

LIEB91.140

EDUCATION STUDIES AND THE MANAGEMENT OF PUPIL BEHAVIOUR

Roger Liebmann, Curtin University of Technology
Andrew Taggart, Edith Cowan University

Although Bartlett (1991, p.13) informs us that: "the only in-depth research into pupil attention in initial encounters in an Australian context was undertaken by Bartlett (1989)", the problem of pupil management is of sufficient import that Barry and King (1988, p.150) suggest that management problems will occur during teaching practice. This paper will attempt to address the apparent need for research into the establishment and maintenance of pupil management.

The study considered in this paper was conducted within the epistemological framework of a disciplined inquiry which reflects the stance that the wide spectrum of interrelated influences that structure the social situation in the classroom revolving around the management of pupil behaviour make it inappropriate to take, only, the narrow view required by traditional "scientific" research methods. The view taken in this study is that as much of the relevant data involved in the performance of pupil management in the classroom as is practicable should be gathered using both quantitative and qualitative methods (Gibson,1960).

This paper includes the presentation of the results gathered from a part of a study which focuses on the five week teaching practice (for eleven subjects) near the end of the teacher training programme. The data which will be presented in this paper has been generated from; supervisor reports on the subject's teaching practice performance, the Rules Observation Instrument (R.O.I.) data from observation of classroom lessons, video recordings of lessons taught by the subjects, pupil responses on the modified Classroom Environment Scale (C.E.S.), and transcripts of recorded interviews with the subjects.

1. Data Collection and Analysis on Teaching Practice

This stage of the study consisted of observations of the eleven subjects while they were completing their five week teaching practice experience. All subjects taught at Government Senior High Schools in the Perth metropolitan area. During the beginning weeks of the subject's five week teaching practice, the researcher

observed the subject's teaching behaviour and gathered data on pupil management behaviour on the R.O.I. and on video tape. Following the first observation, a concentrated feedback intervention was given to each subject. Near the end of the second observation, the classroom pupil's responses to the modified C.E.S. forms were collected. The subjects were interviewed about their views concerning pupil management.

1.1 Analysis of Supervisors' Reports

The three supervisors gave comments and numerical assessments on each student teacher in reports to the University. A mean of the numerical assessments formed a major part of the student teacher's second Teaching Practice Result.

Student teachers were assessed in equal parts in terms of their competency in:

preparatory efforts, teaching skills, communication skills, relationship with pupils, classroom management and professional qualities. A major factor of the classroom management assessment was the management of pupil behaviour.

University teaching practice reports were analyzed to compare and contrast the comments and the numerical assessment of the supervisor's report. The numerical assessments were out of 100, above 75 being considered highly competent and an assessment below 65 being considered low in competence (see Table 1). The high and low competence cut off points are determined by the Student Teacher Assessment Form for the Faculty.

Table 1
Assessment of Teaching Competency (T/C) by Supervisors

Subject	Sex	Age	Curriculum	Area	T/C
High competence group					
Jan		F		Home	20
Economics			90		
Jean	F		44	Social Studies	87
Fay		F		Art	27
Elly		F		Science	20
Dave	M		22	Art	83
Portia	F		35	Mathematics	83

Low competence group				
Shelly	F		23	Art 63
Lin		F		35 Home
Economics			60	
Patrick M			39	Social Studies
			60	
Ruth	F		30	Science
			60	
Yoni	M		35	Mathematics
			50	

Since a subject's teaching competency score in terms of over-all competency may not reflect the supervisors' assessment of competency in terms of the subject's pupil management, the supervisor comments have been analysed for pupil management comment. The comments of the supervisors on each subject's pupil management were compared with the numerical mean from the three supervisor assessments in terms of the over-all competence assessment. The comments of the supervisors in terms of pupil management agreed with the teaching competency scores for ten of the eleven student teachers.

A typical supervisor comment in terms of pupil management by subjects with high teaching competence was: "Jean's discipline measures can only be described as being positive, fair, and consistent. Students perceived her to be a very caring approachable person. As a consequence, pupils reacted accordingly. Jean demonstrated effective supervision skills whilst working with individuals or groups. At all times, students were only too willing to 'do the right thing'. Jean's empathy for her pupils, her caring nature, honesty and positive personality traits, allowed for effective classroom management." A typical supervisor comment in terms of pupil management by subjects with low teaching competence was: "Yoni's lesson procedures did not always maintain satisfactory standards of: i)pupil input, ii) pupil participation, iii) pupil attention and interest. His use of praise and encouragement was not always appropriate and added little to the instruction of the pupils. Yoni had difficulty adjusting to impromptu situations and his time schedules were not always met.",

Patrick is the exception who proved the rule in the sense that he was the only subject with a low teaching competence who did not have low pupil management comments from the supervisors. Typically supervisors felt that the objectives and content of Patrick's lesson plans needed development. However the

pupil

management comments about Patrick were more balanced. Some examples of these comments are: "Although he has good on-task behaviour from the pupils most of the time, while working with individuals, Patrick might monitor the rest of the class a bit more closely." and "Patrick has developed an excellent rapport with the students." The mean of the three supervisors' numerical assessments on over-all teaching practice performance, which divided the student teachers into high and low competency groups, was not accepted as an automatic indication of the subjects' pupil management competencies. The comments from the three supervisors were analysed in terms of the consideration of the student teachers' pupil management behaviour. The comments on pupil management agreed with the numerical assessments for ten of the eleven student teachers. teaching practice.

1.2 The Rule Observation Instrument Analysis

The Rule Observation Instrument (R.O.I.) was used in the classroom of each subject to record the pupil management behaviours. Although pro-active teacher behaviour may relate to pupil management, the study focused on the teacher's reactions to misbehaviour. For the purposes of this study the teacher's reactions to misbehaviour are considered in nine behaviours. A teacher may ignore (coded I) or not see a misbehaviour. If a teacher does not ignore misbehaviour in the classroom, then the teacher may react to a misbehaviour by speaking to the whole (W) class about the misbehaviour, or by naming (N) the pupils involved. A teacher may further respond to a misbehaviour by; mentioning the rule (R) which was broken, causing a misbehaviour to stop (S), defining (D) a rule, explaining why (Y) a rule is required, warning the pupil(s) of the consequences (C) of a misbehaviour or by following-up (F) the misbehaviour with a consequence. Misbehaviour is determined by the teacher's view of what is inappropriate pupil behaviour. The R.O.I. is designed to be used by the observer to record what the teacher does after misbehaviour has occurred in the classroom. The first three R.O.I. behaviours (I,W, & N) cover the initial possibilities, in that the teacher will either ignore the misbehaviour or react to the class about it or indicate the pupil(s) responsible. These three R.O.I. behaviours are the main behaviours observed and all misbehaviour that occurs in the lesson may be identified within these three

behaviours. The rest of the R.O.I. behaviours are subsets of speaking to the whole class or naming students for misbehaviours (they occur after either W or N and are dependent on them).

Table 2 indicates that subjects in the high competence group ignored misbehaviour less than those in the low competence group. The R.O.I. behaviours of: defining a rule (D), explaining why a rule is required (Y), explaining the consequences of misbehaviour (C), or following up on misbehaviour with a consequence (F), were seldom used by the subjects in response to misbehaviour.

Table 2
Frequency of the R.O.I. Behaviours for Each Subject During the First Observed Lesson

Subject	R.O.I. Behaviour Codes						
	R	C	I	S F	W	N D	Y
<hr/>							
High Competency Group							
Jan		31		13	6	17	16
	1		0				
Jean	7		6	1	1	2	6
		0					
Fay				14		9	25
	26		23		4	4	1
		1					
Elly					4	5	6
		11		9		0	0
	0		0				
Dave			30		16	12	24
		7		2		4	0
	0						
Portia			12		11	10	21
		16		0		3	0
	0						
		mean	11		10	12	20
		12		1		3	0
	0						
<hr/>							
Low Competency Group							
Shelly			18		2	2	4
		1		0		0	0
	0						

Lin	5	2	51	0	7	1	4	0
	0							
Patrick	0	9	1	8	2	4	1	11
	5							
Ruth	0	25	0	9	1	9	0	12
	4							
Yoni	1	49	4	4	0	7	0	6
	5							
	0	mean	30	6	1	5	0	8
	3							
	0		1	1				

After the observation of the first teaching practice lesson each subject underwent a concentrated feedback intervention consisting of the video playback of the lesson, the presentation of R.O.I. results from the observed lesson and comments from the researcher about pupil management. The second observations of the subject's lessons (see Table 3) were undertaken in the fourth or fifth week of the five week teaching practice. In Table 3 the frequency for each of the R.O.I. behaviours for all subjects during the second observation of lessons are given under each R.O.I. behaviour code. Subjects tended to ignore misbehaviour less after the concentrated feedback intervention.

In order to compare and contrast the R.O.I. behaviours in the second observation (see Table 3), in terms of the high and low competency groups (see Table 1), a mean frequency score for all R.O.I. behaviours within each competency group was depicted (see FIGURE 1).

Figure 1 indicates that subjects in the low competency group ignored misbehaviour approximately three times more than the subjects in the high competency group. This result supports the findings of researcher's such as Evertson and Emmer when they claim that: "Effective teachers are consistent in managing behaviour by noting and reacting to departures from acceptable classroom behaviour" (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 35).

Further Sanford (1984) suggests that effective managers seldom ignored misbehaviour, on the other hand, ignoring too much misbehaviour was characteristic of almost all of the teachers experiencing pupil management difficulties. As Figure 1 indicates the subjects ignored misbehaviour in

relation

to their high or low competence in a way which supports the implications of Sanford's suggestion. (for a copy of Figure 1 write to: R. Liebmann, 3 Molloy St., Bunbury, W.A., 6230)

Table 3
 Frequency of the R.O.I. Behaviours for Each Subject During the Second Observed Lesson

Subject	R.O.I. Behaviour Codes						
	Y	R	I C	S F	W	N D	
High Competence Group							
Jan		14		22	2	18	9
Jean	2		1	0	0		0
Fay	13	0	21	0	20	9	0
Elly	19	1	27	12	26	7	3
Dave	0	10	0	15	2	13	1
Portia	24	1	17	0	11	1	12
		37	0	12	0	8	0
	16	mean	24	7	18	1	1
		1		0			
Low Competence Group							
Shelly			36		3		9
Lin	0	11	0	5	0		0
Patrick	0	5	0	8	0	5	4
	31		3	12	0		15
		0	12	0	0		1

Ruth		25		9		11
	18		9	0	1	
1		0				
Yoni		29		2		32
	30		17	0	0	
0		3				
	mean	20		6		14
	20		10	0	0	
0		1				

The frequency of stopping misbehaviour for the low competence group is approximately half that of the high competence group. This may be a consequence of the high competence group responding to more misbehaviour (W+N) than the low competence group, or it may be a consequence of the low competence group ignoring misbehaviour approximately three times more than the high competence group (see Figure 1).

Teachers with misbehaviour problems were also considered by Kounin (1970) in a study of 80 first and second grade American pupils, where he found that the teachers with less misbehaviour in the classroom displayed more "withitness" and "overlapping" skills. That is they were aware of the misbehaviour in the classroom and able to respond to it so as to select the correct pupil for a desist. In the light of Kounin's (1970) work, one might have expected the high competence group in this study to have less comments to the whole class and more comments to the individuals responsible for the misbehaviour than the low competence group. However Figure 1 indicates little difference between the high and low groups in commenting to the whole class (W) or naming the involved pupils (N) about misbehaviours.

Figure 1 clearly indicates that the subjects, from both teacher competency groups, seldom; defined a rule, explained why a rule was required, mentioned the consequences of misbehaviour or followed through on the consequences for misbehaviour during observed lessons. This result is contrary to the expectations of Charles (1989, p.174) when he suggests to beginning teachers that they: "Invoke the consequences tied to misbehavior. If you have explained your rules and the consequences for breaking them, your students come to understand that they are choosing how to behave and that they are also choosing the consequences that automatically accompany their behavior. Follow through consistently. Make sure you invoke consequences

the same way day after day”.

Doyle (1986) claims that effective teachers clearly explained the rules to the pupils and monitored the pupils closely and stopped misbehaviour promptly. There was less time given to explaining rules and more time on academic procedures in studies of junior high classrooms than in studies of primary classrooms. The low use of the last four R.O.I. behaviours (Defining, Why, Consequences, & Follow-up) by the subjects of this study may be due to a more academic focus in the high school classroom than in either the junior high or primary schools. It should also be noted that the subjects in the second stage of this study were student teachers on teaching practice, while the subjects of the above American studies were professional teachers, some with many years of experience.

1.3 Video Analysis

The reliability of the R.O.I. was further established by comparing results from its insitu use with the analysis of the video recordings of observed lessons.

1.4 Classroom Environment Scale Analysis

During the second observation the modified C.E.S. form was given to all pupils. These forms required pupil responses to comments about the subjects' pupil management behaviour. The mean positive pupil response for each subject was calculated with a maximum score of twenty (see Table 4). To be given the highest possible total (20), a student teacher would have needed ten true and ten false responses from a pupil, to the comments on the Modified C.E.S.

Table 4 indicates that for eight of the ten subjects, the pupils made similar assessments of the pupil management in their classrooms to the supervisors' assessments indicated in the teacher competence scores. The similarity of the pupils' perceptions to the supervisors' perceptions supports the C.E.S. research by Fraser (1986) where pupils are considered reasonable sources of information about classroom behaviour because they are observers of that behaviour on a typically more consistent basis than “experts” who may make intermittent observations.

Table 4

Mean Number of Positive Responses by Pupils

Subject	Mean/Positive/Response
	n/a

High Competence

Jan			15
13.3			
Jean		25	
		13.0	
Fay			17
10.9			
Elly			29
12.6			
Dave		20	
		12.0	
Portia		30	
		11.8	

Low Competence Group			
Shelly		17	
		8.0	
Lin			17
15.5			
Patrick		26	
		12.2	
Ruth		30	
		12.8	
Yoni		11/b	
		8.3	

/a Number of pupils who completed C.E.S. forms. /b 11 out of the 27 pupils returned completed forms in this class.

1.5 Audio /Interview Analysis

All subjects in the second stage of the study were interviewed and an audio recording was made of each interview. The interviews were structured so that each subject was asked the same questions. The interviews were transcribed and sent to the subjects for verification . Typical comments made by subjects in the high competence (H/C) and low competence (L/C) groups were compared. Differences between these comments which represented the majority view of the group were considered in terms of the relevant topic.

ORDER IN THE CLASSROOM:

H/C - "I think you need to have complete order because you need to hear yourself think and talk. If you don't have order it's too disruptive".

L/C - "I want to have order that's based on respect, and also knowing that they will gain from the experience".

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ORDER:

H/C - "Initially the teacher has to be responsible for the establishment but after a while you can pass a lot of that responsibility onto the students to maintain their own behaviour to the standard that you have set".

L/C - "This is the responsibility of the teacher, to lay down the classroom rules and impose them so that the pupils know what the teacher expects from them. The teacher must follow the rules strictly".

RE-ACTION TO MISBEHAVIOUR

H/C - "Well, I draw their attention first to the fact that they are causing a disruption, or that I'm not happy that they are talking when I'm talking. I did write their names on the board, but I don't find that very effective. I find it just as effective to speak to them".

L/C - "Strictly speaking there shouldn't be any warning at all if I have been taking the class for four weeks or more because the students are expected to know what the rules are in the classroom. As a teacher I will not let them have any chance to argue back".

PRO-ACTION TO AVOID MISBEHAVIOUR:

H/C - "Mostly just by adopting routines and strategies that minimize the avenues that kids can use to take advantage of situations of misbehaviour".

L/C - "But at the same time not letting everyone think that they can get away with what that person did. I guess it's a very delicate balance between different

situations and following up when you say you're going to do something. Following up is a very important thing to do”.

FAILURE TO MANAGE MISBEHAVIOUR:

H/C - “I think that probably the major thing is not wanting to stand up to these little kids and not wanting to get on the bad side of them. But it's crazy being intimidated by a fourteen year old”.

L/C - “They don't follow through on the rules that they have set up and they don't carry out their warnings. If you're too authoritarian it gets the kids back up and they might misbehave more. They won't like the teacher, so they'll give the teacher a hard time”.

The low competence subjects seemed to be unprepared to communicate with the pupils so that solutions to misbehaviour could be worked out when they expected that the pupils knew what to do and thought that the pupils should not have been allowed to argue back. In contrast the high competence subjects seemed to be prepared to communicate with the pupils so that solutions to misbehaviour could be worked out.

2 Conclusion

The results of the second stage of this study have been listed in relation to the sources of the data collected. Data was collected from: the assessment reports of the three supervisors, the R.O.I. recordings, the pupils' responses on the modified C.E.S. forms, and the transcripts of interviews with the subjects.

2.1 Supervisors' Reports

The subjects were divided into high and low competence groups through the supervisors' numerical assessments. The supervisors' reports were studied for discrepancies between the subjects' teaching competence scores and the supervisor comments. The subjects' teacher competency scores were typically consistent with the supervisors' comments on the subjects' pupil management behaviour.

2.2 The Rule Observation Instrument

Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the subjects seldom; defined a rule, explained why a rule was required, mentioned the consequences of misbehaviour or followed through on the consequences for misbehaviour during observed lessons.

The low competence group ignored misbehaviour in the classroom approximately three times more than the high competence group. This result is similar to the findings of Evertson and Emmer when they claim that: "inappropriate behaviour thrives when the teacher ignores it." (Evertson & Emmer, 1982, p. 35). All the misbehaviour recorded on the R.O.I., and depicted in Figure 1 is found under codes (I), (W) or (N). The total frequency of misbehaviour for the observed lessons of the low competence group is approximately a third greater than that found for the high competence group. These results may indicate that the low competence group is less effective than the high competence group in pupil management.

2.3 Classroom Environment Scale

The modified Classroom Environment Scale was a third source of data on the pupil management behaviours of the subjects in the second stage of the study.

Table 4 indicates that for eight of the ten subjects, the pupils made similar assessments of the pupil management in their classrooms to the supervisors' assessments indicated in the teacher competence scores. The similarity of the pupils' perceptions to the supervisors' perceptions supports the C.E.S. research by Fraser (1986) where pupils are considered reasonable sources of information about classroom behaviour.

2.4 Audio /Interview

The subjects answered questions on their views of pupil management toward the end of the second stage and the subjects comments were compared in terms of the high and low competence groups. There was some differentiation between the comments from the two groups

Comments from the student teachers in the high competence group tended to:

- a. focus on maximum order prevailing in the classroom so that teaching and

learning can take place,

- b. express the view that the responsibility for order is shared between the teacher and the pupils,

- c. work a problem out with the pupil in the classroom because speaking to the

misbehaving pupil about the problem is important,

- d. indicate the need for routines and strategies to reduce misbehaviour.

- e. claim that an ineffective teacher might have been too weak or afraid of being

too authoritarian.

The low competence group tended to:

- a. express concern about being respected,

- b. consider that the teacher had total responsibility for order in the classroom,

- c. claim that they would send the pupils from the room or use the

administration as a reaction to misbehaviour,

- d. maintain the concept of warnings and consequences without the concept of

discussion with the student,

- e. claim that some ineffective teachers may be too weak and others are too

authoritarian.

The comments of the low competence group seemed to be teacher centred, while

the high competence group seemed to be more pupil centred. A major difference

between the views of the high and low competence groups seems to be in the area

of the teacher's working relationship with the pupils. Where the high competence

group tended to handle their concern about order by talking with pupils about

misbehaviour, the low competence group tended to handle their concern about order in terms of wishing to be respected by the pupils and did not discuss it with

the pupils. In other words the low competence group, through fear of seeming too

authoritarian, ignored misbehaviour or, through a fear of seeming too weak, created an atmosphere in the classroom which was too authoritarian. In

either

case the low competence group were not willing to confer with the pupils about

misbehaviour.

By ranking the student teachers according to their supervisors' competency score, and the R.O.I. behaviour of ignoring misbehaviour, and the pupil's responses on the modified C.E.S. form an apparent similarity of student teacher placement across the rankings (see Table 5). Lin stands out as an exception, which may be explained by the talk given to the pupils by her coordinating teacher, just before the last observation, on the subject of Lin's job prospects if the behaviour of the class did not improve.

Table 5
Rankings Obtained from Three Classroom Data Sources

Supervisor	Modified C.E.S.	R.O.I. (ignoring)
Jan		Jean Lin
Jean		Jan Jan Elly
Fay		
Jean Elly		Patrick
Dave		Ruth Lin Elly
Portia		Dave Patrick Fay
Shelly		Dave
Patrick	Portia Portia	
Lin		Ruth Fay
Ruth		Yoni Yoni Shelly Shelly
Yoni		

Ruth, Yoni and Shelly are represented in the bottom three places on at least two of all rankings. Jan and Jean are in the top three positions of all rankings.

In the second stage of this study on all R.O.I. measures the high competence group ignored misbehaviour less, and were more effective in stopping misbehaviour than the low competence group. On all R.O.I. measures the eleven student

teacher

subjects seldom: defined the rules, explained why the rules were required, explained the consequences of misbehaviour, or followed-up with consequences for misbehaviour during observed lessons.

Bartlett draws on a hypothetical model of classroom behaviour which he attributes to Doyle (see Figure 1. of Bartlett, 1991, for complete data). This

model suggests that if the teacher ignores misbehaviour the class will be "lost".

But if the teacher reacts to the misbehaviour appropriately to the misbehaviour

pupil attention and cooperation will be attained. Bartlett claims (1991, p. 7) to

have tested this model in his Ph.D. thesis and that his findings exhibited features

with "only apparent similarity" to Doyle's model.

Since the low competence student teachers in this study had twice as much misbehaviour in their classrooms as the high competence student teachers, and the low competence student teachers ignored misbehaviour in their classrooms three times more than the high competence student teachers, this study finds that the student teacher behaviour in terms of ignoring misbehaviour has an apparent similarity to what would be expected from Bartlett's interpretation of Doyle's model.

The second stage of the study followed the subjects from the pedagogical laboratory to the teaching practice classroom and considered their pupil management various data sources. The next stage of the study will follow subjects from the teaching practice classroom to the professional classroom (conventional & unconventional) in their induction year. Consideration of teacher behaviour in response to misbehaviour in the induction year classroom will need to wait for the next paper on the study of beginning teachers pupil management.

REFERENCES

Barry, K., & King, L. (1988). *Beginning teaching*, Wentworth Falls, NSW: Social Science Press

Bartlett, V. L. (1991). "The reality of establishing attention in initial classroom encounters: implications for research in teacher education", *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 19, 1., pp. 5-15

Charles, C. M. (1989). *Building Classroom Discipline*, New York: Longman.

Doyle, W. (1986). *Classroom organization and management*, in M. Wittrock

(Ed.).

Handbook of Research on Teaching. (3rd. edn.), pp. 392-431, New
York:
Macmillan.

Evertson, C. M. & Emmer, E. T. (1982). In D. L. Duke , (ED.), Helping
teachers
manage classrooms. Association for Supervision and Curriculum
Development,
Alexandria , Va. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED
218 710)

Fraser, B. J. (1986). Classroom Environment, London: Croom Helm.

Gibson, Q .B. (1960). The Logic of Social Enquiry, London: Routledge &
Kegan Paul

Kounin, J. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New
York:
Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Sanford, J. P. (1984). Classroom management in junior high and middle
schools :
Findings from two studies. R&D Report No. 6156. (ERIC Document
Reproduction
Service No. ED 271 473)