 'most or 'all/almost all' of the pupils they encountered around the school were generally well behaved. In total, 99 per cent of headteachers stated that 'most' or 'all/almost all' pupils generally behaved well around school, followed by teachers (91 per cent) and then additional support staff (84 per cent).

5.3   This pattern of responses – headteachers being most positive in their appraisals of pupils' behaviour around school followed by teachers, then support staff – matches that found as regards their perceptions of positive and negative behaviour in the classroom (see Chapters Three and Four). Once again, this underlines the difference in the 'world views' of the respondent types. What is noteworthy about positive behaviour around the school, however, is that the difference between the opinions of the 3 groups of school staff is less pronounced than, say, it was as regards their perceptions of positive behaviour in the classroom.

Table 5.1 The proportion of pupils considered by headteachers, teachers and additional support staff to be generally well behaved around the school

Proportion of pupils who are generally well behaved around the school	Headteachers		Teachers		Additional support staff	
	(N)	**(%)**	**(N)**	**(%)**	**(N)**	**(%)**
All/almost all	187	49	252	23	79	16
Most	193	50	734	68	344	69
Some	2	1	81	8	69	14
Few	0	0	8	1	8	2
None/almost none	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	2	1	5	1	1	<1
TOTAL	384	100	1080	100	501	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

5.4   Analysis by school sector, displayed in Table 5.2, shows that the primary school staff who were surveyed considered more pupils to be generally well behaved around the school than their secondary colleagues. Specifically, higher proportions of primary school respondents stated that 'all/almost all' pupils were generally well behaved around the school, with higher proportions of secondary staff recording that 'most' were generally well behaved in this context.

Table 5.2 The proportion of pupils considered by headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (primary and secondary) to be generally well behaved around the school

Proportion of pupils who are generally well behaved around the school	Headteacher		Teachers		Additional support staff	
	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)	Primary (%)	Secondary (%)
All/almost all	61	34	34	14	34	5
Most	39	65	62	74	60	74
Some	1	1	4	11	5	19
Few	0	0	<1	1	1	2
None/almost none	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

5.5 In the pupil survey involving 7 schools, respondents were also asked to indicate, on a 5-point scale, how many pupils they thought were generally well behaved around the school building. Table 5.3 shows that just under two-thirds of pupils (63 per cent) thought that 'most' or 'all' generally behaved well around the school. A further quarter (26 per cent) recorded that 'some' pupils were generally well behaved in this context. Of note is that nearly one-tenth (9 per cent) stated that only a 'few' pupils or 'none' were generally well behaved around school; a much higher proportion than that found in the responses of school staff. Of all the groups surveyed, pupils were most negative in their appraisals of positive pupil behaviour around the school, just as they were regarding classroom behaviour (see, for example, Chapter Three). Thus, this is again in line with earlier findings (paragraph 5.3 above, as well as Chapters Three and Four) whereby perceptions of positive behaviour differed depending on respondents' 'world view'.

Table 5.3 The proportion of pupils considered by pupils (overall, primary and secondary) to be generally well behaved around the school

Proportion of pupils who are generally well behaved around the school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
All	30	2	13	5	17	2
Most	891	61	201	70	690	60
Some	383	26	58	20	325	28
Few	113	8	14	5	99	9
None	13	1	0	0	13	1
No response	31	2	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	1461	100	286	100	1144	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

5.6 Analysis of pupil responses by school sector revealed that, as was the case with the staff data, those from primary schools were more likely to respond positively about behaviour around the school. As Table 5.3 illustrates, three-quarters (75 per cent) of the surveyed primary pupils compared with nearer three-fifths (62 per cent) of their secondary peers

registered that the majority of pupils ('most' or 'all/almost all') were generally well behaved around the school.

What sort of positive behaviour is in evidence around the school?

5.7   In the school staff survey, headteachers and teachers were presented with a list of 9 different types of positive behaviour that staff might encounter in the course of their duties around the school, and were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale how frequently, in the last full teaching week, they had come across each behaviour type. Tables 5.4 to 5.5 relay the responses of headteachers and teachers to this inquiry.

5.8   When examining Tables 5.4 and 5.5, it is immediately noticeable that headteachers were consistently more positive than teachers in their assessment of the frequency with which the positive pupil behaviours were evident over the last full teaching week. Thus, the difference in perception depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type is once more apparent.

5.9   For both the surveyed headteachers and teachers, 'pupils greeting staff pleasantly' was the most frequently cited positive behaviour around the school, with over four-fifths (84 per cent) of headteachers and two-thirds (66 per cent) of the teachers observing this several times daily. Next most often encountered by both respondent types was 'pupils actively helping their peers'. There was some difference of opinion regarding the third most frequently encountered behaviour: for teachers, it was 'pupils taking turns', whilst for headteachers, it was 'pupils queuing in an orderly manner' (a behaviour observed far less often by teachers).

5.10   Among the lesser observed behaviours were 'pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks' and 'pupils respecting toilet / break / cloakroom areas'. However, of all the positive behaviours studied, 'pupils challenging others' negative behaviour' was by far the least frequently occurring, with 15 per cent of headteachers and 28 per cent of teachers stating that they had not encountered this behaviour at all in the last full teaching week.

5.11   Analysis by school sector revealed that primary school staff reported encountering the positive behaviours around the school more frequently than their secondary counterparts. In particular, 'pupils taking turns', 'pupils using litter bins' and 'pupils actively helping their peers' emerged as much more common in primary schools. 'Pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks' was the only positive behaviour that, according to the staff's questionnaire responses, occurred more frequently at secondary than at primary level. This may be attributable to the fact that a number of respondents, especially those from primary schools, stated that pupils were not allowed to use facilities during break times.

5.12   Earlier chapters in this report have established correlations between the extent of teachers' confidence in responding to indiscipline and their perceptions of pupils' behaviour. For example, the more confident teachers felt, the more likely they were to observe incidences of positive behaviour in the classroom (see Chapter Three). Such an association was also apparent in terms of positive behaviour around the school. Again, the more confidence that teachers felt they possessed with regard to dealing with indiscipline in their classrooms, the more inclined they were to report experience of positive behaviours around the school. This was true of all types of positive behaviour around the school included in the

questionnaire, with the exception of 'pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks'.

5.13   Likewise, an association was established between the levels of support teachers identified as being available to them and perceptions of positive behaviour around the school. Specifically, the more supported teachers felt, the more likely they were to report encountering positive behaviour around the school. This was true of all types of positive behaviour under consideration, and also corresponds with findings presented in Chapters Three and Four whereby school support was linked with perceptions of positive classroom behaviours[6].

---

[6] It is important to note here that, as previous chapters have documented, the correlations that reveal associations between teacher confidence and their perceptions of positive behaviour around the school, and associations between school support for teachers and their perceptions of positive behaviour around the school, do not establish the direction of causality.

Table 5.4 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour around the school from the perspective of headteachers

Type of behaviour	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	N/A (%)	No response (%)
Pupils actively helping their peers	76	10	8	5	<1	<1	1
Pupils taking turns	73	10	6	3	2	3	3
Pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks	64	13	6	5	2	10	1
Pupils engaged in playing games and sports together	73	16	8	3	0	<1	1
Pupils queuing in an orderly manner	74	19	4	1	1	1	1
Pupils respecting toilet / break /cloakroom areas	65	17	9	2	3	2	3
Pupils using litter bins	71	14	7	4	1	1	2
Pupils greeting staff pleasantly	84	9	5	1	0	0	1
Pupils challenging others' negative behaviour	13	17	17	32	15	4	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Table 5.5 Frequency of types of positive pupil behaviour around the school from the perspective of teachers

Type of behaviour	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	N/A (%)	No response (%)
Pupils actively helping their peers	56	17	11	14	2	1	<1
Pupils taking turns	51	18	12	9	3	6	2
Pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks	34	18	13	11	6	17	2
Pupils engaged in playing games and sports together	46	19	12	9	5	8	2
Pupils queuing in an orderly manner	43	23	13	13	5	3	1
Pupils respecting toilet / break / cloakroom areas	34	15	16	13	11	8	3
Pupils using litter bins	44	14	15	16	7	3	1
Pupils greeting staff pleasantly	66	16	9	7	1	<1	1
Pupils challenging others' negative behaviour	13	12	13	27	28	5	2

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Summary

- The vast majority of the school staff surveyed indicated that 'all/almost all' or 'most' of the pupils they encountered around the school were generally well behaved. Headteachers were the most positive followed by teachers and then support staff. Pupils were most negative in their assessment of their peers' behaviour around the school. Thus, differences in perceptions of behaviour depending on the 'world view' of the respondent type were again apparent (though it was of note that the difference in the opinions of the 3 groups of school staff regarding positive behaviour around school was less pronounced than, say, it was in relation to positive behaviour in the classroom).

- When headteachers and teachers were asked to rate the frequency with which they had encountered a list of 9 positive behaviours around the school over the last full teaching week, 'pupils greeting staff pleasantly' and 'pupils actively helping their peers' were the most frequently cited. In contrast, 'pupils challenging others' negative behaviour' emerged as the least observed behaviour.

- Headteachers were consistently more positive than teachers in their appraisals of the frequency with which the 9 positive behaviours were evident around the school. Primary school staff reported seeing the positive behaviours more often than their secondary colleagues.

- The more confident teachers felt themselves to be with regard to responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the more likely they were to report observing positive behaviours around the school. Similarly, the more supported teachers felt by their schools, the more likely they were to register encountering positive behaviours around the school.

CHAPTER SIX   NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Introduction

6.1   Chapter Six considers the extent and type of negative pupil behaviour in evidence around the school, as well as how typical that behaviour is, and examines the effect such behaviour has on staff and pupils. It then focuses on the frequency and nature of complaints received by headteachers from the general public, local community or the media, about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises.   The chapter ends by considering perceptions of the extent and nature of pupil violence in school and staff experiences of pupil violence.

How badly behaved or difficult to deal with are pupils around school?

6.2   Headteachers and teachers in the survey schools were asked to identify on a 5-point scale how many pupils they found badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with when moving around the school. Table 6.1 presents their responses.

Table 6.1 The number of pupils considered by headteachers and teachers to be generally badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with around school

Number of pupils generally badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with around school	Headteachers		Teachers	
	(N)	**(%)**	**(N)**	**(%)**
All/almost all	4	1	10	1
Most	5	1	32	3
Some	58	15	348	32
Few	229	60	560	52
None/almost none	80	21	112	10
No response	8	2	18	2
TOTAL	384	100	1080	100

Notes to table Percentages do not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.3   Table 6.1 shows that, as with behaviour in lessons, headteachers were generally more positive than teachers about the behaviour of their pupils around school. More than four-fifths (81 per cent) of headteachers surveyed reported that a 'few' or 'none/almost none' of their pupils were badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with around school, compared with just over three-fifths (62 per cent) of teachers. Teachers were more than twice as likely as headteachers to report that 'some', or 'most', pupils were badly behaved around school.

6.4   Analysis by school sector, shown in Table 6.2 overleaf, revealed that negative behaviour around school was identified as more of a problem in secondary schools than in primary schools. This is perhaps not surprising given the different nature of secondary schools, being larger with more movement around school between lessons, and pupils allowed off site, for example, to visit local shops. Indeed, secondary staff in the focus groups identified off-site locations at breaktimes and lunchtimes as particularly problematic in terms of behaviour. In one focus group of secondary teachers, the problem of chip vans at

lunchtimes, which caused problems between pupils from two neighbouring schools was particularly highlighted. As with negative behaviour in the classroom, the tiny number of headteachers (2 per cent) who reported that 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved around school, were primary headteachers. This may be due to the fact that primary schools are usually smaller and headteachers often have more of a physical presence around school, for example, in playgrounds, or again, may reflect the phenomenon of younger pupils in primary schools exhibiting anti-social behaviour. There was little difference in the numbers of primary and secondary teachers reporting that most, or all/almost all, their pupils were badly behaved around school, although primary teachers were less likely to report that some or a few pupils were badly behaved.

Table 6.2   The number of pupils considered by headteachers and teachers in both primary and secondary schools to be generally badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with around school

Number of pupils generally badly behaved and/or difficult to deal with around school	Headteachers		Teachers	
	Primary (%)	**Secondary (%)**	**Primary (%)**	**Secondary (%)**
All/almost all	2	0	1	1
Most	1	2	2	4
Some	11	21	22	43
Few	54	70	58	48
None/almost none	32	7	17	4
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

What sort of negative behaviour is in evidence around the school?

6.5   Headteachers and teachers in the survey schools were presented with a list of 23 behaviours around school, once again largely based on the 18 used in the 2004 survey conducted by Edinburgh University (Munn *et al*., 2004)[7]. Headteachers were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale how frequently, during the last teaching week, each behaviour had either been referred on to them, or directly encountered by them. Teachers were asked to indicate on the same 5-point scale how often they had encountered each behaviour around school.

---

[7] The five additional behaviours around school included in the current survey were: physical violence towards other pupils (such as punching, kicking, use of a weapon); physical violence towards staff (such as punching, kicking, use of a weapon); pupils deliberately excluding others; pupils withdrawing from interaction with their peers; and pupils truanting.

Table 6.3 Frequency of types of pupil behaviour encountered around school by headteachers and teachers

Type of behaviour	Headteachers						Teachers					
	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	No response (%)	Several times daily (%)	Once a day (%)	3 or 4 times a week (%)	Once or twice a week (%)	Not at all (%)	No response (%)
Running in the Corridor	14	17	11	36	21	1	30	22	14	26	8	1
Unruliness while waiting (e.g. to enter classrooms)	7	10	12	43	28	1	25	22	14	29	10	1
Showing lack of concern for others	6	10	15	47	19	3	24	17	18	29	12	1
Persistently infringing school rules	9	9	10	43	27	2	25	14	15	30	16	1
Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	9	12	11	37	28	3	22	13	15	29	20	1
Loitering in 'prohibited' areas	8	8	13	26	42	3	19	14	10	25	30	2
Leaving school premises without permission	3	6	8	23	59	2	5	6	6	21	60	2
General pupil rowdiness or mucking about	9	8	17	42	23	1	23	12	18	31	15	1
Use of mobile phones/texting	6	5	7	16	64	2	19	8	7	12	53	1
Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking/damage)	1	1	3	23	70	3	2	3	5	24	66	1
Racist abuse towards other pupils	0	0	0	7	90	3	<1	<1	<1	8	91	1
Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	<1	<1	1	7	90	2	1	1	2	13	83	1
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	7	7	17	40	27	1	14	9	15	35	27	1
Racist abuse towards you	0	0	0	1	98	1	0	<1	<1	1	99	<1
Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	0	0	0	0	98	2	<1	0	<1	2	97	1
General verbal abuse towards you	0	1	1	10	86	2	2	2	5	19	71	1
Physical aggression towards other pupils	6	4	16	47	24	3	7	6	15	40	31	1
Physical violence towards other pupils	2	3	8	40	45	2	3	3	6	27	59	1
Physical aggression towards you	0	<1	<1	2	96	2	<1	<1	1	3	95	1
Physical violence towards you	0	0	0	1	97	2	0	<1	<1	1	97	2
Pupils deliberately excluding others	1	6	10	48	34	2	4	7	11	44	33	1
Pupils withdrawing from interaction with peers	1	4	6	44	41	4	5	7	10	42	36	1
Pupils truanting	4	5	9	17	62	2	6	6	10	22	56	1

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.6   Table 6.3 shows that the types of behaviour around school encountered most frequently by headteachers and teachers were: 'running in the corridor' (the most frequent response); 'unruliness while waiting' (for example, to enter classrooms); 'persistently infringing school rules'; 'cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses'; 'showing a lack of concern for others'; 'loitering in 'prohibited' areas'; 'general pupil rowdiness or mucking about'; and, to a lesser extent, 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils'. Teachers were more likely than headteachers to identify these behaviours as ones they encountered on a daily basis, particularly unruliness while waiting, probably because it is unlikely that these are behaviours that would be referred on to headteachers. More serious behaviour around school such as racist or sexist abuse towards staff, or towards other pupils, and physical aggression or violence towards staff was rare. Physical aggression and violence towards other pupils was slightly more common, but not usually on a daily basis. Pupils in the focus groups confirmed that more serious incidents, such as "fighting", generally took place outside the classroom.

6.7   Analysis by school sector revealed that incidents of negative behaviour around school were reported more frequently (i.e. at least daily) in secondary schools. Again, this difference may be attributed to the sheer number of pupils; the less supervised nature of breaktimes and lunchtimes in secondary schools; as well as the increased opportunities for negative behaviour provided by moving from lesson to lesson. Secondary school staff in the focus groups particularly referred to corridors and stairs as locations for negative behaviour outside the classroom. In addition, perhaps not surprisingly, particular behaviours such as 'loitering in 'prohibited' areas', 'leaving school premises without permission' and 'pupils truanting' were reported much more frequently in the survey secondary schools. The 'use of mobile phones' was again identified almost exclusively as a secondary school behaviour around school.

6.8   As with negative behaviour in the classroom, the very few incidents of physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported around school occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary. As Chapter Four noted, primary school staff are reported to be coping with increasing numbers of very young children entering mainstream school with quite serious difficulties, or a lack of social skills, which can manifest themselves in negative, or inappropriate behaviour, such as aggression or violence towards staff.

6.9   Analysis revealed an association between teachers' confidence and perceptions of negative behaviour around the school. The more confident teachers felt themselves to be in responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour around school. This was true of all types of negative behaviour around the school included in the survey, with the exception of racism towards pupils or towards staff. Again, this may have implications for CPD for those teachers who reported not feeling confident in dealing with indiscipline.

6.10   At the same time, an association was also revealed between the level of support teachers identified as being available to them and perceptions of negative behaviour around the school: the more supported teachers felt, the less likely they were to report negative behaviour around the school. This was true of all types of negative behaviour around school included in the survey, except for racism towards pupils, or towards staff, sexism towards staff and violence towards staff, again, the direction of causality was not clear.

How typical is that negative behaviour?

6.11   Headteachers in the school staff survey were asked to state whether the pattern of occurrences of different behaviours around school (i.e. the frequency) they had identified as being referred on to them, or directly encountered by them, during the previous teaching week was typical of the general experience around their school. Teachers were asked to say whether the pattern (i.e. the frequency) of behaviours around school they had reported experiencing during the previous teaching week was typical of the experience around their particular school. If either group indicated these behaviours were not typical, they were then asked to explain why not. Table 6.4 below presents the responses of headteachers and teachers.

Table 6.4. Is the pattern/frequency of different around school behaviours identified typical of the general experience around your school?

Is the pattern/frequency of different around school behaviours identified typical of the general experience around your school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteachers						
Yes	331	86	182	88	149	95
No	33	9	25	12	8	5
No response	20	5				
TOTAL	384	100	207	100	157	100
Teachers						
Yes	1011	94	491	93	520	95
No	61	6	35	7	26	5
No response	8	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	1080	100	526	100	546	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.12   Table 6.4 shows that the majority of headteachers (86 per cent) and almost all teachers (94 per cent) reported that the pattern of negative behaviour around the school they had described was **typical** of their particular school. Analysis by school sector revealed that the responses were very similar for primary and secondary teachers, while slightly more secondary headteachers identified the pattern as typical than primary headteachers.

6.13   Of the small number of headteachers who reported that the pattern of negative behaviour around the school was **not typical**, slightly more were primary headteachers, while there was very little difference between the primary and secondary teachers indicating this.

6.14   For the primary headteachers who identified the pattern of negative behaviour around school that they had described as not typical, the overwhelming reason provided for this was that it was affected by individual pupils, or small numbers of pupils, persistently presenting negative behaviour. For secondary headteachers describing the pattern of occurrences of behaviour around the school as not typical, this was mainly because of their limited view. Generally secondary headteachers may not have as great a physical presence around school at

breaktimes and lunchtimes, when the majority of negative behaviour around school was reported to take place. Here again, this may be an issue to be explored in schools further.

6.15   Primary teachers who indicated that the pattern of behaviour around the school they had described was not typical were most likely to respond that the majority of their pupils were well behaved around school, but that there were individual pupils, or small groups of pupils, who persistently presented negative behaviour. The most common response for secondary teachers identifying the pattern of behaviour around school as not typical was their limited view. This may be because secondary teachers do not spend as much time around school (i.e. at breaktimes as lunchtimes) as their primary colleagues. The other reason provided by secondary teachers was individual pupils, or small groups of pupils, persistently presenting negative behaviour around school.

6.16   Once again, it is worth bearing in mind, as Chapter Four noted, when proffering reasons for non-typicality, headteachers and teachers tended to relate these to their experience generally rather than to their experience around school the previous week.

What impact does poor behaviour around the school have on staff and pupils?

6.17   Teachers were asked to report, on a 5-point scale, how difficult they had found it to deal with the types of negative behaviours around school that they had identified encountering during the previous teaching week. Table 6.5 sets out their responses.

Table 6.5 How difficult teachers find it to deal with the negative behaviour they report around school

How difficult teachers found it to deal with the negative behaviours reported around school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Extremely difficult 1	47	4	13	3	34	6
2	128	12	40	8	88	16
3	262	24	97	19	165	30
4	311	29	149	29	162	30
Not difficult at all 5	320	30	221	43	99	18
No response	12	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	1080	100	520	100	548	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.18   The above table shows that almost three-fifths (59 per cent) of the teachers in the school survey did not find the negative behaviour around school that they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. However, this was much more the case for primary teachers, nearly three-quarters (72 per cent) of whom indicated this, than it was for secondary teachers, less than half (48 per cent) of whom indicated that this was the case. Secondary teachers were more likely than their primary colleagues to identify some degree of difficulty in dealing with negative behaviour around the school (e.g. one in five compared with one in ten).

6.19   Headteachers in the school survey were invited to identify up to 3 negative behaviours around school, in the list of 23 they had been presented with, which had had the greatest negative impact on staff duties around the school during the previous teaching week. Teachers were asked to identify up to 3 negative behaviours around school that had had the greatest negative impact on their duties around school during the previous teaching week. Table 6.6 presents the highest ranking negative behaviours around school (as identified by one in 10 or more headteachers and teachers).

6.20   Table 6.6 shows that the negative behaviours around school identified by headteachers and teachers to have had the greatest impact on staff duties around school were very similar. Two extra behaviours, 'deliberately excluding others' and 'physical violence towards other pupils', emerged for headteachers as having the greatest impact. For headteachers, 'general pupil rowdiness or mucking about' was the negative behaviour around school that had the greatest impact, whilst for teachers it was 'unruliness while waiting',. 'General verbal abuse', 'cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses', 'physical aggression towards other pupils' and 'loitering in prohibited areas' were reported by headteachers as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school than by teachers. 'Showing a lack of concern for others', 'persistently infringing school rules' and 'running in the corridor' were identified by teachers as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school than by headteachers.

Table 6.6 Negative behaviours around school reported by headteachers and teachers to have had the greatest negative impact on staff duties around the school (from 23 possible choices)

Negative behaviours around school reported by headteachers and teachers to have had the greatest negative impact on staff duties	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteachers						
General pupil rowdiness/mucking about	131	34	56	15	75	20
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	119	31	74	19	45	12
Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	118	31	54	14	64	17
Persistently infringing school rules	95	25	40	10	55	14
Showing lack of concern for others	90	23	50	13	40	10
Physical aggression towards other pupils	89	23	70	18	19	5
Unruliness while waiting	73	19	42	11	31	8
Loitering in prohibited areas	55	14	15	4	40	10
Running in corridor	50	13	34	9	16	4
Pupils deliberately excluding others	42	11	36	9	6	2
Physical violence towards other pupils	41	11	32	8	9	2
Teachers						
Unruliness while waiting (e.g. to enter class)	401	37	212	20	189	18
General pupil rowdiness/mucking about	382	35	145	13	237	22
Showing lack of concern for others	357	33	134	12	163	15
Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	328	30	124	11	204	19
Persistently infringing school rules	317	29	116	11	201	19
Running in the corridor	249	23	150	14	99	9
General verbal abuse towards other pupils	220	20	115	11	105	10
Physical aggression towards other pupils	140	13	110	10	30	3
Loitering in prohibited areas	133	12	35	3	98	9

Notes to table Multiple response question: school staff could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.21   Analysis by school sector revealed that 'physical aggression towards other pupils' and, to a lesser extent, 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils' and 'running in the corridor' were identified as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school by primary headteachers than by secondary headteachers. 'Unruliness while waiting', 'running in the corridor', 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils' and 'physical aggression towards other pupils' were identified as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school by primary teachers than by secondary teachers.

Complaints about pupil behaviour from the general public, local community or the media.

6.22   Headteachers were asked to report how frequently, if at all, they received complaints from the general public, local community, or the media about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises. Their responses are presented in Table 6.7 below.

Table 6.7 Frequency of complaints received from the general public, local community or the media, as a result of negative behaviour shown by pupils outside the school premises

Frequency of complaints received by headteachers about negative pupil behaviour outside the school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Frequently 1	12	3	0	0	12	7
Sometimes 2	100	26	18	9	82	49
Rarely 3	135	35	74	35	61	37
Never/almost never 4	133	35	121	57	12	7
No response	4	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	384	100	213	100	167	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.23   As Table 6.7 shows, complaints from the general public, local community or the media were not frequently received. Nearly three-quarters (70 per cent) of headteachers reported that they 'rarely' or 'never/almost never' received complaints about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises, while just over a quarter (26 per cent) reported 'sometimes' receiving complaints.

6.24   Not surprisingly, analysis by school sector revealed that secondary headteachers were more likely than their primary colleagues to report receiving complaints about the conduct of their pupils outside school. Over half (56 per cent) of secondary headteachers reported 'frequently' or 'sometimes' receiving complaints, compared with less than one in 10 (9 per cent) of primary headteachers. Just over two-fifths (44 per cent) of secondary headteachers reported 'rarely' or 'never/almost never' receiving complaints, compared with the vast majority (92 per cent) of primary headteachers. Again, this difference is most likely to be attributable to the fact that secondary pupils have increased opportunity to go off site during the school day (for example, to visit local shops), as well as the increased movement of secondary pupils around the school between lessons, which can facilitate truancy. In addition, secondary pupils are more likely to travel to and from school by themselves, thus allowing greater opportunity for negative behaviour in the local community before and after school, whereas the majority of primary pupils will be brought to school by parents/carers.

6.25   Headteachers who reported 'frequently' or 'sometimes' receiving complaints from the general public, local community or the media about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises were asked to indicate (from a choice of 6 possibilities) the basis for these complaints. They were also invited to suggest any other behaviours outside the school premises about which they had received complaints. Table 6.8 presents their responses.

Table 6.8 Basis of complaints to headteachers regarding negative pupil behaviour outside the school premises

Basis of complaints regarding negative behaviour	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Cheeky or impertinent remarks to members of the public	58	52	11	61	47	50
Verbal abuse towards any individual (pupils/teachers/the public)	41	37	12	67	29	31
Physical aggression towards any individual (pupils/teachers/public)	21	19	7	39	14	15
Physical destructiveness	49	44	9	50	40	43
General rowdiness/horseplay	75	67	9	50	66	70
Anti-social behaviour	66	59	6	33	60	64
Other	35	32	1	6	34	36
No response	2	2	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	345	100	55	100	292	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Multiple response question: headteachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.26   Table 6.8 shows that the most common basis for a complaint about negative pupil behaviour outside school to be made to the headteacher was 'general rowdiness/horseplay', closely followed by 'anti-social behaviour' and then 'cheeky or impertinent remarks to members of the public'. Primary headteachers were more likely to report 'verbal abuse' and 'cheeky or impertinent remarks' as the basis for complaints about negative pupil behaviour outside school, while secondary headteachers were more likely to report 'general rowdiness/horseplay' and 'anti-social behaviour'. Interestingly, primary headteachers were more likely than their secondary counterparts to report 'physical aggression towards any individual (other pupils, teachers or members of the public)' and, to a lesser extent, 'physical destructiveness'. However, it should be noted that less than one in 10 primary headteachers (9 per cent) had indicated frequently or sometimes receiving complaints and thus, it is this tiny minority that were responding to the question about the nature of complaints.

6.27   When asked to indicate any other negative behaviours outside the school premises that had culminated in complaints being made, responses focused overwhelmingly on litter. This was the only behaviour identified by primary headteachers who responded and was identified by four-fifths (82 per cent) of the secondary headteachers responding. Other behaviours identified by secondary headteachers, but to a far lesser degree, included: road safety (12 per cent); school transport (6 per cent); gangs (6 per cent); behaviour in shops (6 per cent); and snowballing (3 per cent).

Violence in school

6.28   As the Introduction to this report noted, teachers in the 2004 Edinburgh University survey expressed concerns about the level of pupil-on-pupil aggression (Munn *et al.*, 2004). The *Policy Update on Behaviour in Scottish Schools* identified a need to consider "the minority of more serious indiscipline" (Scottish Executive, 2004) and recommended the development of further approaches to prevent, and respond to, pupil-on-pupil violence or aggression. The current survey sought to explore this issue further by focusing on

perceptions of the extent and nature of pupil violence towards other pupils and towards school staff.

6.29   As a result, school staff in the current survey were asked to report whether they felt that pupil violence was a problem in their school. Table 6.9 below presents the response of headteacher, teachers and additional support staff.

Table 6.9   Headteacher, teacher and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) responses to 'do you feel that pupil violence is a problem in your school?'

Is pupil violence a problem in school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteachers						
Yes	103	27	40	19	63	38
No	275	72	171	81	104	62
No Response	6	2	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	384	100	211	100	167	100
Teachers						
Yes	364	34	110	21	254	47
No	705	65	416	79	289	53
No Response	11	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	1080	100	526	100	543	100
Additional support staff						
Yes	162	32	33	18	129	42
No	334	67	153	82	181	58
No Response	5	1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL	501	100	186	100	310	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.30   As Table 6.9 shows, headteachers, teachers and additional support staff did not perceive pupil violence to be a particular problem in their school. This was the response of almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of the headteachers in the sample, almost two-thirds (65 per cent) of teachers and just over two-thirds (67 per cent) of additional support staff. Teachers were thus the least positive of the 3 groups with just over a third reporting pupil violence was a problem.

6.31   Analysis by school sector revealed that the problem of pupil violence was considered to be more serious by secondary school staff, particularly secondary teachers. For example, almost two-fifths (38 per cent) of secondary headteachers, nearly half (47 per cent) of secondary teachers and two-fifths of secondary additional support staff (42 per cent) reported that pupil violence was a problem in their school, compared with around a fifth of primary headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (19, 21 and 18 per cent respectively).

6.32   Comparing the figures in Table 6.9 above with those from the Edinburgh University survey in 2004 (Munn *et al*., 2004), it can be seen that, although the percentage of secondary headteachers stating that violence was a problem in 2004 has remained pretty much the same in 2006 (only reducing from 40 per cent in 2004 to 38 per cent in 2006), the percentage of primary headteachers stating it was a problem in 2004 has fallen considerably by 2006 (36 per cent in 2004, 19 per cent in 2006). The percentage of primary teachers in 2004 reporting that pupil violence was a problem has remained similar in 2006 (though rising slightly from

20 per cent in 2004 to 21 per cent in 2006), but the percentage of secondary teachers reporting that it was a problem has risen from 43 per cent in 2004 to 47 per cent in 2006. Thus, primary headteachers surveyed in 2006 perceived pupil violence to be less of a problem than those primary headteachers surveyed in 2004, while secondary teachers surveyed in 2006 perceived it to be slightly more of a problem than those secondary teachers surveyed in 2004. There are no data on additional support staff from the 2004 survey with which to compare the responses of additional support staff in the current survey.

6.33   In the current survey, those staff who responded that pupil violence **was** a problem in their school (27 per cent of headteachers, 34 per cent of teachers and 32 per cent of additional support staff) were asked to elaborate on this by specifying which types of violence, from a choice of 4 (for headteachers and teachers) and 6 (for additional support staff), were a problem. Table 6.10 overleaf sets out their responses, calculated as a percentage of the total sample.

6.34   Staff who reported that pupil violence was a problem in their school were most likely to cite pupil-to-pupil verbal abuse/aggression. The percentage of reports of physical violence towards other pupils were similar for the 3 groups of staff – although slightly lower for headteachers. At the same time, a higher percentage of teachers and additional support staff identified 'verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers' than did headteachers. Of the sample overall, a fifth of additional support staff identified 'verbal abuse/aggression towards support assistants' as an issue. Physical violence towards teachers was reported to be rare, with 2 per cent of all headteachers, 4 per cent of teachers and 4 per cent of additional support staff identifying it. In addition, 4 per cent of additional support staff cited physical violence towards support staff.

6.35   Examining the data by school sector revealed that for those staff (27 per cent of headteachers, 34 per cent of teachers and 32 per cent of additional support staff) who indicated that pupil violence was a problem in their school:

- 'Verbal abuse/aggression pupil-to-pupil' and 'physical violence pupil-to-pupil' were cited more by all 3 staff groups (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) in secondary schools than in primary schools.
- 'Verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers' was noted more by all 3 staff groups (headteachers, teachers and additional support staff) in secondary schools than in primary schools, particularly by the latter group.
- 'Verbal abuse/aggression' and 'physical violence towards support staff' were cited by more additional support staff in secondary schools than in primary schools.
- The numbers citing 'physical violence towards teachers' were very similar, although this was the case for very slightly more primary headteachers and secondary support staff.

Table 6.10 Types of pupil violence problematic for headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary)

Types of pupil violence	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	**%**	**(N)**	**%**	**(N)**	**%**
Headteachers						
Verbal abuse/aggression pupil to pupil	97	25	39	18	58	34
Physical violence pupil to pupil	80	21	35	16	45	27
Verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers	54	14	16	7	38	22
Physical violence towards teachers	8	2	6	3	2	1
No response	0	0	/	/	/	/
TOTAL RESPONSES	239		96		143	
Teachers						
Verbal abuse/aggression pupil to pupil	340	31	104	20	236	43
Physical violence pupil to pupil	262	24	94	18	168	31
Verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers	274	25	64	12	210	38
Physical violence towards teachers	38	4	19	4	19	3
No response	2	<1	/	/	/	/
TOTAL RESPONSES	916		282		634	
Additional support staff						
Verbal abuse/aggression pupil to pupil	155	31	32	17	123	39
Physical violence pupil to pupil	118	24	27	14	91	29
Verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers	133	27	18	10	115	37
Physical violence towards teachers	20	4	6	3	14	4
Verbal abuse/aggression towards support staff	98	20	20	11	78	25
Physical violence towards support staff	21	4	7	4	14	4
No response	0	0	/	/	/	/
TOTAL RESPONSES	545		110		435	

Notes to table This was a filter question. The numbers are based on those who answered the question 'Do you feel pupil violence is a problem in your school' with 'yes' (103 headteachers; 364 teachers and 162 additional support staff). The percentages are based on all respondents. Multiple response question: school staff could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.36   However, it is important to note here that what constitutes a violent incident for one member of staff may be perceived differently by another. Equally, perceptions of violence can be affected by the context of the school and local area, as shown in the following quote from a local authority interviewee:

> "*There was a long debate about what constitutes anti-social behaviour. So, if a pupil swears at a teacher do you fill a form in every time that happens? If that happened in one of our more difficult areas staff would be sitting all day filling forms in*".

6.37   Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff in the school survey were asked whether they had personally experienced violence against them in the course of their duties in school. It should be noted that, when answering this question, 5 headteachers and 12 teachers specifically noted that they were referring to verbal violence. It is not known how many others may have been referring to this form of violence but did not specify that this was the case.

6.38   Responses to this question were cross-tabulated by the length of time staff had been in their current role. There were 3 bands of service length for headteachers (3 years or less, between 4 and 10 years, and more than 10 years); 4 bands of service length for teachers (3 years or less, between 4 and 7 years, between 8 and 20 years and more than 20 years); and 3 bands of service length for additional support staff (2 years or less; between 3 and 5 years, and more than 5 years). The results are shown in the following bullet points.

Headteachers:

- 18 per cent of headteachers who had been in role for 3 years or less had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 38 per cent of headteachers who had been in role for between 4 and 10 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 47 per cent of headteachers who had been in role for more than 10 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties.

Teachers:

- 19 per cent of teachers who had been in role for 3 years or less had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 31 per cent of teachers who had been in role for between 4 and 7 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 33 per cent of teachers who had been in role for between 8 and 20 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 33 per cent of teachers who had been in role for more than 20 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties.

Additional support staff:

- 21 per cent of additional support staff who had been in role for 2 years or less had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 18 per cent of additional support staff who had been in role for between 3 and 5 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties
- 24 per cent of additional support staff who had been in role for more than 5 years had experienced violence against them in the course of their duties.

6.39   The analysis revealed a significant relationship between experience of violence and the length of time headteachers had been in that role, but not for either of the other two staff groups (teachers and additional support staff). That said, however, far fewer teachers who had been in role for 3 years or less had experienced a violent incident against them compared with the proportion who had been teaching for 4 years or more.

6.40   School staff in the survey who reported experiencing violence towards them were then asked to indicate how many times this had happened. Responses from primary headteachers indicated a mean of 3 and those of secondary headteachers a mean of 2. For both primary and secondary teachers, responses indicated a mean of 3. Responses from primary additional support staff indicated a mean of 4, and responses from secondary additional support staff a mean of 2.

6.41   It is important to note here that analysis showed that the number of times headteachers and additional support staff had experienced a violent incident related to the number of years they had been working in that particular role. For example, of headteachers who reported having experienced a violent incident 3 times, 6 per cent had been in that role for 3 years or less, over a third (39 per cent) for between 4 and 10 years, and over half (56 per cent) for more than 10 years. Of additional support staff who reported having experienced a violent incident 3 times, 7 per cent had been in that role for 2 years or less, over a third (36 per cent) for between 3 and 5 years, and more than half (57 per cent) for more than 5 years.

6.42   For teachers, the relationship between the number of times they had experienced a violent incident against them and the length of time they had been in that role was also evident, but to a slightly lesser extent. For example, of those who reported experiencing a violent incident 3 times, 2 per cent had been in that role for 3 years or less, almost a quarter (24 per cent) for between 4 and 7 years, more than a third (36 per cent) for between 8 and 20 years, and almost two-fifths (38 per cent) for more than 20 years.

6.43   Thus, additional support staff in primary schools who reported experiencing violence towards them also experienced it more often than either headteachers or teachers. This was borne out in the focus group discussions with additional support staff who, although stating that incidences were rare, were more likely than any of the other staff groups to report experiencing violence. One primary support assistant described a personal attack on them as "scary" and something s/he would prefer to forget. When focus group participants were asked at what point staff no longer felt able to cope with negative behaviour, the most common response was physical violence.

6.44   There was also a strong perception amongst additional support staff in the focus groups of a blame culture, with pupils (and their parents) increasingly aware of their rights. Participants spoke of the wisdom of always having a witness if they needed to physically intervene between pupils, something they might do instinctively even though advised not to. A primary teacher in one focus group reported being accused of slapping a pupil when they had merely touched the child's shoulder, while another identified an incident where a classroom assistant had been "hit and kicked", but had not reported the incident for two weeks because they were frightened of the consequences. Staff in the focus groups voiced the need for more training for additional support staff in managing behaviour, particularly a national system of training, rather than always being expected to attend courses in their own time.

6.45   School staff who had indicated that they had experienced violence against them were then asked to indicate whether or not they had reported the incident and, if they had, to whom they had reported it. Table 6.11 presents their responses to the first part of this question – whether or not they had reported the incident.

Table 6.11 Proportion of headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) who did, and did not, report the violent incident

Proportion reporting violent incident	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Headteachers						
Yes	92	71	53	65	39	81
No	30	23	25	31	5	10
No Response	7	5	3	4	4	8
TOTAL	129	100	81	100	48	100
Teachers						
Yes	294	88	134	82	160	94
No	23	7	20	12	3	2
No Response	17	5	10	6	7	4
TOTAL	334	100	164	100	170	100
Additional support staff						
Yes	96	94	37	97	59	98
No	2	2	1	3	1	2
No Response	4	4	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	102	100	38	100	60	100

Notes to table Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.46   Table 6.11 shows that the majority of school staff who indicated that they had experienced violence against them had reported it. This was true for almost three-quarters (71 per cent) of headteachers, over three-quarters (88 per cent) of teachers and almost all (94 per cent) additional support staff.

6.47   Analysis by school sector revealed that headteachers and teachers in secondary schools were more likely than their primary colleagues to report the incident. Over three-quarters (81 per cent) of secondary headteachers had reported an incident against them compared with just under two-thirds (65 per cent) of primary headteachers, while almost all (94 per cent) of secondary teachers had reported an incident compared with over three-quarters (82 per cent) of primary teachers. There was very little difference between the responses of primary and secondary additional support staff (97 and 98 per cent respectively).

6.48   Figure 6.1 below illustrates the person and/or organisation to whom/which staff in the survey had reported the violent incidents they had experienced. It presents the responses overall from headteachers, teachers and additional support staff, as well as by school sector.

Headteachers Overall	Teachers Overall	Additional support staff Overall
Local authority (88%) Police (22%) Health & safety department (5%)	Headteacher (51%) Local authority (20%) School SMT (19%) Deputy headteacher (10%)	Headteacher (44%) School line manager (18%) School SMT (16%) Local authority (7%)
Primary	**Primary**	**Primary**
Local authority (91%) Health & safety department (8%) Parent perpetrator (8%)	Headteacher (76%) Local authority (12%) School SMT (8%)	Headteacher (92%) Class teacher (8%) Local authority (5%)
Secondary	**Secondary**	**Secondary**
Local authority (85%) Police (44%)	Headteacher (31%) School SMT (28%) Local authority (26%) Deputy headteacher (15%) Principal teacher (10%)	School line manager (29%) School SMT (24%) Headteacher (14%) Deputy headteacher (10%) Local authority (9%) Principal teacher (7%)

Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

6.49   Figure 6.1 shows that headteachers were most likely to report violent incidents to the local authority (88 per cent). Teachers and additional support staff were most likely to report a violent incident to the headteacher of the school (51 and 44 per cent respectively). Looking at the above figure according to school sector, the picture remains much the same. However, just over two-fifths (44 per cent) of secondary headteachers also reported referring violent incidents to the police when appropriate, whereas this was not referenced at all by primary headteachers. An interesting difference emerges for additional support staff. Whereas almost all primary support staff (92 per cent) reported referring violent incidents to the headteacher, secondary support staff were more likely to refer incidents to their line manager in school (29 per cent) and SMT (24 per cent) before the headteacher (14 per cent).

6.50   It was apparent from the telephone interviews with local authority representatives that most authorities operated a centralised system for schools to report incidents of violence by pupils to them. Incidents were typically recorded on a form within the school and logged onto a database by the local authority for termly or annual review. Although a number of local authority interviewees referred to an upward trend in violent incidents towards staff, possible reasons given for this (as already identified in Chapter Four) included the rise in "unsocialised" behaviour amongst very young children who can be quite aggressive and of "syndrome-related" behaviours, coupled with the fact that recording systems have become more robust.

> "*Teachers are invited, encouraged and advised to submit a* [violent incident recording] *form if they have been a victim of a violent assault that is either verbal or physical in their schools*" (local authority representative).

> "*I think violence towards teachers is being reported more than it would have been in the past. I think it gives the outward appearance of having risen, but it probably*

hasn't, and it is that it has been reported more now than it would have been in the past" (local authority representative).

6.51   However, this is not to deny the very profound effect violence towards a member of staff can have on that staff member, as borne out in the comments from support staff in the focus groups (see paragraph 6.43). A number of local authority interviewees discussed possible forms that follow-up might take where serious or violent incidents had been recorded by the authority. These included:

- identifying schools with recurring problems for additional support and professional development
- offering support and counselling to affected staff
- in the case of very serious incidents, authorities might instigate risk assessments, with the school looking at the behaviour, how it manifests itself and what can be put in place to minimise the risks to staff and other pupils (e.g. de-escalation/physical intervention training).

Summary

- As with behaviour in lessons, headteachers were generally more positive than teachers about the behaviour of their pupils around school. Teachers were more than twice as likely as headteachers to report that 'some', or 'most', pupils were badly behaved around school.

- Negative behaviour around school was identified as more of a problem in secondary schools than in primary schools. Secondary schools are often larger with more movement around school between lessons, and pupils allowed off site, for example, to visit local shops. Secondary staff in the focus groups identified off-site locations at breaktimes and lunchtimes as particularly problematic in terms of behaviour.

- As with negative behaviour in the classroom, the tiny number of headteachers who reported that 'all/almost all' pupils were badly behaved around school, were primary headteachers.

- They types of behaviour around the school encountered most frequently by headteachers and teachers were: 'running in the corridor' (the most frequent response); 'unruliness while waiting'; 'persistently infringing school rules'; 'cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses'; 'showing a lack of concern for others'; 'loitering in 'prohibited' areas'; 'general pupil rowdiness or mucking about'; and, to a lesser extent, 'general verbal abuse towards other pupils'. Teachers were more likely than headteachers to identify these behaviours as ones they encountered on a daily basis. More serious incidents such as physical aggression or violence towards staff were rare.

- Incidents of negative behaviour around school were reported more frequently (i.e. at least daily) in secondary schools, which is perhaps not surprising given the greater opportunities for such behaviour afforded by moving from lesson to lesson.

Secondary school staff in the focus groups particularly referred to corridors and stairs as locations for negative behaviour outside the classroom. .

- As with negative behaviour in the classroom, the very few incidents of physical aggression or violence towards staff that were reported around school occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary.

- The more confident staff felt in responding to indiscipline in their classrooms, the less likely they were to report incidents of negative behaviour around school. This may have implications for CPD for those teachers who reported not feeling confident in dealing with indiscipline. At the same time, those teachers who identified a greater level of support available to them in school were less likely to report incidents of negative behaviour around school. This may be important in relation to whole-school approaches to behaviour, if some teachers do not feel supported in responding to behaviour around the school.

- The majority of headteachers and teachers surveyed reported that the pattern of negative behaviour around school they had described was typical of their school.

- For primary headteachers who identified the pattern of behaviour around school they had described was not typical, the overwhelming reason was individual pupils, or small groups of pupils, persistently presenting negative behaviour. For secondary headteachers and teachers stating the pattern was not typical, this was mainly because of their limited view of behaviour around school. Primary teachers indicating the pattern was not typical tended to refer to certain pupils presenting persistent negative behaviour. It should be noted though, that headteachers and teachers were asked to relate their answers to their experience during the previous week, but the majority tended to relate them to their experience generally.

- Most teachers, particularly in primary schools, did not find the negative behaviour around school they had reported particularly difficult to deal with. Secondary teachers were more likely than their primary counterparts to identify some degree of difficulty in dealing with negative behaviour around school.

- For headteachers, 'general pupil rowdiness or mucking about' was the negative behaviour around school that had the greatest impact on staff duties, whilst for teachers it was 'unruliness while waiting'. 'General verbal abuse', 'cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses', 'physical aggression towards pupils' and 'loitering in prohibited areas' were reported by headteachers as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school than by teachers. 'Showing a lack of concern for others', 'persistently infringing school rules' and 'running in the corridor' were identified by teachers as having a greater negative impact on staff duties around school than by headteachers.

- Complaints were not frequently received by headteachers from the general public, local community or the media about the conduct of their pupils outside the school premises. Secondary headteachers were more likely than primary headteachers to report receiving complaints. The most common basis for a complaint was, for primary headteachers, 'verbal abuse' and 'cheeky or impertinent remarks to members of the public', while for secondary headteachers, it was' general rowdiness/horseplay'

and 'anti-social behaviour'. Another behaviour, reported by both primary and secondary headteachers, to result in complaints to headteachers (not on the list offered to them) was litter.

- Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff did not perceive pupil violence to be a particular problem in their school. Teachers were the least positive of the 3 groups, with just over a third reporting that they thought it was a problem. Pupil violence was considered to be more serious by secondary school staff, particularly secondary teachers.

- Primary headteachers surveyed in the current study in 2006 perceived pupil violence to be less of a problem than those primary headteachers surveyed in the Edinburgh University study in 2004, while secondary teachers surveyed in 2006 perceived it to be more of a problem than those secondary teachers surveyed in 2004. There are no data on additional support staff from the 2004 survey with which to compare the responses of additional support staff in the current survey.

- Staff reporting pupil violence as a problem in their school were most likely to cite 'pupil-to-pupil verbal abuse/aggression'. A higher percentage of teachers and additional support staff identified verbal abuse/aggression towards teachers than did headteachers. Physical violence towards teachers was reported to be rare.

- Analysis showed a significant relationship between experience of violence and the length of time headteachers had been in that role, but not for either of the other two staff groups (teachers and additional support staff). That said, however, far fewer teachers who had been in role for 3 years or less had experienced a violent incident compared with the proportion who had been teaching for 4 years or more.

- The majority of school staff who had experienced violence against them had reported it. Headteachers were most likely to report violent incidents to the local authority, and teachers and primary additional support staff to the headteacher. Secondary support staff were more likely to refer incidents to their line manager in school and SMT before the headteacher. Secondary headteachers also reported referring incidents to the police when appropriate.

- Local authority interviewees confirmed that most authorities operated a centralised system for schools to report incidents of violence by pupils to them. Incidents were typically recorded on a form within the school and logged onto a database by the local authority for termly or annual review. Follow-up after a serious or violent incident had been recorded included: identifying schools in need of additional support; offering direct support and counselling to staff; and (for very serious incidents) instigating risk assessments to look at what can be put in place to minimise the risks to staff and other pupils (e.g. de-escalation/physical intervention training).

PART THREE:
EFFECTIVE PRACTICE IN MANAGING BEHAVIOUR

CHAPTER SEVEN   APPROACHES TO MANAGING BEHAVIOUR

Introduction

7.1   This chapter focuses on approaches to managing behaviour, with specific attention being paid to the following: the use of approaches to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour (at a local authority, school and classroom level); the involvement of the school community in developing strategies; the perceived effectiveness of approaches; and the general supportiveness of parents. The results from the school staff survey constitute the main body of the chapter, however, additional findings from the pupil survey, local authority interviews, staff and pupil focus groups as well as the contextual staff interviews are used to support and contrast key findings.

Approaches to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour

Approaches currently used at a local authority level

7.2   Through discussions with all 32 local authority personnel, it appeared that a number of local authorities were adopting specific strategies/initiatives in relation to the ways in which schools in the authority respond to indiscipline and promote positive behaviour. Specifically, 12 interviewees stated that they were in the process of rolling out Staged Intervention/ Framework for Intervention (FFI) across the authority. Restorative Practices was mentioned by 4 local authority personnel, with an additional 6 stating that they were currently piloting this approach. Finally, the Solution-Oriented school was highlighted by 4 interviewees, with a further 2 individuals stating that it was currently being piloted within their authority.

Approaches currently used at a school and classroom level, as identified by headteachers and teachers

7.3   In the questionnaires sent to headteachers and teachers, a list of 24 specific approaches, that some classroom teachers use to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour, was presented. Respondents were asked to consider each approach and indicate whether it was currently used in their school or not and also, if appropriate to the approach, whether it was available to them off-site. Table 7.1 provides the detail.

7.4   The responses of headteachers and teachers to this question were largely similar, although teachers were more unsure. Responses from headteachers and teachers indicated that a whole range of approaches were in current use in Scotland's schools, as at least two-fifths of respondents (headteachers and teachers) stated that each approach was currently used in their school, with the exception, for teachers, of whole-school initiatives. Results from the staff focus groups and local authority interviews support this finding as an array of different and, often inventive, approaches to managing behaviour were detailed.

7.5   The existence of a current behaviour/discipline policy produced the highest proportional responses from both headteachers and teachers (100 per cent and 97 per cent respectively). This finding is supported by all seven contextual staff interviewees who

confirmed that their school had a behaviour/discipline policy in place, whilst results, from one primary additional support staff focus group, illustrated the perceived importance of a school behaviour policy because of it "…letting everyone know what is expected".

7.6   Historically successful approaches to managing behaviour were employed by the majority of headteachers and teachers, including, for example, rules and rewards for pupils (99 per cent and 95 per cent respectively) and school uniforms (95 per cent and 94 per cent respectively).   School staff in 2 focus groups highlighted the importance of the school uniform as a means of managing behaviour with reasons including the belief that it creates a visual ownership and ensures consistency for pupils in the school. Once again, these findings show the levels of school implementation of BB-BL recommendations.

7.7   The use of BB-BL recommended pupil support aids, such as the pupil support bases, home-school link workers and an integrated support team appeared to be evident to a lesser degree.   However, these were still being currently used by nearly half of respondents. Discussions with local authority interviewees suggested that many local authorities were in the process of actively trying to offer and provide more of these types of resources and approaches to their schools.

7.8   The current employment of a whole-school initiative produced the lowest proportional responses from both headteachers and teachers (45 per cent and 28 per cent respectively). This is likely to be indicative of the changing climate of approaches to managing behaviour, in that they are relatively new and so likely to take time to implement and 'bed in' to the normal working of schools. Indeed, one contextual staff interviewee stated that the hardest thing about a new initiative is "reinforcing it and continuing it", as it often takes time for initiatives to develop and for staff to wholly adopt the working practices of them. This is also mirrored in the words of one local authority interviewee who stated that, in relation to Staged Intervention:

> "…some schools see the value of it but the issues are time, resources, cover. Other schools are really buying into it and it is really working well for them. But, because all the schools are in the initial stages they are requiring a lot of support to keep it going".

7.9   For the majority of approaches, a higher proportion of secondary school staff stated that their school was currently employing each approach. Of those instances when a higher proportion of primary school headteachers and teachers indicated the employment of an approach in their school, examples included, at a significant level, the use of rules and rewards for pupils and the active involvement of pupils in developing the school environment (e.g. eco school project). Qualitative data from the staff focus groups, contextual staff interviews and the pupil focus groups all support this apparent primary dominance, particularly in terms of the use of rules and rewards. Indeed, many primary school interviewees and primary pupils discussed the important role that classroom rules played in primary schools, with pupils often being involved in devising the rules (See paragraph 7.29 for a fuller discussion of pupil involvement in devising school rules).

Table 7.1 Current use of approaches that are used to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour according to headteachers and teachers

Type of approach	Headteachers					Teachers				
	Used in my school	Not used in my school	Available to my school but off-site	Don't Know	No Response	Used in my school	Not used in my school	Available to my school but off-site	Don't Know	No Response
Rules and rewards for pupils	99	1	N/A	0	1	95	2	N/A	1	2
Citizenship/participation activities	97	2	<1	0	1	81	5	1	11	3
School uniform	95	5	N/A	0	1	94	5	N/A	<1	1
Health promotion activities	98	1	-	0	1	94	2	<1	3	1
Buddying/peer mentoring	90	9	N/A	0	1	86	8	N/A	4	1
Parent support activities	55	32	8	1	4	44	24	2	27	3
Learning programme for social, communication and behaviour skills	79	15	4	1	2	59	17	2	20	2
Flexible curriculum options	62	30	2	2	4	49	33	2	15	3
Pupil support base	46	43	7	1	3	60	32	3	4	2
Integrated support team	58	28	8	2	3	57	23	3	14	3
Breaktime supervision	94	4	N/A	0	2	88	8	-	4	1
Home-school link	66	23	6	1	5	67	12	2	16	3
Support assistants	92	6	N/A	0	2	94	4	N/A	2	1
A behaviour/discipline policy	100	0	N/A	0	<1	97	1	N/A	1	1
An anti-bullying policy	98	1	N/A	0	1	95	2	N/A	3	1
Behaviour coordinator (e.g. trained colleague offering support on behaviour issues as in Staged Intervention (FFI))	49	41	6	1	3	43	36	2	17	2
In-service events/input on behaviour	82	8	7	1	2	74	16	3	6	1
Partners from other agencies able to support pupils with behaviour issues	79	10	10	<1	1	64	12	6	16	2
A multi-disciplinary group to plan children's support	68	18	10	2	2	46	21	3	28	2
Specialist consultancy (e.g. educational psychologists, authority advisors)	89	4	7	0	1	87	3	6	5	1
Whole-school initiatives such as Restorative Practices, Motivated School, or Solution-Oriented School	45	45	N/A	2	4	28	36	N/A	33	3
Pupils actively involved in developing ideas and activities in the school (e.g. pupil council)	99	1	N/A	0	1	95	3	N/A	2	1
Pupils actively involved in developing the school environment	85	11	N/A	1	3	73	15	N/A	10	1
Pupils respecting diversity (different nationalities, disabilities)	92	5	N/A	1	2	78	7	N/A	14	1

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

81

7.10   In both headteacher and teacher surveys, respondents were presented with a series of structured approaches in response to indiscipline and asked to rate how often each is employed in their recipient schools. Table 7.2 provides the results.

Table 7.2   Headteacher and teacher ratings of how often structured and staged approaches to indiscipline are used in their school

Rating of how often each approach is used	Frequently (%)	Sometimes (%)	Rarely (%)	Never (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher						
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	16	25	14	38	7	100
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	44	36	13	6	1	100
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	7	50	32	10	2	100
Referral for exclusion	5	31	39	24	1	100
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	19	51	23	6	1	100
Teacher						
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	18	26	22	27	7	100
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	36	39	15	5	6	100
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	6	33	34	20	7	100
Referral for exclusion	7	26	39	22	6	100
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	13	34	30	17	6	100

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.11   Overall, the responses of headteachers and teachers were similar in terms of the approaches that they used the most (i.e. 'frequently' or 'sometimes'). However, headteachers typically stated that they used each approach more frequently than did teachers. For both, over three-quarters (headteachers: 80 per cent; teachers: 75 per cent) stated that they 'frequently' or 'sometimes' made a referral to a key member of staff. Referral for exclusion was the approach that had the lowest proportion of headteachers and teachers stating that they 'frequently' or 'sometimes' used it, however, this still accounts for a third of their responses (headteachers: 36 per cent; teachers: 33 per cent).

7.12   When headteacher and teacher responses were analysed according to the type of school, the dominant finding is that higher proportions of secondary school staff stated that they use approaches 'frequently' when compared with their primary counterparts (See Table 7.3). However, there is an interesting difference in the responses of primary and secondary teachers for planned support and help for the teacher, with a higher proportion of secondary teachers stating that this was 'rarely' provided, when compared to their primary counterparts.

Table 7.3 Headteacher and teacher (primary and secondary) ratings of how often structured and staged approaches to indiscipline are used in their school

Rating of how often each approach is used	Frequently (%)		Sometimes (%)		Rarely (%)		Never (%)		No Response (%)		Total (%)	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Headteacher												
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	6	31	16	39	19	10	59	20	-	-	100	100
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	28	66	42	30	21	4	10	1	-	-	100	100
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	3	11	39	65	41	22	16	3	-	-	100	100
Referral for exclusion	1	11	12	54	45	32	42	2	-	-	100	100
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	17	23	48	55	27	19	9	3	-	-	100	100
Teacher												
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	12	27	18	37	27	20	43	16	-	-	100	100
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	23	51	43	39	24	9	10	1	-	-	100	100
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	5	8	25	45	38	35	32	11	-	-	100	100
Referral for exclusion	1	14	11	43	46	38	43	5	-	-	100	100
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	13	15	37	35	27	36	23	14	-	-	100	100

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, *2006*

Approaches currently used at a school and classroom level, as identified by pupils

7.13   Alongside the headteacher and teacher questionnaires, pupils were presented with a shortened, but similar list of specific approaches, that some schools use to help pupils behave well and to stop bad behaviour. Pupils were asked to consider each approach and indicate whether it was currently used in their school or not. Table 7.4 provides the details.

Table 7.4 Current use of approaches that are used to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour according to pupils

Type of approach	Yes – Used in my school (%)	No – Not used in my school (%)	Don't Know (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
School rules for pupils to follow	95	1	3	<1	100
Rewards for pupils who perform well or behave well	71	14	14	1	100
Citizenship lessons and activities	57	10	32	1	100
School uniform	89	7	3	1	100
Lessons or activities to do with health (e.g. healthy living)	74	10	15	1	100
Pupils who buddy/mentor other pupils	64	14	21	1	100
A place in school where a pupil might go to get extra help for their behaviour	76	7	16	1	100
Staff who are on duty at breaktime	88	4	7	1	100
Other members of staff who help teachers in lessons	84	6	10	1	100
An anti-bullying policy	67	8	24	1	100
A pupil council where pupils meet to talk about school issues	69	10	20	1	100
Environmental / green school projects (e.g. to help look after the school environment)	42	19	38	1	100

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

7.14   Table 7.4 shows that, for all approaches, more than two-fifths of pupils always stated that the approaches were currently used in their school. Pupils identified that school rules were employed most within their schools (95 per cent); however, a lower proportion stated that rewards for pupils who perform well or behave well were used in their schools (71 per cent).

7.15   Two-thirds of pupils were aware of an anti-bullying policy (67 per cent), while nearly a quarter (24 per cent) felt they didn't know whether their school had one or not. Results from the pupil focus groups provide support for this finding as participants in 8 out of the 14 groups stated that they were not aware that their school had an anti-bullying policy. However, in 3 of these schools, pupils attributed this absence of knowledge as a result of low or non-existent levels of bullying within their school.

7.16   Over a fifth of pupils did not know if their school used pupils who buddy/mentor other pupils (21 per cent) or if there was a pupil council where pupils meet to talk about school issues (20 per cent). This may be because pupils' knowledge of these approaches varies according to whether they are personally involved in these types of schemes. This is supported by the findings derived from the pupil focus groups where those who were involved in such activities appeared more informed than those who were not involved.

7.17   The lowest proportion of pupils stated that citizenship lessons and activities (57 per cent) and environmental/green school projects (42 per cent) were employed by teachers within their schools. This result could be due to the fact that these lessons have a lower profile in the curriculum and, hence, pupils have failed to recall their schools use of them, or do not consider them as an approach to behaviour.

7.18   As shown in Table 7.5 overleaf, a higher proportion of primary school pupils stated that the approaches were used in their school, when compared to secondary pupils. There were only 2 instances when a higher proportion of secondary pupils cited the use of approaches in their school compared to primary pupils: knowledge of an anti-bullying policy and a place in school where a pupil might go to get extra help for their behaviour.

7.19   In the pupil questionnaire and the pupil focus groups, respondents were asked whether there was anything else schools could do to help pupils behave well. A third (33 per cent) of pupils stated that **there was more** that schools could do to help pupils behave well including:

- Reward well behaved pupils (overall: 16 per cent; primary: 12 per cent; secondary: 17 per cent). Types of rewards most commonly cited were: trips/days out; prizes/treats (e.g. play games at the end of the day, given sweets); and more certificates and awards
- Punish badly behaved pupils (overall: 8 per cent; primary: 5 per cent; secondary: 9 per cent). Types of punishment most commonly cited were: privileges being taken away (e.g. prevented from playing football or not allowed on school trips); exclusion; expulsion; detention; and physical punishment (e.g. corporal punishment)
- A fairer treatment of pupils by teachers (overall: 7 per cent; primary 0 per cent; secondary: 8 per cent). This was also suggested by participants in two pupil focus groups who wanted more equality and consistency in terms of teacher treatment of pupils
- Removal of badly behaved pupils (overall: 6 per cent; primary: 2 per cent; secondary: 6 per cent). The pupil focus groups also supported this suggestion as three groups suggested that pupils should be sent to support bases more often so as to allow the rest of the class to get on with their lessons
- More enjoyable lessons (overall: 5 per cent; primary: 3 per cent; secondary 5 per cent). Once again, the discussion arising from the pupil focus groups also support this suggestion, with two groups also asking for more enjoyable lessons which could include 'shorter, less boring explanations' from the teacher and 'more practical interactive opportunities'.

Table 7.5 Current use of approaches that are used to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour according to pupils (primary and secondary)

Type of approach	Yes – Used in my school (%)		No – Not used in my school (%)		Don't Know (%)		Total (%)	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
School rules for pupils to follow	96	96	1	1	3	3	100	100
Rewards for pupils who perform well or behave well	85	69	5	17	11	15	100	100
Citizenship lessons and activities	81	52	4	12	15	37	100	100
School uniform	97	88	1	9	2	4	100	100
Lessons or activities to do with health (e.g. healthy living)	90	71	2	12	7	18	100	100
Pupils who buddy/mentor other pupils	69	64	11	15	20	22	100	100
A place in school where a pupil might go to get extra help for their behaviour	68	79	11	6	21	15	100	100
Staff who are on duty at breaktime	97	87	1	4	2	8	100	100
Other members of staff who help teachers in lessons	89	84	3	6	7	10	100	100
An anti-bullying policy	62	69	8	8	30	22	100	100
A pupil council where pupils meet to talk about school issues	95	63	1	12	3	25	100	100
Environmental / green school projects (e.g. to help look after the school environment)	79	33	7	22	14	45	100	100

Notes to table Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of pupils, 2006

7.20   The 2 most common suggestions centred on the rewarding of well behaved pupils and the punishment of badly behaved pupils. The pupil focus groups lend further support to the importance of this for pupils: in their opinion, good behaviour was not rewarded as often as it should be.

> "*If you are generally a pleasant, well mannered pupil…you get bypassed*" (S1-S6 pupil focus group).

> "*…most teachers recognise bad behaviour not good behaviour… It is actually disappointing because you have been really good and she hasn't noticed*" (P7 pupil focus group).

7.21   A consistent theme arising from both the pupil survey and the focus groups is the call for more severe punishments for those pupils who misbehave. Indeed, a commonly cited punishment in the questionnaire results included physical punishment. Although this was not suggested in the focus groups, participants did call for more severe punishment, for example, duties that could humiliate and embarrass the pupils, such as cleaning the toilets. It was felt that these types of punishments would deter pupils from behaving badly.

Involvement of the school community in developing these strategies

Perceived levels of involvement of the school community in developing strategies

7.22   As part of the school staff survey, headteacher, teachers and additional support staff were asked a number of questions that required them to rate how involved they felt school staff were in the development of strategies for improving behaviour in their individual schools. Tables 7.6 and 7.7 provides the details.

Table 7.6 Headteacher, teacher and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how involved school staff are in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school

Rating of how involved school staff are in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school	Strongly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher 'I involve my staff in discussion about improving behaviour in the whole school at least once a year'							
Overall	3	3	5	32	57	1	100
Primary headteachers	3	3	5	30	59	-	100
Secondary headteachers	3	3	4	35	55	-	100
Teacher 'My colleagues and I are regularly involved in discussion about improving behaviour in the whole school'							
Overall	6	12	14	38	29	1	100
Primary teachers	6	10	14	36	35	-	100
Secondary teachers	7	15	15	40	23	-	100
Additional support staff 'Support assistant (s) are regularly involved in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school'							
Overall	16	26	16	23	19	0	100
Primary additional support staff	10	14	16	31	29	-	100
Secondary additional support staff	19	33	16	19	13	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.23   Table 7.6 reveals clear differences in the perceptions of headteachers, teachers and additional support staff in relation to the regular involvement of school staff in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school. Overall, headteachers agreed the most with this statement followed by teachers and then additional support staff. There was little difference in the responses of primary and secondary headteacher responses to this question. However, over half (52 per cent) of secondary additional support staff either 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' that they were regularly involved in whole-school discussions, while one-fifth of secondary teachers stated the same (22 per cent).

7.24   Results shown in Table 7.7 reveal marginal differences in the perceptions of headteachers and teachers with regard to the contribution of staff ideas and the support that staff offered to colleagues regarding pupil behaviour. Overall, the vast majority of headteachers (93 per cent) and teachers (85 per cent) 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that they gave, or were given, the opportunity to state their ideas and also support their colleagues on issues associated with pupil behaviour. For both, however, higher proportions of primary staff were more extreme in their ratings than secondary staff as they gave a 'strongly agree' response.

Table 7.7   Headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) rating of whether staff can contribute ideas and provide support to other colleagues regarding pupil behaviour

Rating of whether staff can contribute ideas and provide support to other colleagues regarding pupil behaviour	Strongly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher 'My staff contribute ideas and provide support to other colleagues regarding pupil behaviour'							
Overall	3	1	3	38	55	1	100
Primary headteachers	3	1	1	32	62	-	100
Secondary headteachers	2	1	4	46	46	-	100
Teacher 'I contribute ideas and support to my colleagues regarding pupil behaviour'							
Overall	2	2	10	48	37	1	100
Primary teachers	2	2	9	44	42	-	100
Secondary teachers	2	2	11	54	32	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.25   Headteachers were asked to indicate whether they 'agreed' or 'disagreed' with a statement about the involvement of staff in the development of the school's behaviour policy. Almost all (95 per cent) respondents either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement. There were no major differences in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers.

Members of the school community involved in developing strategies

7.26   In order to assess further, the involvement of school staff and the wider school community in the development and planning of strategies linked to behaviour, a number of questions were included that asked respondents to think back over the last year. Specifically, headteachers were asked to indicate which members of the school community had been involved in discussing and developing strategies related to discipline and the promotion of positive behaviour in their school. Teachers were asked to indicate how many times they had been involved in whole school planning in relation to discipline and positive behaviour. Tables 7.8 and 7.9 provides the results.

Table 7.8 Members of the school community who have been actively involved in discussing and developing strategies related to discipline and the promotion of positive behaviour in your school in the last year according to headteachers (overall, primary and secondary)

Members of the school community	Overall		Primary Headteacher		Secondary Headteacher	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Teachers	376	98	208	97	168	99
Parents	269	70	153	71	116	67
Pupils	349	91	200	93	149	88
Youth workers	75	20	11	5	64	38
Home-school link staff	159	41	57	27	102	60
Social workers	123	32	42	20	81	48
Educational psychologists	250	65	125	58	125	74
Learning support staff	286	75	136	63	150	89
School caretakers / janitors	146	38	82	38	64	38
School meal staff	79	21	57	27	22	13
Lunchtime assistants	172	45	132	61	40	24
Other	60	16	39	18	21	12
No response	4	1	4	2	0	0
TOTAL	2348	100	1246	100	1102	100

Notes to table Multiple response question: headteachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.27 Headteachers stated that they had included a whole range of individuals from the school community over the last year. Indeed, there was no instance in which a listed member of the school community was cited by less than a fifth of all headteachers surveyed. Figure 7.1 below lists the 'top five' most commonly cited type of individual (in rank order):

Figure 7.1 Most commonly cited members of the school community involved in developing strategies

Overall	Primary	Secondary
1. Teachers (98 per cent)	1. Teachers (97 per cent)	1. Teachers (99 per cent)
2. Pupils (91 per cent)	2. Pupils (93 per cent)	2. Learning support staff (89 per cent)
3. Learning support staff (75 per cent)	3. Parents (71 per cent)	3. Pupils (88 per cent)
4. Parents (70 per cent)	4. Learning support staff (63 per cent)	4. Educational psychologists (74 per cent)
5. Educational psychologists (65 per cent)	5. Lunchtime assistants (61 per cent)	5. Parents (67 per cent)

7.28 Notable differences between primary and secondary headteacher responses include the higher proportions of secondary headteachers stating that youth workers, home-school link staff, social workers, educational psychologists and learning support staff were included in consultation, over the last year, when compared to primary headteachers. In addition, primary school headteachers stated, to a much higher extent (61 per cent) than their secondary counterparts (24 per cent), that they had included lunchtime assistants in discussions over the last year. Reasons for this could include the higher levels of supervision

required in primary school yards and playgrounds (due to maturation issues), thus, the more central role that lunchtime assistants have in primary schools.

7.29   Although the results shown above indicate that headteachers believed they include pupils in whole-school planning, results from the 14 pupil focus groups suggest that these pupils did not think the same. Participants in 9 pupil focus groups did not think that they had been involved in deciding school rules or devising anti-bullying/behaviour policies; in 2 pupils were unsure and pupils in only 3 stated that they had been involved in this type of activity. Many of the pupils stated that they had been involved in devising the **class rules** but not the **school rules,** which were perceived to be under the sole directive of the headteacher and not something pupils could have control in deciding. The Pupil Council was cited by a number of the focus groups as being a means through which pupils views are sought. However, pupils in 3 of the groups doubted the validity of this pupil forum as illustrated in the following quotations:

> "*...pupils in the pupil council have very little effect on anything that happens. I don't want to say that it isn't a democracy in the pupil council but it is not doing what it should* (S1-S3 pupil focus group)

> "*It is as if they are humouring us…we are talking and writing down minutes but that is as far as it goes* (S4–S6 pupil focus group)

7.30   As stated in 7.26 teachers were asked to indicate approximately how many times they had been involved in whole-school planning in relation to discipline and positive behaviour in the last year. Table 7.9 provides a summary of the results.

Table 7.9   The number of times teachers (overall, primary and secondary) have been involved in whole school planning in relation to discipline and positive behaviour in the last year

Number of times	Overall		Primary Teacher		Secondary Teacher	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Never	209	19	92	18	117	22
Once or twice	510	47	246	47	264	49
More than twice	352	33	189	36	163	30
No response	9	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	527	100	544	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.31   Table 7.9 shows that, in the last year, nearly half (47 per cent) of teachers surveyed estimated that they had been involved in whole-school planning, in relation to discipline and positive behaviour in the last year. A further 33 per cent had been involved more than twice. However, one in 5 (19 per cent) stated that they had 'never' been involved in this type of planning in the previous year. There was little difference in the responses of primary and secondary teachers to this question.

7.32   A specific question was included in the survey of headteachers and teachers, which asked them to estimate how much time they had spent, in the last full teaching week, working with other partners or members of the school community in planning, developing or

delivering activities in school. As shown in Table 7.10, the largest proportion of headteachers (61 per cent) and teachers (84 per cent) spent either under an hour or no time at all, in their last full teaching week, working with other members of the school community. The absence of partnership working was most apparent in the teacher responses (67 per cent compared to 28 percent). Both primary headteachers and teachers, generally spent less time than their secondary counterparts working with other members of the school community. The issue of working with outside agencies and the wider school community was expressly discussed in one secondary headteachers' focus group. The group stressed the importance of working with outside agencies in trying to tackle the issue of indiscipline but also highlighted that, in their view, there was an absence of coherent, joined up thinking between schools and outside agencies that hindered these collaborations. One focus group participant illustrated the point further by describing the current partnerships as "very frustrating", with school staff only acting on agreed actions decided in previous meetings and agencies appearing to have made little or no progress.

Table 7.10 Headteacher and teacher estimations of personal time spent, in the last full teaching week, working with other partners or members of the school community in planning, developing or delivering activities in school

Rating of time spent	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
No time spent	107	28	80	38	27	16
Under an hour	127	33	68	32	59	35
An hour to 3 hours	120	31	60	28	60	36
More than three hours	25	7	3	1	22	13
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	211	100	168	100
Teacher						
No time spent	726	67	353	67	373	68
Under an hour	181	17	110	21	71	13
An hour to 3 hours	127	12	58	11	69	13
More than three hours	41	4	5	1	36	7
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	526	100	549	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Key factors necessary for the development of a whole-school approach

7.33   As part of the focus group discussions, a specific question was posed to all groups asking them to consider what it takes to develop a whole-school approach to behaviour, specifically the promotion of positive behaviour. Although a number of different suggestions were proffered by participants, a set of common key features emerged. These are listed in rank order below:

1. Consistency amongst all school staff (5)
2. Involvement of parents (5)
3. Involvement of pupils (4)
4. Support (from SMT) (2)

5. School staff consultation (2)
6. Flexibility (2)

7.34 In relation to the issue of consistency, focus group participants stressed the importance of all school staff members, ranging from teachers to school caretakers, to be "singing from the same hymn sheet". However, a few focus groups also advocated a degree of flexibility in the way teachers choose to apply it. Supporting the results shown earlier in this chapter, the involvement of parents and pupils was perceived to be key in developing a whole-school approach. Finally, participants in a number of focus groups drew attention to the importance of support which must underpin any whole-school approaches to behaviour. Support from school senior management was cited by both groups, however, one group also indicated that local authority support was important.

Effectiveness of these approaches

Perceived effectiveness of approaches to behaviour as identified by school staff

7.35 In the survey, headteachers were specifically asked a question requiring them to rate, on a scale of one to 5, how effective the 24 listed approaches presented to them in a previous question (see paragraphs 7.3 to 7.9 for further discussion) had been in relation to the following: 'promoting positive behaviour in the classroom and the school'; and 'responding to indiscipline in the classroom and the school'. Table 7.11 provides the detail below.

7.36 Table 7.11 shows that, in general, ratings clustered in the upper part of the response scale, thus, headteachers believed the approaches to be effective in promoting positive behaviour in the classroom and the school and in responding to indiscipline in the classroom and the school. Specifically, the majority of headteachers provided a rating of either 4 or 5 in terms of the effectiveness of the approaches for the two said outcomes (promoting positive behaviour: 84 per cent; responding to indiscipline: 79 per cent).

Table 7.11 Headteacher (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of the effectiveness of approaches in promoting positive behaviour and responding to indiscipline in the classroom and the school

Rating of effectiveness	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
'Promoting positive behaviour in the classroom and the school'						
Not effective at all 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	<1	0	0	1	1
3	53	14	20	10	33	20
4	196	51	99	47	97	58
Very effective 5	125	33	90	43	35	21
No response	9	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	209	100	166	100
'Responding to indiscipline in the classroom and the school'						
Not effective at all 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	3	1	1	1	2	1
3	66	17	26	12	40	24
4	212	55	112	54	100	61
Very effective 5	93	24	70	34	23	14
No response	10	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	209	100	165	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.37   Overall, primary headteachers were more emphatic in their ratings to these questions, with more than twice the proportion giving a 'very effective' rating when compared with their secondary counterparts. In turn, double the proportion of secondary headteachers were more ambivalent in their ratings for both outcomes, by endorsing a middle rating of 3, when compared to primary headteachers.

7.38   In the questionnaire, teachers were asked to rate how **confident** they felt in their ability to 'promote positive behaviour in their classroom' and to 'respond to indiscipline in their classroom'. See Table 7.12 for details.

Table 7.12 Teacher (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of the confidence in their ability to promote positive behaviour and respond to indiscipline in their classroom

Rating of confidence	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
'Promoting positive behaviour in your classroom'						
Not confident at all 1	4	<1	2	<1	2	<1
2	14	1	4	1	10	2
3	93	9	36	7	57	10
4	431	40	199	38	232	42
Very confident 5	535	50	288	54	247	45
No response	3	<1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	529	100	548	100
'Responding to indiscipline in your classroom'						
Not confident at all 1	2	<1	1	<1	1	<1
2	18	2	7	1	11	2
3	132	12	60	11	72	13
4	439	41	212	40	227	42
Very confident 5	485	45	249	47	236	43
No response	4	<1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	529	100	547	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.39   The majority of responses, as shown in Table 7.12, appear to cluster around the upper part of the response scale (4 or 5), thus showing that teachers felt confident in their ability to promote positive behaviour in their classroom (90 per cent) and also to respond to indiscipline in their classroom (86 per cent). A very slightly higher proportion of primary school teachers endorsed a rating of 4 or 5 (92 per cent) in their ability to promote positive behaviour in their classroom when compared to secondary teachers (87 per cent). In contrast, there was no significant difference in the confidence ratings of primary and secondary teachers in their ability to respond to indiscipline in their classrooms.

7.40   Following the initial question which assessed teacher confidence in promoting positive behaviour and responding to indiscipline in the classroom, a series of approaches were then presented in the questionnaire, with respondents being asked to indicate if any of them would increase their confidence in promoting positive behaviour and responding to indiscipline in their classroom. Table 7.13 provides the details.

7.41   When comparing the responses of teachers for the 4 approaches, Table 7.13 shows that the highest proportion of teachers believed understanding individual pupils' learning styles and motivations would increase their confidence in promoting positive behaviour and responding to indiscipline (86 per cent).   Personal safety training was the approach deemed least likely to increase teacher confidence, however, it should be noted that half (50 per cent) of respondents still thought that it would increase their confidence. For all approaches, a higher proportion of primary school teachers believed the approaches would make them more confident in the classroom when compared to secondary teachers, with personal safety training showing greatest polarity between sectors.

Table 7.13 Increases in teacher (overall, primary and secondary) confidence according to the use of an approach

Type of approach	Yes (%)	No (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Overall				
A colleague available to give confidential advice and feedback	78	21	1	100
Understanding of individual pupils' learning styles and motivation	86	12	2	100
Suggested scripts to help you deal with different situations	58	40	2	100
Personal safety training	50	49	1	100
Primary				
A colleague available to give confidential advice and feedback	85	15	-	100
Understanding of individual pupils' learning styles and motivation	91	9	-	100
Suggested scripts to help you deal with different situations	64	36	-	100
Personal safety training	58	42	-	100
Secondary				
A colleague available to give confidential advice and feedback	74	26	-	100
Understanding of individual pupils' learning styles and motivation	85	15	-	100
Suggested scripts to help you deal with different situations	54	46	-	100
Personal safety training	44	56	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Most effective approach/es in encouraging positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour as identified by school staff

7.42   In the headteacher and teacher questionnaires, respondents were asked to endorse the 3 approaches, from the list presented to them (see paragraphs 7.3 to 7.9 for further discussion), that they thought were the most effective in overcoming negative behaviour and promoting positive behaviour. It should be noted that, as respondents were asked to endorse the three approaches they found most helpful from a list of 24 different approaches, the percentages shown in Figure 7.2 overleaf appear relatively low. This is due to the spread of responses across the different approaches.

Figure 7.2   Approaches cited by the highest proportion of headteachers and teachers as being the most helpful in behaviour management

Headteachers	Teachers
Rules and rewards for pupils (67 per cent)	Rules and rewards for pupils (71 per cent)
A behaviour/discipline policy (27 per cent)	A behaviour/discipline policy (27 per cent)
Breaktime supervision (21 per cent)	Support assistants (19 per cent)
Citizenship/participation activities (20 per cent)	Breaktime supervision (18 per cent)
Pupils actively involved in developing ideas and activities in the school (e.g. pupil council) (20 per cent)	School uniform (17 per cent)
	Pupil support base (17 per cent)

Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.43   The importance of rules and rewards and a behaviour/discipline policy were cited by both teachers and headteachers as being the main approaches which proved to be the most helpful in promoting positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour. This supports the findings discussed in paragraph 7.5 in that these approaches were used to a high extent and were also perceived to be effective. A higher proportion of teachers cited additional support resources as being most effective, including support assistants, breaktime supervision and also pupil support bases, than did headteachers. This is likely to be a result of their direct 'ground level' experience in which these support aids are used. In contrast, headteachers were more likely than teachers to cite approaches that involved pupils in activities such as citizenship/participation and also, specifically, in developing ideas and activities in the school.

Most effective approach/es in encouraging positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour as identified by pupils

7.44   As part of the pupil survey, primary and secondary pupils were also asked to state one approach, from the list presented to them (see paragraphs 7.13 to 7.21 for further discussion), that they thought worked best in helping pupils behave well and to stop bad behaviour. Of those 1178 pupils who completed this question, the 'top five' most effective approaches were:

1. Rewards for pupils who perform well or behave well (overall, 27 per cent; primary, 12 per cent; secondary, 31 per cent). This was also cited by eight out of the 14 pupil focus groups as an effective means of overcoming indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour
2. School rules for pupils to follow (overall, 16 per cent; primary, 19 per cent; secondary, 15 per cent). Seven pupil focus groups also cited this as an effective approach to behaviour management
3. A place in school where a pupil might go to get extra help for their behaviour (overall, 11 per cent; primary, 13 per cent; secondary, 10 per cent)
4. An anti-bullying policy (overall, 7 per cent; primary, 15 per cent; secondary, 5 per cent)
5. Staff who are on duty at breaktime (overall, 5 per cent; primary, 6 per cent; secondary, 5 per cent).

7.45   For nearly all of the 'top 5' approaches, higher proportions of primary school pupils stated that the said approach would help pupils behave well and stop bad behaviour (see earlier bullet points). However, more than twice the proportion of secondary school pupils (31 per cent), than their primary school equivalents (12 per cent), thought that rewards for pupils who perform/behave well was most effective.

7.46   Pupils in the focus groups were also asked what they thought worked well in stopping bad behaviour and helping pupils to behave. Although rewards and punishments were the approaches cited as being the most effective and, as discussed in paragraphs 7.19 to 7.21 the ones pupils thought schools should employ to a greater extent, the group also named a number of other approaches that were different from those discussed previously. These included increased parental involvement (5 focus groups) because parents have greater power to punish their children than teachers; increased SMT involvement (3 focus groups) because

the headteacher was still perceived by many to be the ultimate punishment and so their involvement was considered a deterrent for bad behaviour; and the use of staged intervention systems, whereby a series of warnings were given prior to punishment (2 focus groups). This was considered by pupils to be a fair approach to managing behaviour because pupils were not immediately dealt a punishment exercise. Finally, pupils also advocated effective approaches to be those that involved talking to the pupil about their behaviour in order to find out possible causes (two focus groups).

Most effective approach/es in encouraging positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour as identified by local authorities

7.47   Local authority personnel were asked to identify examples of effective practice in responding to indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour at a local authority level and then at a school and classroom level. Although interviewees were asked separate questions about indiscipline and positive behaviour, many felt it difficult to disaggregate the two as essentially, "promoting positive behaviour underpins the whole behaviour and discipline strategy within the council" (local authority interviewee). As such, responses have been combined and so represent examples of both responding to indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour. At a local authority level, a number of initiatives and specific strategies were cited as being effective means of responding to indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour. Indeed, Staged Intervention/Framework for Intervention (FFI) (13 comments), Restorative Practices (4 comments) and Solution-Oriented schools (4 comments) were specifically cited by local authority interviewees. They were all thought to offer schools structured and helpful ways of managing behaviour and also supporting staff:

> "*Things like framework for intervention have been very helpful in supporting individual class teachers to manage behaviour difficulties in the context of their own teaching and learning environment*" (local authority interviewee).

7.48   In addition to the specific strategies cited above, local authority interviewees also pointed to the effectiveness that a comprehensive Continuing Professional Development (CPD) menu of training opportunities, available to all school staff, has on behaviour management (7 comments). In addition, 4 interviewees pointed to the effectiveness of greater integrated working amongst agencies (particularly education and social work) and also the importance that a clear inclusion policy and inclusion training has had as being examples of effective local authority practice.

7.49   In relation to effective approaches at school and classroom level, behaviour and pupil support bases were cited the most by local authority personnel (9 comments). A further 7 interviewees highlighted the positive effect that an alternative, flexible and appropriate curriculum had on behaviour management, whilst 6 stressed that additional support/behaviour support staff had an impact on indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour. Assertive Discipline was also proffered as an effective approach to dealing with behaviour (5 comments).

> "*I think assertive discipline has been effective in supporting teachers to manage behaviour in a standardised way. This is particularly for teachers that have come out of college and they are immediately moving into an environment where they know how the school operates because it is a very*

formal and highly structured discipline system whilst also being very supportive to pupils" (local authority interviewee).

Key factors in effective behaviour management

7.50   As part of the interviews with local authority personnel, interviewees were asked what factors they considered to be key to effective behaviour management, both at local authority level, and at school/classroom level.

7.51   At local authority level the most frequently cited factors were:

- Effective support and communication between the local authority and schools (14)
- Integrated/multi-agency/joint working (9)
- Clear and relevant local authority policies (8)
- Provision of professional development and training (8)

7.52   At school and classroom level, a wider range of key factors was identified by interviewees. One overarching theme which was mentioned by around half of all interviewees (15) was the importance of strong leadership and commitment to behaviour management from the headteacher or senior management of the school. This leadership was seen to be absolutely fundamental by many interviewees and its impact could be felt in a wide range of ways within a school.

7.53   Factors that were often linked to school leadership by interviewees were the development of relevant, clear and recognised school policies and procedures relating to behaviour, and good communication of these within the school (12). A strong school ethos and a sense of community within school were also mentioned by a third (10) as were innovative and flexible approaches to behaviour management (9). Finally, the importance of a good CPD programme was also referred to by 9 interviewees.

7.54   Several aspects of teaching and learning approaches within schools were referred to by local authority interviewees in terms of their relevance to effective behaviour management. Effective classroom management was felt to be important, and this theme was again linked with comments on training and professional development. Furthermore, it was felt that schools and teachers needed to adopt a great deal of flexibility both in terms of their teaching methods and the content of lessons in order to meet the individual needs of pupils. The introduction of a flexible curriculum was referred to by 6 interviewees, and was seen as bringing great benefits to many pupils who would struggle with a more formal academic approach. It was felt that the perceived relevance of the learning experience could have a significant impact on pupils' motivation and behaviour. As one interviewee put it:

"*You can turn 'Better Behaviour, Better Learning' round and make it 'Better Learning, Better Behaviour' and that has been the way we have approached it…*" (local authority interviewee).

7.55   As part of the focus group discussions with school staff, participants were also asked, in their experience, what worked in managing poor behaviour and promoting positive behaviour. The most commonly cited factors or approaches, as listed in rank order, included:

- Consistency and a whole school approach (8)
- Rules and rewards (5)
- Good teachers skills (4) (including a good relationships between the teacher and the pupil; a strong, well organised teacher; and the ability to present the curriculum in an interesting way)
- An appropriate and flexible curriculum (2)
- School uniform (2)
- Diet and exercise (2)
- Smaller classes (2).

7.56   A consistent, whole-school approach was deemed to be the most effective way of managing behaviour, with the consistent use of rules and rewards as being an effective means of doing so. Focus group participants also touched on the issue of teacher skills as being a key factor in managing behaviour. This is also supported by results from the pupil focus groups, which indicated that pupils thought their behaviour varied according to the teacher taking the class and the means by which they taught the lesson.

7.57   An appropriate and flexible curriculum was cited by a few staff focus groups (showing similarity with local authority views), as too was diet and exercise, and a school uniform. Finally, in 7 of the 8 staff focus groups, participants cited the need for smaller classes as an effective means of managing behaviour. Views were expressed energetically, with participants suggesting that the issue of class size really underpins the effectiveness of any approach for behaviour.

Supportiveness of parents

Perceived supportiveness of parents by school staff

7.58   As part of the survey of school staff, headteachers were specifically asked to rate the general supportiveness of parents of pupils in their school. As depicted in Table 7.14 below, results show that headteachers perceived there to be good levels of general support from parents of pupils at their school, with ratings largely clustering around the upper end of the response scale (84 per cent rating 4 or 5). There was no real difference in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers for this question.

Table 7.14   Headteacher (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of the general supportiveness of parents of pupils in their school

Rating of the general supportiveness of parents of pupils in school	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Not supportive at all 1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	5	1	2	<1	3	2
3	56	15	30	14	26	16
4	180	47	94	44	86	51
Very supportive 5	142	37	89	41	53	32
No response	1	<1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	215	100	168	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Time school staff spend talking to parents about their child's behaviour

7.59   In order to find out about the level of contact school staff had with parents of pupils at their school, a question was posed to both headteachers and teachers about the amount of time they had spent talking to parents about their child/ren's behaviour, in the last full teaching week (excluding parents evenings). Table 7.15 provides the detail.

Table 7.15 The time headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) spent talking to parents about pupil behaviour in the last full teaching week

Time spent talking to parents	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
No time spent	74	19	55	26	19	11
Under an hour	160	42	102	48	58	34
An hour to 3 hours	130	34	51	24	79	47
More than 3 hours	18	5	5	2	13	8
No response	2	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	213	100	169	100
Teacher						
No time spent	749	69	319	60	430	79
Under an hour	249	23	188	36	61	11
An hour to 3 hours	64	6	22	4	42	8
More than 3 hours	14	1	0	0	14	3
No response	4	<1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	529	100	547	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

7.60   Overall, headteachers spent much more time (39 per cent) (an hour to more than 3 hours) talking to parents compared to teachers (7 per cent). In addition, higher proportions of teachers (69 per cent) spent no time at all talking to parents about behaviour in their last full teaching week compared to headteachers (19 per cent). In the main, secondary headteachers and primary teachers spent the most time (an hour to more than 3 hours), in their last full teaching week, talking to parents about pupil behaviour. Primary headteachers, however,

spent the least time talking to parents as three-quarters (74 per cent) spent under an hour or no time at all compared with less than half (45 per cent) of secondary headteachers.

7.61 For those headteachers and teachers who indicated on the school survey that they had spent some time talking to parents about behaviour in the last week, an additional question was posed asking what the focus of these discussions was. Table 7.16 depicts the results. On the whole, the response profiles of headteachers and teachers are largely similar, with the highest proportions stating that the parental discussions involved a balance of positive and negative feedback on their child's behaviour (headteacher: 68 per cent; teacher: 55 per cent). In contrast, relatively low proportions of headteachers and teachers stated that the discussion had involved mostly positive feedback (3 per cent and 9 per cent respectively). Higher proportions of both secondary school headteachers and teachers talked to parents more about their child's negative behaviour when compared to their primary school counterparts. Conversely, one in 7 (14 per cent) primary teachers gave mostly positive feedback compared to one in 50 secondary teachers (2 per cent).

Table 7.16 The focus of discussions headteachers and teachers (overall, primary and secondary) had with parents in the last full teaching week

Focus of parental discussions	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
Mostly positive feedback on their child's behaviour	9	3	7	5	2	1
Mostly negative feedback on their child's behaviour	69	22	19	12	50	35
A balance of positive and negative feedback on their child's behaviour	208	68	121	78	87	60
Other	14	5	9	6	5	4
No response	8	3	2	-	-	-
TOTAL	308	100	158	100	150	100
Teacher						
Mostly positive feedback on their child's behaviour	30	9	28	14	2	2
Mostly negative feedback on their child's behaviour	76	23	44	22	32	32
A balance of positive and negative feedback on their child's behaviour	181	55	120	60	61	60
Other	15	5	9	5	6	6
No response	25	8	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	327	100	201	100	101	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

Summary

- Local authorities were rolling out, and piloting, a range of initiatives/strategies (e.g. Staged Intervention/Framework for Intervention (FFI); Solution-Oriented Schools; and Restorative Practices).

- In terms of approaches, the majority of schools operated a school-wide behaviour/discipline policy; used a range of rules and reward systems; had a school uniform; and were involving parents and pupils in school-wide issues. Pupil support bases; home-link workers; integrated support teams pupil councils and buddying/mentoring schemes were used to a lesser extent.

- Referrals to a key member of staff was a popular strategy used to manage behaviour as over three-quarters of headteachers and teachers 'frequently' or 'sometimes' employed it in their school. A third of both headteachers and teachers stated that they 'frequently' or 'sometimes' made a referral for an exclusion in their school.

- Pupils thought schools could do more by: rewarding well behaved pupils; punishing badly behaved pupils (with more severe punishment); a fairer treatment by teachers; removing badly behaved pupils; and making lessons more enjoyable.

- The 'top-five' individuals included by headteachers in whole-school discussion were: teachers; pupils; learning support staff; parents; and educational psychologists. However, pupils involved in the survey and focus groups felt that they had not been included in deciding school rules or devising an anti-bullying policy.

- School staff identified the key factors in developing a whole-school approach to behaviour as: consistency; involvement of parents and pupils; SMT support; school staff consultation; and flexibility.

- The majority of headteachers and teachers reported that they spent under an hour or no time at all working with other members of the school community in the last full teaching week. Less time was spent by primary staff than secondary staff. An absence of joined up thinking between schools and outside agencies was thought to be hindering collaborations.

- The vast majority of teachers already felt confident in their ability to promote positive behaviour and deal with indiscipline in their classroom. However, understanding individual pupils' learning styles and motivations was the approach thought by teachers to be most likely to increase their confidence. Personal safety training was the approach deemed least likely to increase teacher confidence. More primary than secondary teachers thought that all the cited approaches would increase their confidence.

- Local authority interviewees considered approaches such as Staged Intervention/FFI to be effective means of responding to indiscipline at a local authority level. They also thought a comprehensive CPD menu; integrated working amongst agencies; a clear inclusion policy; and inclusion training were all effective. At a school and classroom level, local authority interviewees thought that the following were the most

effective: pupil support bases; alternative, flexible and appropriate curriculum; additional support/behaviour support staff; and Assertive Discipline.

- Headteachers from secondary schools spent the most time talking to parents about their child's behaviour in the last full teaching week. Discussions mainly involved a balance of positive and negative feedback. However, secondary school staff talked to parents about negative feedback more than primary staff.

CHAPTER EIGHT   SUPPORT AVAILABLE FOR STAFF

Introduction

8.1   This chapter draws on data about the support available to staff. This includes local authority support; Continuing Professional Development (CPD); and school level support. Once again, the results from the school staff survey are presented first, with findings from the local authority interviews, school staff and pupil focus groups, and the contextual staff interviews being used to provide further comment.

Local authority support

Continuing Professional Development

8.2   As part of the questionnaire survey, headteachers were asked to indicate whether they had received any training relevant to school discipline since assuming their current post. Table 8.1 below, shows that nearly three-fifths (58 per cent) of headteachers **had** received some form of training related to school discipline since being in their current post, with two fifths (42 per cent) indicating that they **had not**. There was no real difference in the profile of primary and secondary school headteacher responses.

Table 8.1 The proportions of Headteachers (overall, primary and secondary) who have, and have not, received training relevant to dealing with school discipline since assuming their current post

Discipline training since being in current post	Overall		Primary Headteacher		Secondary Headteacher	
	Number	**%**	**Number**	**%**	**Number**	**%**
Received discipline training	222	58	123	58	99	59
Not received discipline training	160	42	91	43	69	41
No response	2	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	214	100	168	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.3   Of the 222 headteachers who had received discipline training since being in their current post, nearly 9 in 10 (87 per cent) stated that they had received this training from the **local authority**. There was a higher proportion of primary school headteachers (95 per cent) citing the local authority as the provider of this training compared to secondary headteachers (77 per cent).

8.4   Just over a quarter (28 per cent) of headteachers (overall) indicated that they had also received training from another provider. Much higher proportions of secondary headteachers (44 per cent) cited this compared to primary headteachers (15 per cent). The predominant 'other' training providers were external consultants and school-based training (25 per cent).

8.5   Results from the 32 local authority interviews provides further evidence of schools' use of training providers other than the local authority. Indeed, 3 interviewees specifically

discussed how schools within their local authority had been given the freedom to use their INSET money to buy-in the training to meets their local needs. A third (13) of all local authority interviewees stated that local and national consultants were typically bought in for the purposes of assessing and delivering training in the authority. A number of specific consultants were named; many of which replicate those cited by the headteachers surveyed. Consultants included those with international and local reputations. Finally, 3 local authority interviewees stressed their local authority's drive to use "home grown" training, including the encouragement of headteachers and schools to undertake collegiate, in-house training.

8.6   Teachers included in the survey were asked how many times, over the last year, they had been involved in any kind of staff development activity in relation to discipline and positive behaviour. Table 8.2 contains the detail.

Table 8.2 Estimations of how many times, in the last year, teachers (overall, primary and secondary) have been involved in a staff development activity in relation to discipline and positive behaviour

Number of times had been involved in staff development activity	Overall		Primary Teacher		Secondary Teacher	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Never	190	18	110	21	80	15
Once or twice	530	49	238	45	292	54
More than twice	351	33	180	34	171	32
No response	9	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	528	100	543	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.7   Results show that over four-fifths (82 per cent) of teachers had been involved, at least once or twice in the last year, in some kind of staff development related to discipline and positive behaviour. More primary teachers (21 per cent) than secondary teachers (15 per cent) stated that they had not been involved in such staff development activity. Conversely, more secondary teachers (86 per cent), than primary teachers (79 per cent), stated that they had been involved in this type of activity, once or more than twice, in the last year.

8.8   Results from a series of 8 focus groups involving primary and secondary headteachers, teachers and additional support staff and interviews with local authority personnel indicated that a plethora of different training sessions and courses are offered to school staff for behaviour management. Figure 8.1 summarises a selection of the different types of training cited. However, it should be noted that the majority of the training sessions were listed from memory and should, therefore, be used to depict a 'snapshot' of the training available as opposed to an exhaustive list of CPD opportunities.

Figure 8.1   Types of behaviour management training cited by local authority interviewees and school staff in the focus groups

From 32 local authority interviews	
Solution-Oriented /focused training (9)	Staged Intervention training (3)
FFI training or planned FFI training (6)	Circle of friends & circle time training (3)
Restorative Practices training (4)	Dealing with anger & conflict training (3)
Diplomas (4)	De-escalation training (3)
Anger management training (4)	Emotional intelligence training (3)
Assertive discipline training (4)	Dedicated training on developmental disorders – ADHD & Aspergers (3)
Promoting positive behaviour (4)	Positive handling strategies training (2)
De-escalation/physical intervention training (4)	Attachment theory/disorder training (2)
Additional Support for Learning Act (ASL) training (3)	Inclusive practices training (2)
From eight school staff focus groups	
Restorative Practices (1)	Challenging behaviour course (1)
External speaker events (1)	Autism training (1)
PDA (1)	General in-school service training (1)

8.9   Overall analysis from all data sets suggests that there is a diverse range of CPD on offer within Scotland's authorities; as in line with BB-BL recommendations. However, it also appears that there are challenges in terms of the range and quality of CPD offered to school staff and also in terms of actual CPD delivery and accessibility. Many participants in the school staff focus groups and a number of the individuals in the contextual teacher interviews all pointed to the need for more practical and proactive training sessions. Many stated that the current CPD was too "airy fairy" (primary class teacher focus group) and of "poor quality" owing to its lack of practicality and usefulness.

8.10   Results from the staff focus groups, contextual staff interviews and interviews with all 32 local authorities also indicated that there was a general need for more training dedicated to behaviour and classroom management. The 2 primary class teacher focus groups pointed to a lack of courses and a shortage in training provision, with many courses being overbooked. Furthermore, participants in both additional support staff focus groups requested more CPD specifically for them. Indeed, as already noted in Chapter Six, participants in one group called for a national system of training for additional support staff in order to fill this perceived gap in training provision.

8.11   The issue of supply cover emerged from staff focus groups, contextual staff interviews and local authority interviews. Concerns were expressed that school staff were unable to attend much-needed training because of a shortage of supply teachers to cover classes in their absence.

"*It is a really difficult one because the willingness to undertake CPD opportunities is there but, basically, if there is no cover then the first thing to go is attendance at a course*" (local authority interviewee).

Nature of local authority support

8.12   A specific question was posed to all headteachers surveyed as to whether they had received any support or assistance from their local authority to try new initiatives for promoting positive behaviour.   Results reveal that three-quarters (75 per cent) of headteachers **had** received support of this nature from their local authority. As Table 8.3 also shows, there were no notable differences in the responses of primary and secondary school headteachers.

Table 8.3 The proportions of headteachers (overall, primary and secondary) who have, and have not, received any support or assistance from the local authority to try new initiatives for promoting positive behaviour

Local authority support	Overall		Primary Headteacher		Secondary Headteacher	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Received local authority support	287	75	158	74	129	77
Not received local authority support	96	25	57	27	39	23
No response	1	<1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	215	100	168	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.13   When asked to indicate the specific type of support or assistance they had received from the local authority, additional funding or staff support (67 per cent) and advice and consultancy (66 per cent) were each cited by two-thirds of headteachers overall (See Table 8.4 below). However, there are some differences in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers for these types of support. Indeed, more secondary headteachers (79 per cent) reported receiving additional funding or support staff than did primary headteachers (57 per cent), whereas consistently more primary headteachers (72 per cent) said they received local authority support in the form of advice and consultancy than did secondary headteachers (58 per cent).

Table 8.4 The type of local authority support received by primary and secondary school headteachers for trying new initiatives to promote positive behaviour

Type of local authority support	Overall		Primary Headteacher		Secondary Headteacher	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Additional funding / staff support	192	67	90	57	102	79
Advice and consultancy	188	66	113	72	75	58
Other	27	9	17	11	10	8
No response	3	1	1	1	2	2
TOTAL	410		221		189	

Notes to table Multiple response question: headteachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.14   Nearly a tenth of headteachers (9 per cent), overall, indicated that they had received support or assistance of another type from the local authority for trying new initiatives to promote positive behaviour (See Table 8.4). The main 'other' types of support cited were support for specific types of training, which included, for example, Circle Time training, (45 per cent) and support for specific interventions/approaches (e.g. Staged Intervention) (24 per cent).

8.15   Participants in the school staff focus groups and all 32 local authority interviewees were asked to detail the kinds of support they, and colleagues, would receive if they experienced a difficult incident. A third (12) of local authority interviewees stated that the support would come from local authority teams who provide behaviour support to schools. The names for these teams and individuals varied, for example, behaviour support staff; quality improvement officers; and additional support team staff. However, in evaluating this support, members of the staff focus groups presented disparate views over the perceived quality and level of support. The rationale for the different views appeared to focus on the perceived responsiveness of the authority to address incidents.

8.16   When local authority interviewees were asked whether their local authority had a staff support/welfare/counselling advisor for school staff, interviewees typically alluded to an authority-wide support service for council employees, which teachers and school staff could readily access, but was not dedicated to the sole purpose of providing support to them. A small number of interviewees (5) did indicate that, within their authority, an education specific advisor or body of support was available to members of the school workforce including: a school advisory service; a staff welfare officer; a teacher welfare officer; and a council-run Care First scheme. Other local authority interviewees also detailed how staff within schools were being trained up to provide help to other staff by essentially fulfilling the role of an advisor.

Level of partnership working between the local authority and schools to promote positive behaviour

8.17   In the survey, school staff were all asked to rate how they thought the education authority worked in partnership with their school to promote positive behaviour. Table 8.5 shows that, on the whole, ratings from headteachers, teachers and additional support staff largely clustered around the centre of the response scale, thus indicating that the education authority was seen by all to work, to a moderately satisfactory level, with respondents' schools to promote positive behaviour. Headteachers were the most positive in their ratings, with nearly half (49 per cent) endorsing the level of partnership between the education authority and their school as either 'good' or 'very good'. In contrast, teachers were the least positive, with 14 per cent giving a 'poor' rating of the relationship: a figure nearly three times that of headteachers and additional support staff.

8.18   In terms of differences according to the type of school, primary school staff were generally more positive in their ratings of how well the education authority worked in partnership with their school than their secondary counterparts. Indeed, over half (53 per cent) of secondary teachers indicated that they felt local authority partnerships were less than good, while only one in eight (15 per cent) gave a positive rating, compared to one four (39 per cent) primary teachers. Correlations also revealed that headteachers, teachers and

additional support staff who gave higher ratings of how the education authority worked in partnership with the school, also felt more supported by their school.

Table 8.5   Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how the education authority works in partnership with the school to promote positive behaviour

Rating of how the education authority works in partnership with the school to promote positive behaviour	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Headteacher						
Poor 1	22	6	10	5	12	7
2	30	8	12	6	18	11
3	139	36	64	31	75	44
4	139	36	89	42	50	30
Very good 5	49	13	35	17	14	8
No response	5	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	210	100	169	100
Teacher						
Poor 1	152	14	36	7	116	22
2	270	25	102	20	168	31
3	351	33	180	35	171	32
4	203	19	140	27	63	12
Very good 5	78	7	60	12	18	3
No response	26	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	518	100	536	100
Additional support staff						
Poor 1	28	6	6	3	22	7
2	61	12	14	8	47	16
3	183	37	58	33	125	42
4	128	26	52	29	76	26
Very good 5	75	15	48	27	27	9
No response	26	5	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	501	100	178	100	297	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

School-level support

Perceived levels of school support from colleagues and senior management

8.19   As part of the survey, headteacher, teachers and additional support staff were asked a number of questions that required them to rate a series of statements relating to the levels of support offered to staff within their school. Although the precise wordings of the questions were tailored according to each type of respondent, some comparisons can be made between the questions. Tables 8.6 to 8.8 provides the detail.

110

Table 8.6 Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how openly they can talk to colleagues about behaviour-related challenges they experience

Rating of how openly staff can talk to colleagues about behaviour-related challenges	Strongly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher 'My colleagues can openly talk about any behaviour-related challenges they experience'							
Overall	3	0	2	32	62	<1	100
Primary headteachers	4	0	1	22	73	-	100
Secondary headteachers	3	0	2	46	49	-	100
Teacher 'I can talk to colleagues openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience'							
Overall	2	1	4	27	66	1	100
Primary teachers	3	2	1	22	72	-	100
Secondary teachers	1	1	6	31	61	-	100
Additional support staff 'I can talk to other support assistants openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience'							
Overall	1	<1	2	21	74	1	100
Primary additional support staff	2	1	4	20	73	-	100
Secondary additional support staff	1	<1	1	22	76	-	100
'I can talk to teachers openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience'							
Overall	1	2	3	31	64	<1	100
Primary additional support staff	1	1	1	21	77	-	100
Secondary additional support staff	1	2	4	37	56	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. *Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006*

8.20   In relation to statements about school staff being able to openly talk to colleagues about any behaviour-related challenges they experience, Table 8.6 shows that the highest proportion of school staff 'strongly agreed' with the statement. When analysed by school sector, primary school staff were more positive in their ratings than secondary staff as considerably more 'strongly agreed' with this statement.   Secondary school additional support staff were more likely to 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in relation to being able to talk to other support staff (98 per cent), but were slightly less likely to 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in relation to being able to talk to teachers (93 per cent).

8.21   In relation to the confidence that headteachers, teachers and additional support staff had that senior staff would help them, or colleagues, if they experienced behaviour management difficulties, Table 8.7 reveals clear differences in the views of different members of staff.   Overall, it appears that headteachers agreed the most that senior staff would help colleagues if they needed it, followed by additional support staff and then finally teachers who agreed to the least extent. According to school sector, higher proportions of primary teachers and additional support staff, than their secondary counterparts, either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that senior staff would help them if they experienced difficulties in managing pupil behaviour.   There was little difference in the responses of primary and secondary headteachers.

Table 8.7 Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of how confident they are that senior staff will help them if they are experiencing behaviour

Rating of help senior staff will provide to colleagues for behaviour management difficulties	Strongly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher 'Senior staff will help colleagues who are experiencing behaviour management difficulties'							
Overall	3	0	<1	21	75	<1	100
Primary headteachers	4	0	1	16	79	-	100
Secondary headteachers	3	0	<1	27	70	-	100
Teacher 'I am confident that senior staff will help me if I experience behaviour management difficulties'							
Overall	6	12	12	34	35	1	100
Primary teachers	5	7	11	30	48	-	100
Secondary teachers	7	17	15	38	24	-	100
Additional support staff 'I am confident that senior managers in school will help me if I experience difficulties with pupil behaviour'							
Overall	2	4	8	33	53	<1	100
Primary additional support staff	2	2	4	27	65	-	100
Secondary additional support staff	2	5	10	36	47	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.22   Results from the 8 staff focus groups lend support to the results found above, with many of them describing SMT support as "critical" to teachers. Indeed, discussions in the primary and secondary teacher groups highlighted the perceived range of senior management support to teachers, with some stating that their school provided ample support whereas other openly discussed that they felt unsupported. This lack of support was often attributed to the senior management being unable to physically provide support when immediately needed. Often, SMT members were felt to be out of the office or in meetings, with a secondary headteacher focus group conceding that staff support can be "very time consuming" amidst all the other pressures of running a school.

8.23   Table 8.8 reveals some clear differences in the perceptions of headteachers, teachers and additional support staff in relation to awareness of confidential support and counselling within the school. Headteachers agreed with the statement the most, followed by additional support staff and then finally teachers who agreed to the least extent. In addition, secondary staff were much more negative and 'disagreed' with the statement than primary staff. Indeed, one in 3 secondary teachers (33 per cent) felt there was no such support available. Results from the focus groups and the contextual staff interviews suggest that some schools are trying to formalise confidential support and counselling structures for their staff. A number of the contextual school staff interviewees stated that their school now had a behaviour coordinator (although the titles did vary locally) who was trained to provide advice and support to staff on behaviour related issues. Other schools discussed that they were hoping to develop this kind of support through initiatives such as Solution-Oriented Schools.

Table 8.8 Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff (overall, primary and secondary) ratings of whether they agree that there is confidential support and counselling for staff

Rating of their knowledge of confidential support and counselling in the school	Strongly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)	No Response (%)	Total (%)
Headteacher 'My staff know there is confidential support and counselling within the school if they need it'							
Overall	5	3	14	40	36	1	100
Primary headteachers	4	2	10	39	46	-	100
Secondary headteachers	7	5	20	44	25	-	100
Teacher 'I know there is confidential support and counselling for staff if I need it'							
Overall	12	13	23	26	26	1	100
Primary teachers	10	8	23	27	33	-	100
Secondary teachers	14	19	23	25	19	-	100
Additional support staff 'I know there is confidential support and counselling available for support staff if I need it within my school'							
Overall	8	13	20	26	32	1	100
Primary additional support staff	5	11	20	26	39	-	100
Secondary additional support staff	9	14	21	27	29	-	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.24   In the questionnaire survey, headteachers and teachers were asked to estimate how much time they had spent, in the last full teaching week, giving or receiving informal support to/from colleagues in relation to indiscipline and positive behaviour. See Table 8.9 below.

Table 8.9 Headteacher and teacher (overall, primary and secondary) estimations of time spent, in the last full teaching week, giving or receiving informal support to/from colleagues in relation to indiscipline and positive behaviour

Rating of time spent giving/receiving informal support	Overall		Primary		Secondary	
	(N)	**%**	**(N)**	**%**	**(N)**	**%**
Headteacher						
No time spent	40	10	32	15	8	5
Under an hour	173	45	119	56	54	32
An hour to 3 hours	143	37	58	27	85	50
More than three hours	25	7	3	1	22	13
No response	3	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	384	100	212	100	169	100
Teacher						
No time spent	210	19	136	26	74	14
Under an hour	616	57	310	59	306	56
An hour to 3 hours	198	18	66	13	132	24
More than three hours	47	4	14	3	33	6
No response	9	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	1080	100	526	100	545	100

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Percentages may not all add up to 100 due to rounding. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.25   As shown in Table 8.9, analysis showed, in general, the highest proportion of both headteachers (45 per cent) and teachers (57 per cent) spent under an hour of their time, in their last full teaching week, giving or receiving informal support to/from colleagues in relation to indiscipline and positive behaviour.   However, twice the proportion of headteachers (44 per cent) spent over an hour to more than three hours providing support than did teachers (22 per cent).   There were significant differences according to school type, in that primary school staff generally spent less time giving or receiving informal support to/from colleagues.

8.26   The issue of informal peer support was discussed in both the staff focus groups and the contextual staff interviews; with both stressing its importance and indicating that it was from this that many teachers derive their support.   One primary school deputy headteacher stated that "teachers do a lot of chat with each other" in relation to behaviour issues, which was helpful and supportive.   Another secondary deputy headteacher detailed his school's plans to try and tap into this informal support mechanism in order to make it a more formal part of the school's support structure.   He proposed that staff should join into small groups, whilst at school, in which they discuss their experiences, and share good behaviour management practice.

> "*Peer evaluation on behaviour support…where 2 or 3 members of staff who trust each other and who may have had some training…can talk to each other and reflect on their experiences*" (contextual school staff interviewee).

Access to support provisions and facilities in the classroom, school and local authority

8.27   As part of the survey, teachers were asked a specific question about what supports they had access to when managing a difficult/challenging class. Table 8.10 shows that access to learning/SEN support for individual pupils was cited by the highest proportion of teachers (58 per cent), followed by an opportunity to request a referral for a pupil for further investigation (54 per cent) and then whole-class support, which included classroom and support assistants (52 per cent). Interestingly, the collegiate support provided by colleagues and the principal teacher or senior management were cited the least by teachers (46 per cent and 40 per cent respectively). This may be related to the findings discussed in paragraph 8.22 where focus groups commented on the problem of SMT workloads preventing them from providing immediate and proactive support. In terms of school sector differences, primary teachers had access to additional support staff, both in terms of whole-class and individual pupils, but had less access to support provided by senior management than did secondary teachers.

Table 8.10   Types of support teachers have access to when dealing with a challenging class

Types of support	Overall		Primary Teacher		Secondary Teacher	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Whole-class support (e.g. from classroom/support assistants)	509	52	369	70	140	31
PT/SMT support	391	40	177	33	214	48
Opportunity to request a referral for a pupil for further investigation	523	54	281	53	242	54
Support from colleagues	448	46	261	49	187	42
Learning/SEN support for individual pupils	567	58	386	73	181	40
No Response	81	8	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2519		1518		1001	

Notes to table Non-responses were included in the figures for the sample overall. The figures for primary and secondary respondents were calculated from those who responded to the question only. Multiple response question: teachers could select more than one option, therefore percentages do not add up to 100. Source: NFER survey of school staff, 2006

8.28   In relation to support facilities and provisions in school and the wider local authority, headteachers were asked the following questions: 'does your school have a 'time-out' room for the short term placement of pupils with behavioural difficulties?' and 'does your school have an on-site unit for the longer-term placement of pupils with behavioural difficulties?'. The majority of the schools **did not** have a 'time-out' room (61 per cent) or an on-site unit (81 per cent) for the longer-term placement of pupils with behaviour difficulties. Much higher proportions of primary headteachers ('time-out': 82 per cent; on-site: 98 per cent) than secondary headteachers ('time-out': 36 per cent; on-site: 60 per cent) stated that they had neither provision within their school. However, it should be noted that there may be some difference in interpretation of the nature of such provisions, as Table 7.1 (see page 79) shows that half (50 per cent) of headteachers in the survey sample and just over three-fifths (63 per cent) of teachers indicated that their school had, or had access to, a pupil support base.

8.29   Results from contextual interviews with school staff indicated that those that did have such provisions on site were finding them effective in terms of reducing low level indiscipline and providing support to their staff. This finding, however, stands in contrast to the views of some pupils in the focus groups who did not perceive the 'time-out' room to be

of much effect in overcoming negative behaviour. Indeed, many discussed that some pupils wanted to be sent to the 'time-out' room because they saw it as a means of avoiding work or a teacher whose lesson they did not enjoy.

8.30 A specific question was also posed to local authority personnel in relation to the level of off-site provision available to schools within their local authority. In the main, most local authority interviewees detailed a range of off-site provision for both primary and secondary school pupils. Indeed, 21 interviewees detailed off-site provision/s for secondary pupils, 15 detailed off-site provision/s for primary pupils and four detailed a provision that was intended for both primary and secondary pupils. Only 4 interviewees stated that there was no off-site provision within their local authorities.

Summary

- A diverse range of CPD opportunities was on offer in local authorities, however, school staff requested more training in general that was of a practical and proactive nature. An absence of supply cover was highlighted as an issue.

- Nearly three-fifths of headteachers had received some CPD since being in their current post, which was predominantly provided by the local authority; and the majority of teachers had been involved in some kind of development activity related to behaviour in the last year.

- Three-quarters of headteachers had received local authority support for trying new initiatives for promoting positive behaviour. Most primary headteachers received this support in the form of advice and consultancy, whilst most secondary headteachers received support for additional funding or support staff.

- Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff all indicated that the education authority worked, to a moderately satisfactory level, with schools to promote positive behaviour. Headteachers were the most positive, followed by additional support staff then teachers. Primary staff were consistently more positive than secondary staff.

- School staff who gave higher ratings of how the education authority worked in partnership with the school, also felt more supported by their school.

- All school staff felt generally supported in their school (as measured by the level that staff could openly talk to colleagues; senior staff would help colleagues; and awareness of confidential support and counselling in the school). However, headteachers agreed the most followed by additional support staff and then teachers. Secondary school staff felt less supported than their primary equivalents.

- The majority of headteachers and teachers spent under an hour giving/receiving informal support to/from colleagues in the last full teaching week. Headteachers spent more time than teachers and secondary staff spent more time than primary staff.

- Teachers had access, to a reasonable degree, to a number of supports to help them with a difficult class. However, primary teachers had access to additional support

staff, both in terms of whole-class and individual pupils, but had less access to support provided by senior management within their school than did secondary teachers.

- Most headteachers indicated that they did not have a 'time-out' room or an on-site unit for the longer-term placement of pupils with behaviour difficulties. Higher proportions of primary headteachers than secondary headteachers stated that they had neither provision within their school. However, there may be some variation in interpretation of the nature of such provisions, as Chapter Seven notes that half of headteachers and just over three-fifths of teachers indicated that their school had, or had access to, a pupil support base.

CHAPTER NINE   CONCLUSION

9.1   This report has focused on behaviour in Scottish school from a range of perspectives: local authority personnel, headteachers, teachers, additional support staff and pupils.   In doing so, it has raised a number of issues and concerns which, it is hoped, will stimulate further debate. The following points are thus raised as final issues for consideration.

9.2   It is important to stress first of all that school staff reported the majority of their pupils to be generally well behaved, both in the classroom and around school. The current study replicates many of the key findings of the earlier research by Edinburgh University (Munn *et al*., 2004).   Low-level negative behaviour continues to be the most prevalent form of indiscipline encountered in schools. Yet, focus group discussions would suggest that these are also the most wearing for staff. Headteachers continue to be more optimistic than their staff about indiscipline, whilst the overall picture remains more positive at primary level than at secondary. On one level, it is reassuring that, in the intervening period since the earlier research, there has been no real decline in standards of behaviour nationally. However, it may be that addressing the common pattern of low-level indiscipline needs greater attention, particularly given its reported de-motivating effect on school staff.

9.3   Although more secondary school staff reported incidences of indiscipline than their primary counterparts, the very tiny number of schools where 'most' or 'all/almost all' children were said to exhibit negative behaviour were actually in the primary sector. Equally, the very few incidents of physical aggression and violence towards staff reported in the survey occurred more frequently in primary schools than in secondary. These findings were corroborated by local authority staff and in staff focus group discussions, suggesting that cohorts of very young children are embarking on their school careers with often complex difficulties, or a lack of basic social skills, which can result in behavioural problems.

9.4   Behaviour in schools is neither a single, nor a simple, phenomenon. In effect, the data presented in this report suggests that there are various 'world views' of indiscipline issues which co-exist within schools and which are dependent on an individual's status and role within the institution. Headteachers, teachers and additional support staff all have differing experiences of the degree and frequency of the positive behaviours and indiscipline they encounter. Recognising these differences and understanding the perspective of others may be an important component of any training and professional development in this area.

9.5   Finally, the 'world view' of indiscipline held by additional support staff consistently appeared to be more negative than that of other school staff, perhaps because of their proximity to the behaviour being exhibited – they may have been working with individual, or small numbers of, children with challenging behaviour. Analysis revealed that the more confident staff felt in responding to indiscipline, the less likely they were to report incidences of negative behaviour. Given that fact that additional support staff in the focus groups identified an increasing lack of confidence in their ability to deal with indiscipline, this may well indicate the need for additional support and training for such staff, especially where they rely on personal experience rather than a professional skill base to handle discipline issues. At the same time, additional support staff in the survey indicated that they were not regularly involved in whole-school discussions and training relating to behaviour. The fact that such activities can often take place after school hours suggests the value of schools giving greater

consideration to fully integrating additional support staff into whole-school behavioural issues.

ANNEX 1   THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

LOCAL AUTHORITY TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1.   What is your perception of the nature and prevalence of indiscipline in primary and secondary schools within your authority?

   Probe - Are there differences between types of school e.g. primary and secondary; urban/rural?

2.   How does your authority monitor and record incidents of violence or bullying in your schools?

   Probe - Have you noticed any trends?

3.   What off-site provision is there in your authority for pupils with behaviour difficulties?

4.   What would you identify as examples of effective practice within your authority in responding to indiscipline?
   - at local authority level)
   - at whole-school level *(any differences between types of school?)*
   - at classroom level

5.   What would you identify as examples of effective practice within your authority in promoting positive behaviour?
   - at local authority level
   - at whole-school level *(any differences between types of school?)*
   - at classroom level

6.   To what extent do you feel the recommendations of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* have affected practice within your authority in responding to indiscipline and promoting positive behaviour?
   - at local authority level
   - at whole-school level
   - at classroom level

7.   Could you identify any key factors in effective behaviour management?
   - at local authority level
   - at whole-school level
   - at classroom level

8.   What progress has been made to date within the authority towards reviewing and developing written policies and guidelines into a single framework (e.g. to include care, behaviour and inclusion policies).

9.   What CPD do you offer in your authority on behaviour / classroom management?
     Probe - What support is offered to individual teachers in your authority if they are struggling with behaviour issues?
         - Does your authority have a staff support/welfare/counselling advisor?

10. Is there anything else you would like to say regarding the issue of behaviour within your authority?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME

CASE-STUDY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL STAFF

Key member of staff – contextual interview

1.   Could you please outline for me your role in school in relation to behaviour?

2.   Could you just tell me a bit about the pupils involved in the focus groups?
Prompt: type of pupil or behaviour

3.   Are there any contextual/local factors that have a bearing on behaviour in this particular school?

4.   Is this school involved in any initiatives for behaviour?
For interviewer: e.g. staged intervention (FFI), restorative practices, solution-oriented schools, motivated school

5.   Does the school have a written behaviour/discipline policy?
If yes: - who was involved in developing it (SMT, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, pupils, parents)?
        - do all staff adhere to it (e.g. is there consistency amongst staff)?

6.   On the whole, how well-behaved would you say pupils are in this school?

7.   Where poor behaviour does take place, is this generally low level or more serious?

8.   Are there any patterns of poor behaviour, e.g. timing (particular lesson/day); particular year groups, classes or individuals?

9.   Does poor behaviour tend to take place inside classrooms or outside e.g. in corridors/playgrounds?

10.   Does the school recognise and promote positive behaviour?
If yes: how?

11.   What strategies/approaches are used effectively in this school to manage or deal with poor behaviour?
Prompt: why are these successful?

12.   Is there support available for members of staff who find it difficult to cope with poor behaviour?
If yes: what type of support?

13.   What training is available to staff at this school in relation to behaviour?
Prompt: needs/gaps

14.   Is there more you think could be done to further improve behaviour in this school?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME

CASE-STUDY FOCUS GROUP SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL STAFF

Questions and prompts for Staff Focus Groups

1.   Could you just say very briefly, what type of school you are from and what your role is within the school in relation to behaviour? Are there any specific local factors that have a bearing on behaviour in your school? *(Ice-breaker to each)*

Nature of behaviour/indiscipline
2.   What sort of poor behaviour are we talking about?
        Prompt: - low level, more serious?

3.   What are the key patterns of poor behaviour that you observe in your schools?
        Prompt: - does it relate to timing (e.g. time of lesson, day of the week),
                particular year groups, particular classes, particular individuals etc.?
                  - what are the circumstances/issues relating to individuals/classes felt
                    to be more challenging?

4.   Where does poor behaviour take place in school?
        Prompt: - does it tend to be mostly in the classroom, or outside e.g. in
                corridors, playgrounds etc.?

5.   What effect does poor behaviour (both inside and outside the classroom) have:
        -   on staff (does it vary for different kinds of staff)?
        -   on teaching and learning?

6.   Do staff observe and recognise positive behaviour?
        Prompt: - what sort of positive behaviour?
                      - how do staff deal with/respond to positive behaviour?

Approaches to/support for managing behaviour
7.   In your experience, what works in managing poor behaviour?
        (For moderator: examples might be school policies; dress codes, rewards; sanctions (including exclusion); support bases; home-school links?)
        Prompt: - why are these successful?

8.   What works in promoting positive behaviour?

        For heads only
        8a   Are there structures within the school/LA that help to promote positive behaviour e.g. bringing pastoral care, learning and behaviour support together; designated staff including pupil care and welfare/behaviour; discipline committees etc.?

        For heads only
        8b   Where does maintaining relationships with the local community fir into this e.g. keeping it informed of development and policy, handling complaints, promoting the image of the school etc?

9.   What kind of support have you (or your colleagues in school) received if you/they have experienced a difficult incident?
        Prompt: - any other forms of support/resources needed for effective behaviour?
                    Management?

10.   Have participants had training in managing behaviour?
        Prompt: - what sort of training is available within their LA?
                    - other needs/gaps in training?

11.   What does it take to develop a whole-school approach to positive behaviour?
        Prompt: - what is the best way to achieve this, what changes are needed?
                    - what time is needed (both staff investment and calendar time)?
                    - are staff/pupils/parents involved and if so, to what extent?
                    - what are the key features of an effective whole-school approach?

Experience and confidence of staff
12.   How do teachers/other staff feel about:
        -   pupil-on-pupil verbal or physical incidents?
        -   incidents directed at staff?
        Prompt: how confident do they feel about intervention e.g. de-escalation?

13.   At what point do teachers no longer feel able to cope with misbehaviour?
        Prompt: is it a particular context/incident/behaviour/pupil?

14.   What is the level of awareness amongst staff of Better Behaviour – Better Learning or other Executive-supported initiatives for behaviour?

15.   What more needs to be done:
        -   at LA level?
        -   at school level?
        -   at classroom level?
        -   At national level?

16.   Are there any other issues in relation to managing behaviour that you would like to raise?

Thank you all for coming today and for your very valuable contributions. We hope you have found it a useful session.

CASE-STUDY FOCUS GROUP SCHEDULE FOR PUPILS

Questions and prompts for pupil focus groups

1.   Could you please just say which year group you are in?

2.   Do you think pupils in this school are generally well-behaved?

3.   When bad behaviour does take place, what sort of behaviour are we talking about (e.g. low level or more serious)?

4.   Where does bad behaviour tend to take place?
        Prompt: is it mostly in the classroom or outside e.g. in corridors, playgrounds etc?

5.   Does it tend to be particular year groups/classes or individuals that are involved in bad behaviour?

6.   Does bad behaviour tend to happen with certain teachers?
        Prompt: why do you think that is?

7.   What effect does bad behaviour have:
        - on you?
        - on other pupils?
        - on the way you learn?

8.   Do teachers recognise good behaviour? What do they do?

9.   What happens when pupils behave badly?

10.   What sort of things do you think work to stop bad behaviour and help pupils behave well?
        Prompt: why do you think these things work?

11.   Do you think pupils are treated fairly when they behave badly?
        Prompt: if yes, why?
                  if no, why not?

12.   Are pupils in this school involved in deciding the school rules?
        Prompt: in what way – check whether any pupil involvement in devising behaviour and anti-bullying policies

13.   Is there more that your school could do to stop bad behaviour and help pupils behave well?

Thank you very much for talking to me and for your very useful comments. I hope you enjoyed the session.

ANNEX 2   THE QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY HEADTEACHERS

NATIONAL SURVEY ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL HEADTEACHERS

- This questionnaire is part of a national survey of behaviour in schools in Scotland. The research has been commissioned by the Scottish Executive with the support and backing of the teacher unions. NFER is carrying out the survey on their behalf.

- Behaviour is a high profile issue. The research will lead to a greater understanding of the reality of pupil behaviour and discipline in Scottish schools.

- The study is seeking the opinions of headteachers, teachers, non-teaching staff and pupils across Scotland. **Your views are very important as they will help to establish what is actually happening in schools.**

- All responses are confidential, and schools and individuals will remain anonymous in all reports.

- If you have any queries about the research, or about how to complete the questionnaire, please contact Dave Hereward on telephone 01753 637352 or email at d.hereward@nfer.ac.uk

Please return the questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope to:

Research Data Services, National Foundation for Educational Research, The Mere, Upton Park, SLOUGH, SL1 2ZN

It would be much appreciated if you could return the questionnaire within 3 weeks.

BSU 3125-26   © NFER 2006   HQ

YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

1. Please indicate your gender and age

Male ☐   Female ☐   *(Please tick one box)*   Age ☐ Years

2a. What is your current appointment ...? *(Please tick one box)*

Permanent ☐   Temporary ☐

2b. Do you work ...? *(Please tick one box)*

Full time ☐   Part time ☐   Job share ☐

3. Please state the approximate length of time you have spent ... *(Please estimate to the nearest whole number)*

3a. As a member of the teaching profession ☐ Years

3b. Working as a headteacher ☐ Years

3c. As a headteacher in your current post ☐ Years

4. Have you held a headteacher post in any other schools? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

5. On average, how many hours of contact time, if any, do you have with classes per week? (Please include time spent during a registration class.) *(Please tick one box)*

None ☐₁   Between 3 and 5 hours ☐₃   Between 11 and 20 hours ☐₅

Under 2 hours ☐₂   Between 6 and 10 hours ☐₄   More than 21 hours ☐₆

6. Which stages, if any, did you teach during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK? *(Please tick all the appropriate boxes according to whether the school you teach in is a primary or secondary school)*

Nursery ☐   P4 ☐   Composite P 1/2 ☐   S1 ☐

P1 ☐   P5 ☐   Composite P 2/3 ☐   S2 ☐

P2 ☐   P6 ☐   Composite P 3/4 ☐   S3 ☐

P3 ☐   P7 ☐   Composite P 4/5 ☐   S4 ☐

Composite P 5/6 ☐   S5 ☐

Composite P 6/7 ☐   S6 ☐

Other ☐   *(Please specify)* ☐

2

7a. Have you received any training relevant to dealing with school discipline since you took up your current post? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

7b. IF YES, please tick as appropriate to indicate the training provider. *(Please tick all that apply)*

Local authority ☐

Other ☐ *(Please specify)* [_____]

8a. Have you received any support or assistance from your local authority to try new initiatives for promoting positive behaviour? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

8b. IF YES, please tick as appropriate to indicate the type of support or assistance received. *(Please tick all that apply)*

Additional funding or staff support ☐   Advice and consultancy ☐

Other ☐ *(Please specify)* [_____]

9. Does your school have a 'time-out' room for the short-term placement of pupils with behavioural difficulties? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

10. Does your school have an on-site unit for longer-term placement of pupils with behavioural difficulties? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

11. Using a scale of 1-5, how do you rate the parents of pupils at your school, in terms of their general supportiveness? *(Please circle one number)*

Not supportive at all   1   2   3   4   5   Very supportive

Please use this space to add any comments

[_____]

BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

12. Thinking about your school overall, please estimate what proportion of the school roll you think are generally well behaved during a lesson. *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

13. We have listed below some examples of different types of positive pupil behaviour which teachers experience during the course of their CLASSROOM TEACHING. Over the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate, from your perspective, how often each type of behaviour was exhibited. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	All lessons	Most lessons	Some lessons	Few lessons	No lessons	Don't know
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils following instructions	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils settling down quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils contributing to class discussions	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Attentive, interested pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils arriving promptly for classes	1	2	3	4	5	6
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please use this space to add any comments

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

14. Thinking about your school overall, please estimate what proportion of the school roll you think are generally badly behaved and / or difficult to deal with. *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

4

129

15. We have listed below some examples of different types of pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they have to deal with during the course of their CLASSROOM TEACHING. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. Please indicate how frequently each behaviour has either been referred on to you, or been encountered directly by you, over the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

		Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all	Don't know
A	Talking out of turn (e.g. by making remarks, calling out, distracting others by chattering)	1	2	3	4	5	6
B	Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise (e.g. by scraping chairs, banging objects, moving clumsily)	1	2	3	4	5	6
C	Hindering other pupils (e.g. by distracting them from work, interfering with equipment and materials)	1	2	3	4	5	6
D	Getting out of their seat without permission	1	2	3	4	5	6
E	Not being punctual (e.g. being late to lessons)	1	2	3	4	5	6
F	Persistently infringing class rules (e.g. pupil behaviour, safety)	1	2	3	4	5	6
G	Eating / chewing in class	1	2	3	4	5	6
H	Calculated idleness or work avoidance (e.g. delaying start to work set, frequent requests to go to the toilet)	1	2	3	4	5	6
I	Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	1	2	3	4	5	6
J	General rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5	6
K	Use of mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5	6
L	Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging furniture and fabric)	1	2	3	4	5	6
M	Racist abuse towards other pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6
N	Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6
O	General verbal abuse towards other pupils (e.g. offensive or insulting remarks)	1	2	3	4	5	6
P	Racist abuse towards you	1	2	3	4	5	6
Q	Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	1	2	3	4	5	6
R	General verbal abuse towards you (e.g. offensive, insulting, insolent or threatening remarks)	1	2	3	4	5	6
S	Physical aggression towards other pupils (e.g. squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5	6
T	Physical violence towards other pupils (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5	6
U	Physical aggression towards you (e.g. squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5	6
V	Physical violence towards you (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5	6
W	Pupils withdrawing from interaction with others / you	1	2	3	4	5	6
X	Pupils missing lessons (e.g. truancy)	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please use this space to add any comments

5

130

16a. Is the pattern of occurences, described in Question 15, typical of the general classroom experience in your school? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

16b. IF NO, please describe why not.

_____

17. From the list in Question 15, please give the letters of up to 3 behaviours that have had the greatest negative impact on the teaching experience of your staff during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*   2 ☐ *(Write letter)*   3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

18. Thinking about all the behaviour you encounter around school, how many pupils do you find generally well behaved? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

19. We have listed below some examples of different types of positive pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they encounter during the course of their duties AROUND THE SCHOOL. Taking your experience during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you encountered each type of behaviour. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all	N/A
Pupils actively helping their peers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils taking turns	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks (e.g. the library, sports facilities)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils engaged in playing games and sports together	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils queuing in an orderly manner	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils respecting toilet / break / cloakroom areas	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils using litter bins	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils greeting staff pleasantly	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils challenging others' negative behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please use this space to add any comments

_____

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

20. Thinking about all the behaviour you encounter around school, how many pupils do you find generally badly behaved and / or difficult to deal with? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

21. We have listed below some examples of different types of pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they have encountered during the course of their duties AROUND THE SCHOOL. Taking your experience during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently each behaviour has either been referred on to you, or been encountered directly by you. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

		Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all
A	Running in the corridor	1	2	3	4	5
B	Unruliness while waiting (e.g. to enter classrooms, for lunch)	1	2	3	4	5
C	Showing lack of concern for others	1	2	3	4	5
D	Persistently infringing school rules	1	2	3	4	5
E	Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	1	2	3	4	5
F	Loitering in 'prohibited' areas	1	2	3	4	5
G	Leaving school premises without permission	1	2	3	4	5
H	General pupil rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5
I	Use of mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5
J	Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging furniture and fabric)	1	2	3	4	5
K	Racist abuse towards other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
L	Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
M	General verbal abuse towards other pupils (e.g.offensive or insulting remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
N	Racist abuse towards you	1	2	3	4	5
O	Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	1	2	3	4	5
P	General verbal abuse towards you (e.g. offensive, insulting, insolent remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
Q	Physical aggression towards other pupils (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
R	Physical violence towards other pupils (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
S	Physical aggression towards you (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
T	Physical violence towards you (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
U	Pupils deliberately excluding others	1	2	3	4	5
V	Pupils withdrawing from interaction with peers	1	2	3	4	5
W	Pupils truanting	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

22a. Is the pattern of occurences, described in Question 21, typical of the general experience around your school? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

22b. IF NO, please describe why not.

23. From the list in Question 21, please give the letters of up to 3 behaviours that have had the greatest negative impact on staff duties around the school during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*   2 ☐ *(Write letter)*   3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

24. How frequently, if at all, do you receive complaints from the general public, local community or the media about the conduct of your pupils outside the school premises? *(Please tick one box)*

Frequently ☐   Sometimes ☐   Rarely ☐   Never/ almost never ☐

If you indicated you 'frequently' or 'sometimes' receive complaints about the conduct of your pupils outside the school premises, please complete Question 25, otherwise please go to Question 26.

25. What has been the basis of these complaints? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Cheeky or impertinent remarks to members of the public ☐₁

Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging property) ☐₄

Verbal abuse towards any individual (e.g. other pupils, teachers, members of the public) ☐₂

General rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about ☐₅

Physical aggression towards any individual (e.g. other pupils, teachers, members of the public) ☐₃

Anti-social behaviour (e.g. smoking, swearing, shouting) ☐₆

Other ☐₇ *(Please specify)* [   ]

PERCEPTIONS OF PUPILS' NEEDS

CHALLENGING CLASSES AND PUPILS

26. In your school, are there particular stages of pupil causing the greatest difficulty for your staff in respect of behaviour? *(Please tick all the appropriate boxes according to whether the school you teach in is a primary or secondary school)*

Nursery ☐	P 4 ☐	S 1 ☐	All stages difficult ☐
P 1 ☐	P 5 ☐	S 2 ☐	None particularly difficult ☐
P 2 ☐	P 6 ☐	S 3 ☐	Too variable to judge ☐
P 3 ☐	P 7 ☐	S 4 ☐	
		S 5/6 ☐	

27. In your experience WHEN is indiscipline most likely to occur in your school? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Before the school day begins ☐₁   Lunchtime ☐₄   After the end of the school day ☐₇

During morning classes ☐₂   During afternoon classes ☐₅

Morning break ☐₃   Afternoon break ☐₆

8

28. In your experience, WHERE is indiscipline most likely to occur in your school? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Corridors and stairs ☐₁	Toilet areas ☐₄	Outside school precincts ☐₇
School playground or yard ☐₂	Dining hall / queue ☐₅	
Classrooms ☐₃	School buses ☐₆	

Other ☐₈ *(Please specify)* [_____]

29. In many schools there are structured and staged approaches to intervention in response to indiscipline. How often, in your opinion, are the following approaches taken in your school?
(Please circle one number in each row)

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	1	2	3	4
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	1	2	3	4
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	1	2	3	4
Referral for exclusion	1	2	3	4
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	1	2	3	4

MANAGING BEHAVIOUR
SUPPORT FOR STAFF

30. Below is a list of statements relating to the overall level of support offered to teachers in your school. Using a scale of 1 - 5 (with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree') please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
My colleagues can openly talk about any behaviour-related challenges they experience	1	2	3	4	5
Senior staff will help colleagues who are experiencing behaviour management difficulties	1	2	3	4	5
My staff know there is confidential support and counselling within the school if they need it	1	2	3	4	5
My staff know there is confidential support and counselling provided by the education authority	1	2	3	4	5
I involve my staff in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school at least once a year	1	2	3	4	5
My staff contribute ideas and provide support to other colleagues regarding pupil behaviour	1	2	3	4	5
Staff have participated in the development of the school's behaviour policy	1	2	3	4	5

9

TIME SPENT

31. Please estimate how much time you personally spent in the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK ...
(Please tick one box in each row)

	No time spent	Under an hour	An hour to 3 hours	More than 3 hours
Undertaking specific activities in your school to promote positive school ethos and behaviour (e.g. reward schemes, citizenship activities)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dealing with indiscipline	☐	☐	☐	☐
Working with other partners or members of the school community (e.g. home-school link staff, youth workers, social workers or voluntary agencies) in planning, developing or delivering activities in school	☐	☐	☐	☐
Giving or receiving informal support to / from colleagues in relation to indiscipline and positive behaviour	☐	☐	☐	☐
Planning or providing behaviour support to individual pupils	☐	☐	☐	☐
Talking to parents about behaviour (exclude parents' evenings)	☐	☐	☐	☐

32. If you spent some time last week talking to parents, what was the focus of these discussions?
(Please tick one box)

Mostly positive feedback on their child's behaviour ☐₁   A balance of positive and negative feedback ☐₃ on their child's behaviour

Mostly negative feedback on their child's behaviour ☐₂

Other ☐₄ *(Please specify)* [   ]

33. Thinking back over the LAST YEAR, which members of the school community have been actively involved in discussing and developing strategies related to discipline and the promotion of positive behaviour in your school? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Teachers ☐₁   Home-school link staff ☐₅   School caretakers / janitors ☐₉

Parents ☐₂   Social workers ☐₆   School meal staff (cooks / serving staff) ☐₁₀

Pupils ☐₃   Educational psychologists ☐₇   Lunchtime assistants ☐₁₁

Youth workers ☐₄   Learning support staff ☐₈

Other ☐₁₂ *(Please specify)* [   ]

POLICIES AND APPROACHES ON INDISCIPLINE IN SCHOOL

EXPERIENCE OF SPECIFIC APPROACHES

34. Below is a list of approaches that some schools and classroom teachers use to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour. Please indicate whether any of the approaches are currently used within your school. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

		Yes - used in my school	No - not used in my school	Available to my school but off-site	Don't know
A	Rules and rewards for pupils	1	2	N/A	4
B	Citizenship / participation activities	1	2	3	4
C	School uniform	1	2	N/A	4
D	Health promotion activities	1	2	3	4
E	Buddying / peer mentoring	1	2	N/A	4
F	Parent support activities	1	2	3	4
G	Learning programmes for social, communiciation and behaviour skills	1	2	3	4
H	Flexible curriculum options	1	2	3	4
I	Pupil support base	1	2	3	4
J	Integrated support team	1	2	3	4
K	Breaktime supervision	1	2	N/A	4
L	Home-school link	1	2	3	4
M	Support assistants	1	2	N/A	4
N	A behaviour / discipline policy	1	2	N/A	4
O	An anti-bullying policy	1	2	N/A	4
P	Behaviour coordinator (e.g. trained colleague offering support on behaviour issues as in Staged Intervention (FFI))	1	2	3	4
Q	In-service events / input on behaviour	1	2	3	4
R	Partners from other agencies able to support pupils with behaviour issues	1	2	3	4
S	A multi-disciplinary group to plan children's support	1	2	3	4
T	Specialist consultancy (e.g. educational psychologists, authority advisors)	1	2	3	4
U	Whole-school initiatives such as Restorative Practices, Motivated School, or Solution - Oriented School	1	2	N/A	4
V	Pupils actively involved in developing ideas and activities in the school (e.g. pupil council)	1	2	N/A	4
W	Pupils actively involved in developing the school environment (e.g. eco school project)	1	2	N/A	4
X	Pupils respecting diversity (different nationalities, disabilities)	1	2	N/A	4

Please use this space to add any comments

11

136

EFFECTIVENESS

35. From the list in Question 34, please give the letters of up to 3 strategies / approaches that have been the most helpful in encouraging positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour in your school.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*   2 ☐ *(Write letter)*   3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

36. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'not effective at all' and 5 being 'very effective'), please rate how effective, as a whole, the approaches detailed in Question 34 have been in ...

36a. ... promoting positive behaviour in the classroom and the school. *(Please circle one number)*

Not effective at all   1   2   3   4   5   Very effective

36b. ... responding to indiscipline in the classroom and the school. *(Please circle one number)*

Not effective at all   1   2   3   4   5   Very effective

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF DISCIPLINARY CLIMATE

37. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'very serious' and 5 being 'not serious at all'), please rate how serious you think the problem of indiscipline is in your own school as a whole. *(Please circle one number)*

Very serious   1   2   3   4   5   Not serious at all

38a. Do you feel that pupil violence is a problem in your school? *(Please tick one box)*   Yes ☐   No ☐

38b. IF YES, please specify which of the following types of violence is a problem. *(Please tick all that apply)*

Verbal abuse / aggression pupil to pupil ☐₁   Verbal abuse / aggression towards teachers ☐₃

Physical violence pupil to pupil (e.g. punching, kicking, headbutting) ☐₂   Physical violence towards teachers (e.g. punching, kicking, headbutting) ☐₄

39a. Have you personally experienced violence against you in your role as a headteacher? Yes ☐   No ☐

IF YES: how many times? ☐

39b. Did you report this incident?   Yes ☐   No ☐

IF YES: who did you report the incident to? ☐

40. Using a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'very good'), please describe ...
(Please circle one number in each row)

... the overall ethos of your school	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... the quality of leadership provided by senior staff in your school.	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... how all staff work together in your school (e.g. the level of collegiality).	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... how the education authority works in partnership with your school to promote positive behaviour.	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

Please attach any further comments you would like to add on a separate sheet.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK

YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

IF YOU ARE A PART-TIME MEMBER OF STAFF WORKING IN MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL, PLEASE ANSWER
THESE QUESTIONS IN RESPECT OF THE SCHOOL THROUGH WHICH YOU RECEIVED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please indicate your gender and age.

Male ☐ Female ☐ *(Please tick one box)* Age ☐ Years

2a. What is your current appointment ...? *(Please tick one box)*

Permanent ☐ Temporary ☐ Probationary ☐

2b. Do you work ... ? *(Please tick one box)* Full time ☐ Part time ☐ Job share ☐

3. Please state the approximate length of time you have spent ... *(Please estimate to the nearest whole number)*

3a. Working as a teacher (in schools). ☐ Years

3b. Working as a teacher in your present school. ☐ Years

4. Do you hold any of the following roles in school? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Principal teacher ☐₁ Registration / house tutor ☐₄

Pastoral care / personal support ☐₂ Deputy headteacher ☐₅

Behaviour / learning support ☐₃

School development responsibilities ☐₆ *(Please describe)* ☐

Other school role ☐₇ *(Please specify)* ☐

5. On average, how many hours of contact time do you have with your class/es per week? (Please include time spent during a registration class.) *(Please tick one box)*

Under 5 hours ☐₁ Between 11 and 20 hours ☐₃

Between 6 and 10 hours ☐₂ More than 21 hours ☐₄

6. Which stages did you teach during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK? *(Please tick all the appropriate boxes according to whether the school you teach in is a primary or secondary school)*

Nursery ☐	P4 ☐	Composite P 1/2 ☐	Composite P 5/6 ☐	S1 ☐	S5 ☐
P 1 ☐	P 5 ☐	Composite P 2/3 ☐	Composite P 6/7 ☐	S2 ☐	S6 ☐
P 2 ☐	P 6 ☐	Composite P 3/4 ☐		S3 ☐	
P 3 ☐	P 7 ☐	Composite P 4/5 ☐		S4 ☐	

Other ☐ *(Please specify)* ☐

2

Please complete QUESTION 7 if you teach in a secondary school.
If you teach in a primary school, please go to QUESTION 8.

7. What are the subjects that you teach most frequently this school year? Please state up to three subjects.

Most frequently taught subject	
Second most frequently taught subject	
Third most frequently taught subject	

BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

8. In how many of the lessons that you teach on a regular basis do you find pupils generally well behaved? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

9. We have listed below some examples of different types of positive pupil behaviour which teachers experience during the course of their CLASSROOM TEACHING. Over the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you experienced each type of pupil behaviour.
(Please circle one number in each row)

	All lessons	Most lessons	Some lessons	Few lessons	No lessons
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils following instructions	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils settling down quickly	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils contributing to class discussions	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	1	2	3	4	5
Attentive, interested pupils	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils arriving promptly for classes	1	2	3	4	5
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

10. In how many of the lessons that you teach on a regular basis do you find pupils generally badly behaved and / or difficult to deal with? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

3

140

11. We have listed below some examples of different types of pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they have to deal with during the course of their CLASSROOM TEACHING. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. Taking ALL the lessons you have taught during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you had to deal with each type of pupil behaviour.
(Please circle one number in each row)

		Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all
A	Talking out of turn (e.g. by making remarks, calling out, distracting others by chattering)	1	2	3	4	5
B	Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise (e.g. by scraping chairs, banging objects, moving clumsily)	1	2	3	4	5
C	Hindering other pupils (e.g. by distracting them from work, interfering with equipment and materials)	1	2	3	4	5
D	Getting out of their seat without permission	1	2	3	4	5
E	Not being punctual (e.g. being late to lessons)	1	2	3	4	5
F	Persistently infringing class rules (e.g. pupil behaviour, safety)	1	2	3	4	5
G	Eating / chewing in class	1	2	3	4	5
H	Calculated idleness or work avoidance (e.g. delaying start to work set, frequent requests to go to the toilet)	1	2	3	4	5
I	Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	1	2	3	4	5
J	General rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5
K	Use of mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5
L	Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging furniture and fabric)	1	2	3	4	5
M	Racist abuse towards other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
N	Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
O	General verbal abuse towards other pupils (e.g. offensive or insulting remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
P	Racist abuse towards you	1	2	3	4	5
Q	Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	1	2	3	4	5
R	General verbal abuse towards you (e.g. offensive, insulting, insolent or threatening remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
S	Physical aggression towards other pupils (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
T	Physical violence towards other pupils (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
U	Physical aggression towards you (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
V	Physical violence towards you (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
W	Pupils withdrawing from interaction with others / you	1	2	3	4	5
X	Pupils missing lessons (e.g. truancy)	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

4

141

12a. Is the pattern of occurences, described in Question 11, typical of your general classroom experience in your school? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

12b. IF NO, please describe why not.

☐

13. On a scale of 1 - 5, (with 1 being 'extremely difficult' and 5 being 'not difficult at all') please rate how difficult you found it to deal with the negative behaviours you have reported in Question 11. *(Please circle one number)*

Extremely difficult   1   2   3   4   5   Not difficult at all

14. From the list in Question 11, please give the letters of up to 3 behaviours that have had the greatest negative impact on your teaching experience during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*   2 ☐ *(Write letter)*   3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

15. Thinking about all the behaviour you encounter around school, how many pupils do you find generally well behaved? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

16. We have listed below some examples of different types of positive pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they encounter during the course of their duties AROUND THE SCHOOL. Taking your experience during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you encountered each type of behaviour. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all	N/A
Pupils actively helping their peers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils taking turns	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils making positive use of school facilities during breaks (e.g. the library, sports facilities)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils engaged in playing games and sports together	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils queuing in an orderly manner	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils respecting toilet / break / cloakroom areas	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils using litter bins	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils greeting staff pleasantly	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pupils challenging others' negative behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please use this space to add any comments

☐

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

17. Thinking about all the behaviour you encounter around school, how many pupils do you find generally badly behaved and / or difficult to deal with? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all ☐₁   Most ☐₂   Some ☐₃   Few ☐₄   None / almost none ☐₅

18. We have listed below some examples of different types of pupil behaviour which teachers have told us they have encountered during the course of their duties AROUND THE SCHOOL. Taking your experience during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you encountered each type of behaviour. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

		Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all
A	Running in the corridor	1	2	3	4	5
B	Unruliness while waiting (e.g. to enter classrooms, for lunch)	1	2	3	4	5
C	Showing lack of concern for others	1	2	3	4	5
D	Persistently infringing school rules	1	2	3	4	5
E	Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	1	2	3	4	5
F	Loitering in 'prohibited' areas	1	2	3	4	5
G	Leaving school premises without permission	1	2	3	4	5
H	General pupil rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5
I	Use of mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5
J	Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging furniture and fabric)	1	2	3	4	5
K	Racist abuse towards other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
L	Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
M	General verbal abuse towards other pupils (e.g. offensive or insulting remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
N	Racist abuse towards you	1	2	3	4	5
O	Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	1	2	3	4	5
P	General verbal abuse towards you (e.g. offensive, insulting, insolent remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
Q	Physical aggression towards other pupils (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
R	Physical violence towards other pupils (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
S	Physical aggression towards you (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
T	Physical violence towards you (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
U	Pupils deliberately excluding others	1	2	3	4	5
V	Pupils withdrawing from interaction with peers	1	2	3	4	5
W	Pupils truanting	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

☐

143

19a. Is the pattern of occurences, described in Question 18, typical of your general experience around your school? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐

19b. IF NO, please describe why not.

☐

20. On a scale of 1 - 5 (with 1 being 'extremely difficult' and 5 being 'not difficult at all'), please rate how difficult you found it to deal with the negative behaviours you have reported in Question 18. *(Please circle one number)*

Extremely difficult   1   2   3   4   5   Not difficult at all

21. From the list in Question 18, please give the letters of up to 3 behaviours that have had the greatest negative impact on your duties around the school during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*   2 ☐ *(Write letter)*   3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

PERCEPTIONS OF PUPILS' NEEDS

CHALLENGING CLASSES AND PUPILS

SECONDARY: If you teach in a secondary school, please complete QUESTIONS 22 to 28 with regard to the most DIFFICULT class that you teach this school year.

PRIMARY: If you teach in a primary school, please complete QUESTIONS 23 to 28 with regard to the class that you MAINLY teach this year.

SECONDARY ONLY

22. Many teachers have told us that they find some of their classes more difficult to deal with than others. How many of the classes you are currently teaching on a regular basis do you find difficult to deal with? *(Please tick one box)*

More than half ☐₁   Less than half ☐₃   None ☐₅

About half ☐₂   One or two ☐₄

If you indicated that you have no classes which you find difficult to deal with, please go to QUESTION 29.

23. Thinking about your most difficult / main class, how many male and female pupils are there in this class?

Number of male pupils ☐   Number of female pupils ☐   Total ☐

7

144

24a. Please indicate how the pupils have been allocated to this class. *(Please tick one box)*

Set / streamed by subject ☐   Mixed abilities class ☐

24b. IF SET / STREAMED, what is the attainment level of the class like in comparison with other pupils in this age range?

Above average ☐   Average ☐   Below average ☐

25. What year group are the pupils in this class?   Year group ☐

26. What proportion of pupils in this class has additional support needs? *(Please tick one box)*

None ☐₁   Very few ☐₂   Up to a quarter ☐₃   Over a quarter ☐₄

27. Has the composition of this class been influenced by decisions about discipline or pupil behaviour problems? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐   No ☐   Don't know ☐

28. Do you have access to any of the following supports to help you manage this class? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Whole-class support
(e.g. from classroom / support assistants) ☐₁   Support from colleagues ☐₄

PT / SMT support ☐₂   Learning / SEN support for individual pupils ☐₅

Opportunity to request a referral
for a pupil for further investigation ☐₃

29. In many schools there are structured and staged approaches to intervention in response to indiscipline. How often, in your opinion, are the following approaches taken in your school? *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Referral to an in-school support base for pupil time-out	1	2	3	4
Referral to a key member of staff (e.g. guidance, behaviour support)	1	2	3	4
Referral for specific intervention to change behaviour (e.g. anger management)	1	2	3	4
Referral for exclusion	1	2	3	4
Planned support and help for the teacher (e.g. support strategy or staff)	1	2	3	4

8

145

MANAGING BEHAVIOUR

SUPPORT FOR STAFF

30. Below is a list of statements relating to the overall level of support offered to teachers in your school. Using a scale of 1 - 5 (with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree') please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I can talk to colleagues openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience	1	2	3	4	5
I am confident that senior staff will help me if I experience behaviour management difficulties	1	2	3	4	5
I know there is confidential support and counselling for staff if I need it	1	2	3	4	5
My colleagues and I are regularly involved in discussion about improving behaviour in the whole school	1	2	3	4	5
I contribute ideas and provide support to my colleagues regarding pupil behaviour	1	2	3	4	5

YOUR CONFIDENCE

31. Using a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'not confident at all' and 5 being 'very confident'), please rate how confident you are in your ability to ...

31a. ... promote positive behaviour in your classroom. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

Not confident at all   1   2   3   4   5   Very confident

31b. ... respond to indiscipline in your classroom.

Not confident at all   1   2   3   4   5   Very confident

32. Please indicate whether the approaches / strategies listed below would make you more confident in your ability to promote positive behaviour and respond to indiscipline in your classroom.
(Please tick one box in each row)

A colleague available to give confidential advice and feedback	Yes ☐	No ☐
Understanding of individual pupils' learning styles and motivation	Yes ☐	No ☐
Suggested scripts to help you deal with different situations	Yes ☐	No ☐
Personal safety training	Yes ☐	No ☐

9

TIME SPENT

33. **Please estimate how much time you personally spent in the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK ...**
(Please tick one box in each row)

	No time spent	Under an hour	An hour to 3 hours	More than 3 hours
Undertaking specific activities in your school to promote positive school ethos and behaviour (e.g. reward schemes, citizenship activities)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dealing with indiscipline	☐	☐	☐	☐
Working with other partners or members of the school community (e.g. home-school link staff, youth workers, social workers or voluntary agencies) in planning, developing or delivering activities in school	☐	☐	☐	☐
Giving or receiving informal support to / from colleagues in relation to indiscipline and positive behaviour	☐	☐	☐	☐
Planning or providing behaviour support to individual pupils	☐	☐	☐	☐
Talking to parents about behaviour (exclude parents' evenings)	☐	☐	☐	☐

34. **If you spent some time last week talking to parents, what was the focus of these discussions?**
(Please tick one box)

Mostly positive feedback on their child's behaviour ☐₁   A balance of positive and negative feedback on their child's behaviour ☐₃

Mostly negative feedback on their child's behaviour ☐₂

Other ☐₄ *(Please specify)* [_____]

35. **Thinking back over the LAST YEAR, approximately how many times have you been involved in ...?**
(Please tick one box in each row)

	Never	Once or twice	More than twice
Whole-school planning in relation to discipline and positive behaviour	☐	☐	☐
Any kind of staff development activity in relation to discipline and positive behaviour	☐	☐	☐

POLICIES AND APPROACHES ON INDISCIPLINE IN SCHOOL

EXPERIENCE OF SPECIFIC APPROACHES

36. Below is a list of approaches that some schools and classroom teachers use to encourage positive behaviour and overcome negative behaviour. Please indicate whether any of the approaches are currently used within your school. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

		Yes - used in my school	No - not used in my school	Available to my school but off-site	Don't know
A	Rules and rewards for pupils	1	2	N/A	4
B	Citizenship / participation activities	1	2	3	4
C	School uniform	1	2	N/A	4
D	Health promotion activities	1	2	3	4
E	Buddying / peer mentoring	1	2	N/A	4
F	Parent support activities	1	2	3	4
G	Learning programmes for social, communication and behaviour skills	1	2	3	4
H	Flexible curriculum options	1	2	3	4
I	Pupil support base	1	2	3	4
J	Integrated support team	1	2	3	4
K	Breaktime supervision	1	2	N/A	4
L	Home-school link	1	2	3	4
M	Support assistants	1	2	N/A	4
N	A behaviour / discipline policy	1	2	N/A	4
O	An anti-bullying policy	1	2	N/A	4
P	Behaviour coordinator (e.g. trained colleague offering support on behaviour issues as in Staged Intervention (FFI))	1	2	3	4
Q	In-service events / input on behaviour	1	2	3	4
R	Partners from other agencies able to support pupils with behaviour issues	1	2	3	4
S	A multi-disciplinary group to plan children's support	1	2	3	4
T	Specialist consultancy (e.g. educational psychologists, authority advisors)	1	2	3	4
U	Whole-school initiatives such as Restorative Practices, Motivated School, or Solution - Oriented School	1	2	N/A	4
V	Pupils actively involved in developing ideas and activities in the school (e.g. pupil council)	1	2	N/A	4
W	Pupils actively involved in developing the school environment (e.g. eco school project)	1	2	N/A	4
X	Pupils respecting diversity (different nationalities, disabilities)	1	2	N/A	4

Please use this space to add any comments

EFFECTIVENESS

37. From the list in Question 36, please give the letters of up to 3 strategies / approaches that have been the most helpful in encouraging positive behaviour and overcoming negative behaviour in your school.

1 ☐ *(Write letter)*　　　2 ☐ *(Write letter)*　　　3 ☐ *(Write letter)*

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF DISCIPLINARY CLIMATE

38. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'very serious' and 5 being 'not serious at all'), please rate how serious you think the problem of indiscipline is in your own school as a whole. *(Please circle one number)*

　　　　　　Very serious　　1　2　3　4　5　　Not serious at all

39a. Do you feel that pupil violence is a problem in your school? *(Please tick one box)*

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes ☐　　No ☐

39b. IF YES, please specify which of the following types of violence is a problem. *(Please tick all that apply)*

Verbal abuse / aggression pupil to pupil ☐₁　　Verbal abuse / aggression towards teachers ☐₃

Physical violence pupil to pupil
(e.g. punching, kicking, headbutting) ☐₂　　Physical violence towards teachers
(e.g. punching, kicking, headbutting) ☐₄

40a. Have you personally experienced violence against you in your role as a teacher?　Yes ☐　No ☐

IF YES: how many times? ☐

40b. Did you report this incident?　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes ☐　No ☐

IF YES: who did you report the incident to? ☐

41. Using a scale of 1-5, (with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'very good') please describe ...
(Please circle one number in each row)

... the overall ethos of your school	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... the quality of leadership in your school	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... how all staff work together in your school (e.g. the level of collegiality)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
... how the education authority works in partnership with your school to promote positive behaviour.	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

42. Please use this space or attach an extra sheet if you have any further comments you would like to add.

☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK

149

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

NATIONAL SURVEY ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

nfer   SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

- This questionnaire asks for your opinion on pupils' behaviour in your school. We are carrying out this research for the Scottish Executive.

- We are very interested in your views. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions. Please just give your honest opinion.

- You don't need to put your name on this and nobody apart from the researchers will see your answers.

- Thank you very much for your help.

- When you have finished, please put the questionnaire in the envelope provided and then hand it to your teacher.

YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

1. Please tick whether you are male or female.

Male ☐   Female ☐   *(Please tick one box)*

2. Please tick which year group you are in. *(Please tick one box)*

| P6 ☐ | S1 ☐ | S3 ☐ | S5 ☐ |
| P7 ☐ | S2 ☐ | S4 ☐ | S6 ☐ |

3. Please say whether you agree / disagree with the following statements by circling ONE number in each row.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
I am usually happy about coming to school	1	2	3	4	5
I am usually well behaved at school	1	2	3	4	5
I find most of my school work interesting	1	2	3	4	5
I know I can always ask for help from a teacher when I don't understand	1	2	3	4	5
I often get into trouble at school	1	2	3	4	5

BSU 3125-26   © NFER 2006   **PQ**

150

BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

GOOD BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

4. Last week, in how many of your lessons were most pupils well behaved for most of the time? *(Please tick one box)*

All lessons ☐₁   Most lessons ☐₂   Some lessons ☐₃   Few lessons ☐₄   No lessons ☐₅

5. Last week, did you see any of the behaviours listed below in your lessons? Say how often you saw these behaviours by circling a number.
(Please circle one number in each row)

	All lessons	Most lessons	Some lessons	Few lessons	No lessons
Pupils bringing the things they need to lessons (e.g. pens, pencils, books)	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils following instructions from the teacher	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils settling down to work quickly	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils being a part of class discussions	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to other pupils' views respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils getting on with their work	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils politely asking for the teacher's help (e.g. by putting their hands up)	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils who listen and are interested in lessons	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils arriving for lessons on time	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils behaving well and making lessons enjoyable for everyone	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

[   ]

POOR BEHAVIOUR IN THE CLASSROOM

6. Last week, in how many of your lessons were pupils badly behaved so that it caused difficulty for the teacher and disturbed other pupils? *(Please tick one box)*

All lessons ☐₁   Most lessons ☐₂   Some lessons ☐₃   Few lessons ☐₄   No lessons ☐₅

151

7. **Last week, did you see any of the behaviours listed below in your lessons? Say how often you saw these behaviours by circling a number ....** *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	All lessons	Most lessons	Some lessons	Few lessons	No lessons
A Pupils calling out, saying things or distracting others by chattering	1	2	3	4	5
B Pupils making too much noise by scraping chairs, banging objects and moving clumsily	1	2	3	4	5
C Pupils distracting other pupils from their work and messing about with other people's things	1	2	3	4	5
D Pupils being late for lessons	1	2	3	4	5
E Pupils who keep breaking class rules by behaving badly or dangerously	1	2	3	4	5
F Pupils getting out of their seat without permission	1	2	3	4	5
G Pupils eating / chewing in class	1	2	3	4	5
H Pupils deliberately delaying getting on with their work (e.g. frequent requests to go to the toilet)	1	2	3	4	5
I Pupils being cheeky to staff	1	2	3	4	5
J Pupils being generally rowdy or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5
K Pupils using mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5
L Pupils breaking objects and damaging furniture	1	2	3	4	5
M Pupils saying racist things to other pupils because they come from a different ethnic background	1	2	3	4	5
N Pupils saying sexist things to other pupils based on whether they are a boy or girl	1	2	3	4	5
O Pupils pushing or being threatening to other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
P Pupils punching, kicking, physically hurting other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
Q Pupils being rude to teachers	1	2	3	4	5
R Pupils pushing or being threatening to teachers	1	2	3	4	5
S Pupils punching, kicking, physically hurting teachers	1	2	3	4	5
T Pupils not letting other pupils join in with them	1	2	3	4	5
U Pupils who stop talking to other pupils and hang around on their own	1	2	3	4	5
V Pupils missing certain lessons (e.g. truancy)	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

3

BEHAVIOUR IN YOUR SCHOOL

8. Thinking about ALL the times that you are in and around the school building (e.g. moving from lesson to lesson, at break and lunchtime), how many pupils do you think are generally WELL BEHAVED? *(Please tick one box)*

All ☐ ₁　　Most ☐ ₂　　Some ☐ ₃　　Few ☐ ₄　　None ☐ ₅

9. Below is a list of things that some schools use to help pupils to behave well and to stop bad behaviour. Please read each statement carefully and circle ONE number in each row to show whether your school uses any of these.

	Yes - used in my school	No - not used in my school	Don't Know
A School rules for pupils to follow	1	2	3
B Rewards for pupils who perform well or behave well	1	2	3
C Citizenship lessons and activities	1	2	3
D School uniform	1	2	3
E Lessons or activities to do with health (e.g. healthy living)	1	2	3
F Pupils who buddy / mentor other pupils	1	2	3
G A place in school where a pupil might go to get extra help for their behaviour	1	2	3
H Staff who are on duty at breaktime	1	2	3
I Other members of staff who help teachers in lessons	1	2	3
J An anti-bullying policy	1	2	3
K A pupil council where pupils meet to talk about school issues	1	2	3
L Environmental / green school projects (e.g. to help look after the school environment)	1	2	3

Which of the above things do you think works best to help pupils behave well and to stop bad behaviour? ☐ *(Write letter)*

10. Please say how serious you think the problem of bad behaviour is in your school by circling one number in the row below.

Very serious	Quite serious	Not serious
1	2	3

11. Is there anything else schools could do to help pupils behave well? *(Please tick one box)*

Yes ☐　　No ☐

IF YES, please describe what could be done.

☐

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY
SCHOOLS WHO ASSIST TEACHERS IN THEIR WORK WITH
PUPILS IN CLASSROOMS AND SUPPORT BASES**

NATIONAL SURVEY ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

nfer   SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS WHO ASSIST
TEACHERS IN THEIR WORK WITH PUPILS IN CLASSROOMS AND SUPPORT BASES
(For the purpose of this questionnaire, these staff are called *classroom assistants*, but you may have
other locally determined job titles)

- This questionnaire is part of a national survey of behaviour in schools in Scotland. The research has been commissioned by the Scottish Executive with the support and backing of the teacher unions. NFER is carrying out the survey on their behalf.

- Behaviour is a high profile issue. The research will lead to a greater understanding of the reality of pupil behaviour and discipline in Scottish schools.

- The study is seeking the opinions of headteachers, teachers, non-teaching staff and pupils across Scotland. **Your views are very important as they will help to establish what is actually happening in schools.**

- All responses are confidential, and schools and individuals will remain anonymous in all reports.

- If you have any queries about the research, or about how to complete the questionnaire, please contact David Hereward on telephone 01753 637352 or email at d.hereward@nfer.ac.uk

Please return the questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope to:

Reseach Data Services, National Foundation for Educational Research,
The Mere, Upton Park, SLOUGH, SL1 2ZN

It would be much appreciated if you could return the questionnaire within 3 weeks.

YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

1. Please indicate your gender and age.

   Male ☐   Female ☐   *(Please tick one box)*   Age ☐ Years

2. Please state the approximate length of time you have spent ... *(Please estimate to the nearest whole number)*

2a. Working as a classroom assistant (in schools)   ☐ Years

2b. Working as a classroom assistant in your present school   ☐ Years

3. Who do you provide classroom support to this school year? *(Please tick all that apply)*

   One individual pupil ☐₁   One particular class ☐₃   Any class as required ☐₅

   A few pupils ☐₂   A few classes ☐₄

   Other ☐₆ *(Please specify)* ☐

BSU 3125-26   © NFER 2006   **AQ**

154

BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND IN THE CLASSROOM

4. Thinking about all the behaviour you encounter around the school, how many pupils do you find generally well behaved? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all [ ]₁   Most [ ]₂   Some [ ]₃   Few [ ]₄   None / almost none [ ]₅

5. In how many of the lessons that you assist in on a regular basis do you find pupils generally well behaved? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all [ ]₁   Most [ ]₂   Some [ ]₃   Few [ ]₄   None / almost none [ ]₅

6. We have listed below some examples of different types of positive pupil behaviour which you may have experienced during the course of your classroom duties. Taking ALL the lessons you assisted in during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you experienced each type of pupil behaviour. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	All lessons	Most lessons	Some lessons	Few lessons	No lessons
Pupils arriving with the correct equipment	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils following instructions	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils settling down quickly	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils contributing to class discussions	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to others' views respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils listening to the teacher respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils keenly engaging with their tasks	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils politely seeking teacher help (e.g. putting hand up)	1	2	3	4	5
Attentive, interested pupils	1	2	3	4	5
Pupils arriving promptly for classes	1	2	3	4	5
Lessons that are calm, relaxed and enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

[   ]

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR AROUND THE SCHOOL AND IN THE CLASSROOM

7. In how many of the lessons that you assist in on a regular basis do you find pupils generally badly behaved and / or difficult to deal with? *(Please tick one box)*

All / almost all [ ]₁   Most [ ]₂   Some [ ]₃   Few [ ]₄   None / almost none [ ]₅

2

155

8. We have listed below some examples of different types of pupil behaviour which you may have experienced during the course of your classroom duties. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. Taking ALL the lessons you assisted in during the LAST FULL TEACHING WEEK, please indicate how frequently you had to deal with each type of pupil behaviour. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Several times daily	Once a day	3 or 4 times a week	Once or twice a week	Not at all
A Talking out of turn (e.g. by making remarks, calling out, distracting others by chattering)	1	2	3	4	5
B Making unnecessary (non-verbal) noise (e.g. by scraping chairs, banging objects, moving clumsily)	1	2	3	4	5
C Hindering other pupils (e.g. by distracting them from work, interfering with equipment and materials)	1	2	3	4	5
D Getting out of their seat without permission	1	2	3	4	5
E Not being punctual (e.g. being late to lessons)	1	2	3	4	5
F Persistently infringing class rules (e.g. pupil behaviour, safety)	1	2	3	4	5
G Eating / chewing in class	1	2	3	4	5
H Calculated idleness or work avoidance (e.g. delaying start to work set, frequent requests to go to the toilet)	1	2	3	4	5
I Cheeky or impertinent remarks or responses	1	2	3	4	5
J General rowdiness, horseplay or mucking about	1	2	3	4	5
K Use of mobile phones / texting	1	2	3	4	5
L Physical destructiveness (e.g. breaking objects, damaging furniture and fabric)	1	2	3	4	5
M Racist abuse towards other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
N Sexist abuse or harassment of other pupils	1	2	3	4	5
O General verbal abuse towards other pupils (e.g. offensive or insulting remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
P Racist abuse towards you	1	2	3	4	5
Q Sexist abuse or harassment towards you	1	2	3	4	5
R General verbal abuse towards you (e.g. offensive, insulting, insolent or threatening remarks)	1	2	3	4	5
S Physical aggression towards other pupils (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
T Physical violence towards other pupils (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
U Physical aggression towards you (e.g. by pushing, squaring up)	1	2	3	4	5
V Physical violence towards you (e.g. punching, kicking, head butting, use of a weapon)	1	2	3	4	5
W Pupils withdrawing from interaction with others / you	1	2	3	4	5
X Pupils missing lessons (e.g. truancy)	1	2	3	4	5

Please use this space to add any comments

3

156

MANAGING BEHAVIOUR

SUPPORT FOR STAFF

9. Below is a list of statements relating to the overall level of support offered to support assistants in your school. Using a scale of 1 - 5 (with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 5 being 'strongly agree'), please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. *(Please circle one number in each row)*

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I can talk to other support assistants openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience	1	2	3	4	5
I can talk to teachers openly about any behaviour-related challenges I experience	1	2	3	4	5
I am confident that senior managers in school will help me if I experience difficulties with pupil behaviour	1	2	3	4	5
I know that there is confidential support and counselling available for support staff if I need it within my school	1	2	3	4	5
I know that there is confidential support and counselling available for support staff if I need it within my authority	1	2	3	4	5
Support assistant(s) are regularly involved in discussions about improving behaviour in the whole school	1	2	3	4	5

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF DISCIPLINARY CLIMATE

10. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being 'very serious' and 5 being 'not serious at all'), please rate how serious you think the problem of indiscipline is in your own school as a whole. *(Please circle one number)*

Very serious   1   2   3   4   5   Not serious at all

11a. Do you feel that pupil violence is a problem in your school? *(Please tick one box)*   Yes ☐   No ☐

11b. IF YES, please specify which of the following types of violence is a problem. *(Please tick all that apply)*

Verbal abuse / aggression pupil to pupil ☐₁   Physical aggression pupil to pupil ☐₄

Verbal abuse / aggression towards teachers ☐₂   Physical aggression towards teachers ☐₅

Verbal abuse / aggression towards support staff ☐₃   Physical aggression towards support staff ☐₆

12a. Have you personally experienced violence against you in your role as classroom assistant?   Yes ☐   No ☐

IF YES: how many times? ☐

12b. Did you report this incident?   Yes ☐   No ☐

IF YES: who did you report the incident to? ☐

13. Using a scale of 1-5 (1 = 'poor' and 5 = 'very good'), please describe ... *(Please circle one number in each row)*

the overall ethos of your school	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
the quality of leadership in your school	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
how all staff work together in your school (e.g. the level of collegiality)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
how the education authority works in partnership with your school to promote positive behaviour.	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK

REFERENCES

KINDER, K., HARLAND, J., WILKIN, A. and WAKEFIELD, A. (1995). *Three to Remember: Strategies for Disaffected Pupils*. Slough : NFER.

KINDER, K., KENDALL, S., HALSEY, K. and ATKINSON, M. (199). *Disaffection Talks: A report for the Merseyside Learning Partnership Interagency Development Programme.* NFER: Slough.

MUNN, P., JOHNSTONE, M. and SHARP, S. (2004). *Discipline in Scottish Schools: A comparative survey over time of teachers' and headteachers' perceptions* [online]. Available: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2004/11/20255/46683

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE. (2001). *Better Behaviour – Better Learning: Summary Report of the Discipline Task Group.* Edinburgh: Stationery Office.

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE. (2004a). *Better Behaviour in Scottish Schools: Policy Update 2004* [online]. Available: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2004/11/20233/46417

SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE. (2004). *Violence and Anti-Social Behaviour in Scottish Schools* [online]. Available: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/stats/bulletins/00318.pdf

GSR
GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH

Analysis for Policy