'A Gold Star for Good Sitting', moving from rewards and punishments to effective communication.

Alys Mendus BA (Hons) PGCE (QTS) EYPS

August 2012

MA Learning and Teaching

Supervisor Penny Borkett, Department of Education, Childhood and Inclusion, Faculty of Development and Society, Sheffield Hallam University.
Acknowledgements.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the support and advice I received from Penny Borkett, my tutor at Sheffield Hallam University. I would also like to thank Kath Bransby and Conor Nutt for their roles as ‘critical friends’, my parents Sue and Gareth Mendus and grandmother Valerie Rickerby OBE for their input proof reading the drafts and to all the people involved in the ‘How to Talk’ study group as the research could not have been completed without you.
Rewards and punishments, stemming from Behaviourism (Pavlov, 1927, Skinner 1935) is the dominant method of behavior management in maintained schools in the UK (Gove, 2011). However these methods, in my opinion, are not working for all pupils. Through exploring the history of behaviour management strategies and philosophies, this dissertation recognizes the long-term psychological effects of these traditional approaches on students (McEachern, 2008) and researches the impact of improving the communication skills of teachers on behaviour in their classes. Findings show that six months after the study group was completed the teachers have been able to augment their practice and, by using 58% of the communication skills learnt, are not only using rewards and punishments less but are more confident practitioners. They have ‘calmer’ classrooms where children are beginning to develop their own self-realization and intrinsic motivation, and where they are able to imitate the new communication skills in their interactions with their peers. Children are now learning in an environment less affected by unintentional emotional abuse, where teachers are meeting their safeguarding role. This work is particularly relevant with the new Early Years Foundation Stage (2012) including new expectations for adult’s communication skills in its ‘Characteristics for Effective Learning.’ This highlights the imminent need for more teachers to have access to training to improve their communication skills in order to manage behaviour more effectively and respectfully, as well as further longitudinal study into holistic approaches to behaviour management.
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CHAPTER ONE - Introduction

Since I began teaching in 2004 I have found myself questioning the ethics of the predominant reward and punishment approach to managing behaviour in the classroom, and so have been looking into alternative methods. However, I am aware that discipline and behaviour are a concern of many teachers who find establishing an environment conducive to learning a challenge and a worry. (Scruggs, Mastropoero, 2008, Hulme, 2011). I am conscious of the need to discipline and the surface practicality of rewards and punishments but I am concerned as to the psychological repercussions and long-term impacts on the child’s overall development, as recent research suggests rewards and punishments may be short-term fixes. (Chaltain, 2010, Bettinger, 2011).

Over the last eight years of teaching I have experienced many different approaches to managing behaviour. I have worked in a wide range of settings from teaching KS3/4 Science, to supply teaching in Primary and Special Schools, to running Forest School sessions for Early Years and KS1, to working in Steiner Waldorf schools, to outdoor instructing and leading expeditions for KS5 students to remote areas of the world. What has really interested me within this time is that virtually all mainstream and special schools that I have worked in have controlled behaviour by methods of rewards and punishment. As a supply teacher I am expected to follow the school’s behaviour policy and usually this means that I am to moderate children’s behaviour by giving out rewards, particularly in primary and special schools. This is a different position to a permanent class teacher who would have been made aware of the school behaviour policy when they joined the school. I feel this is a method of enticing children to behave by rewards but whilst I do not agree with this, I feel isolated without the skills to deal with this situation in a different way.

I started a group for parents and educators in September 2010 whose aim was to look at current approaches to education both mainstream
and alternative, to carry out workshops and talks to encourage discussion and debate around different educational models and approaches. I brought my concerns about behaviour management in Primary and Nursery schools to the group and it was agreed to hold a weekly study group on behaviour. The study group used the book ‘How to Talk So Kids Will Listen and Listen So Kids Will Talk ’. (Faber, Mazlish, 2001). This dissertation, within the context of the literature review, researches the impact of the course on participants’ practice, and on the behavior of children in their settings.

When I began this research I knew that I wanted
- Skills to improve my management of behaviour when teaching but more importantly I wanted to
- Truly understand motivating factors behind behaviour and its effects on child development and have the skills to help children help themselves with their long term internal self-mastery, (Kohn, 1999, Rosenberg, 2005), as well as
- Share my new knowledge with teachers, practitioners and parents of the people attending my study group.

I can draw similarities in my views to Chomsky’s philosophy of education which is more concerned with cultivating responsible citizens than simply reaching a competent level of knowledge; where the goal of education is to produce free human beings whose values are not accumulation and domination, but rather free association on terms of equality. (Chomsky, 2003).
CHAPTER TWO – Literature Review
Historical context – Introduction

To understand the present educational system it is helpful to put it in its historical context. Elementary education (5-11) was made compulsory in 1880 by the Elementary Education Act and became free in 1891. (Gillard, 2011). At this time, Britain wanted to be at the forefront of manufacture and improvement and compulsory schooling offered a safe place for children to be so that both their parents could work. Forster, the Liberal MP who drafted the 1870 Elementary Education Act was motivated by the belief that, "the speedy provision of elementary education depends on our industrial prosperity." (Gillard, 2011: Chapter 3). It is worth asking here whether the true aim of education was to produce workers for industry or to empower human beings for society?

At this time the church was concerned that it was going to lose control of the education of the poor. (Richards, 1999:54). ‘Mass education’ had long been an issue and when the Parochial Schools Bill of 1807 was debated in the Commons, Tory MP Davies Giddy warned the House that it would mix up social classes and could lead to radicalization and that it may burden the country with a great expense to educate the poor children. (Chitty, 2007).

However the act went ahead and the government now had a chance to be in charge of what was taught, which they were particularly keen to do since the 1867 Reform Act had raised concerns that unless some sort of education was available then they would be unsure if the newly enfranchised citizens would vote wisely. Contrary to the churches position many believed ‘mass education’ gave the opportunity of teaching the required social character, 'habits of regularity, "self-discipline", obedience, and trained effort'. (Williams 1961:141).

Schools since the 1880’s relied on concepts such as respect for elders and parental expectations of children to be dutiful and to want to work hard in school. Although rewards such as being top of the class were
possible, deterrents such as the use of corporal punishment had a more important role. The Education Act 2, in 1986 abolished corporal punishment in maintained schools (from August 1987). (Gillard, 2011). However it was not until 1998 with the School Standards and Framework Act that it was finally made illegal in Independent schools. Don Foster, Liberal Democrat education spokesman insisted that he saw no reason to keep caning legal in schools as there is no evidence that it,

"is an effective deterrent, either for a child who may have been misbehaving nor indeed is it a deterrent for other children." (Corporal Punishment Banned for all, 1998).

It is important to recognise that although physical punishments have been illegal in maintained schools since 1987 the use of psychological and emotional punishments have continued to be used in schools and in McEachern et al’s research they suggested it could be as regular as a daily occurrence (2008). Hyman and Snook’s research, (1999), reported that 50-60% of people surveyed had at least one school related experience that caused them psychological trauma. Emotional abuse in the classroom has limited references in literature and this could be because the behaviour is not reported as abuse, as teachers are unaware of the impact of their behaviour on students. (Nesbit, Philpott, 2002, Shumba, 2002).

There have also been difficulties in defining what is emotional abuse. (McEachern et al, 2008). However in terms of education, Hyman and Snook’s, definition that it is, “any disciplinary or motivational practice that psychologically hurts children,” (1999:71), covers techniques that I have observed used by teacher’s, such as verbal abuse, humiliation and separation from the group. There is a concern here for educators upholding the statutory safeguarding document, (HM Government 2005), which clearly defines emotional abuse as unacceptable, to try and understand why the abuse continues. The literature suggests that emotional abuse is much more likely to occur in the classroom when a teacher is under stress, (McEachern, 2008), and when they lack the
alternative skills for handling the class. (Benbenishty et al, 2002). The negative cycle from this approach is that students experiencing emotional abuse in the classroom are more likely to display behavioural problems in school. (Hyman, Snook, 1999). There is also significant research into the severe impact that isolation techniques such as ‘Time Out’ can have on children particularly those who have suffered from neglect. (Purvis, Cross, Sunshine, 2007). This highlights an essential need for intervention to give teachers the skills to avoid using emotional abusive approaches in their lessons whether intentional or not.

**History of debate around differing techniques and research on behaviour management in Primary and Nursery Schools.**

Rewards and punishments as we see now in some Primary Classrooms stem from over one hundred years of educational psychological research into behaviour. Pavlov, (1927), can be seen as the father of this research for his paper on conditional reflexes. Slightly earlier, in 1911, the American psychologist, Thorndike, was investigating how rewards promoted and strengthened learning. (Jordan et al, 2009: 22). This work was taken further by another American psychologist, Watson, who included emotional responses in his work and coined the term ‘Behaviourism”. (Jordan et al, 2009: 23). The work was then reinforced by an equally famous piece of work by Skinner, (1935), who investigated ‘operant conditioning’ and reinforcement in mice. His focus described by Leonard was that he was, “not interested in mental states, but only in external outputs, learning products and behavioural change”. (2002:16).

Pavlov’s research began the apparent scientific endorsement of the reward and punishment methodology (including corporal and psychological) methods already in use in schools for a long time prior to his work being published. (Jordan et al, 2009). However this in turn affected children’s way of learning so that they expect external stimuli to control their behaviour and their motivation to learn became
extrinsic. (Deci, 1971). However, the scientific community was not united over Behaviourism and other research was being carried out into alternative approaches at the same time, such as Adler, (1930a, 1930b 1963), and his followers including Driekurs, (1972ab, 1998), and Dinkmeyer. (2000).

Adler developed “Individual Psychology” in 1911. His belief can be seen as more optimistic in comparison to Pavlov and Skinner in that he regards people as unique social decision-making beings whose thoughts and actions have purpose and goals. He believed each person is part of a social setting with a capacity to decide and choose. (Blamires, 2006:5). So in contrast to Behaviourism; “encouragement” and “discouragement” are key concepts for Adlerian Psychology as they have an impact on the child’s courage to take responsibility for aspects of their life as well as building self-confidence of the child so that he or she can handle difficulty. (Dinkmeyer,1965). Dreikurs recognised that behaviour is communication. He suggested that misbehaviour is, “only a discouraged child trying to find their place; he is acting on the faulty logic that his misbehaviour will give him social acceptance which he desires.” (1972a:32).

It appears that Dinkmeyer and Dreikurs suggest a move from autocratic methods to democratic methods of child guidance. Their democratic methods encourage choice and responsibility in order to foster autonomous relationships which they believe are at the heart of effective behaviour training. This is, in turn, based on encouragement, a respect for order through clear expectations, the experience of natural consequences for misbehaviour, and the avoidance of conflict. (1963). Their aim was to develop internal rather than external motivation by focussing on effort and improvement towards a goal rather than the achievement of the goal per se. From an Adlerian perspective, praise (including rewards) teaches a child to conform, to please others and to feel worthwhile only when moving ahead of others. (Blamires, 2006:8). In terms of learning the Adlerian approach
encourages children to want to learn and behave for themselves, with their own intrinsic motivation.

Aside from the Adlerian approach, Behaviourism, itself was being developed as more research became available and by the mid-twentieth century, Neo-Behaviourism, was becoming established with the, “growing recognition that conditioning involves a cognitive element,” (Jordan et al, 2009: 26). Tolman, (1926), demonstrated that rats can learn, remember and use facts. However, at the time it seemed that his research had little impact as Skinner (being much more well respected) argued that studying behaviour was much more important than investigating mental states. By the 1960’s cognitive approaches looking at internal mental processes dominated the field and the term Cognitivism was coined. (Jordan et al, 2009: 26). One of the most notable critics of ‘Behaviourism’ was Chomsky, (1959), with his argument that language could not be acquired purely through conditioning, and must be at least partly explained by the existence of internal mental states. Other Cognitivists such as Piaget, (1928), felt that Behaviourists had neglected to explain cognition and that people were not programmed animals but rational beings that need to be active participants to learn. (Leonard, 2002). In Piaget’s terms he believed humans must construct their own knowledge built through experience which he named ‘Schemas’ of developmental learning. (1928). His focus on the individual mind developed into the ‘Cognitive Constructive approach’. (Atherton, 2011). However other researchers, such as Vygotsky, (1978) were investigating the social impact of learning and had focused on learning as a process in which the learner actively builds (constructs) new ideas and concepts (Leonard, 2002). This was called ‘Social Constructivism.’

Kohn, an American advocate of Progressive Education, motivation and learning, took inspiration from Dewey, Piaget and the constructivist approach to learning (1999, 2006). Kohn’s contention maintains that anything that encourages children to think primarily about their performance (e.g. higher standards, additional testing, tougher grading,
more incentives) will undermine their interest in learning and their desire to be challenged. (1999). In terms of the effect of rewards on student learning and the behaviour of children, Kohn, (1999), discusses research that extrinsic motivators in schools are not only ineffective but also often counterproductive only producing, “temporary compliance. They buy us obedience,” (1999: 161). Kohn, 1999, argues that young children don’t need to be rewarded to learn, at any age. Rewards are less effective than intrinsic motivation for promoting effective learning and that rewards for learning undermine intrinsic motivation.

Kohn, also argues that punishment is destructive even when termed "logical consequences." (Brandt, 1995:1). He would suggest it is still a way of doing things TO children instead of working WITH them. (Brandt, 1995). With this view, Kohn, is taking a step further than Adlerian conclusions, which support logical consequences. Kohn explains that what children need is unconditional support and encouragement and love. He states that the problem with praise is not, as some people seem to think, that we overdo it. He argues that it is the nature of praise, what we say and how we say it. He feels that the approach to praise currently used in schools is insincere and manipulative - do what I (the adult) want and then I will tell you (the child) that you did it correctly and well and how proud I am of your work and choices. (Brandt, 1995).

American psychologist, Bruner, (1967), influenced by Piaget’s ideas about cognitive development in children supported a discovery learning approach: (Leonard, 2002), promoting autonomy, responsibility and independence. Bruner’s approaches could be seen to increase the level of intrinsic motivation for learners as it had given them skills of empowerment. Another researcher Bloom, had an influential taxonomy on internal and external behaviours, (1956), and ‘mastery learning’ (1968). (Jordan et al, 2009: 29). In educational terms, mastery learning, concentrates on the process of learning and is a system
whereby the learner does not move onto more complicated work until they have mastered each stage.

Brofenbrenner’s, (1979), Ecological Systems theory states that development reflects the influence of several environmental systems, and it identifies that a child’s behaviour may be linked to one or some of them and that an understanding of these could help educators in their communication, relationship and understanding of their students. (Russo, 2011). In terms of my research this approach highlights the interrelationships between family, peers and educators and the challenges that educators face if this micro-system is not working together. (Russo, 2011).

Maslow’s 1954 ‘Hierarchy of Needs’ recognizes the relationship between behaviour and environment similar to Brofenbrenner’s, 1979, work. Maslow’s levels show progression from basic survival, to competence and self-actualisation. This approach continues to be relevant today as it assumes that each of us is motivated by needs. (Chapman, 2010). The ‘Hierarchy of Needs’ can help to provide a learning environment, which encourages and enables students to fulfill their own unique potential. For example, using Maslow’s hierarchy approach it is understood that you can’t motivate a student to achieve top grades (level 4) when there are problems at home like divorce (level 3) so the approach can encourage empathy. Ecosystemic educators, (like Brofenbrenner and Maslow), view their role in behaviour management in a much more flexible role than Behaviourists. Thereby giving them the chance to be more dynamic in their practice, recognizing that classroom behaviour does not occur in isolation but is a product of a variety of influences and is not simply a student unwilling to behave/ learn as requested by a teacher. (McPhee, Craig, 2009, Behaviour for Learning website, 2007).

Vygotsky’s socio-cultural context of development complements Bronfenbrenner’s ecology of human development and has direct implications for helping children become intrinsically motivated learners
with his work on ‘scaffolding’ (Vygotsky, 1978). A technique wherein educators model behaviours and then enable independence so that students are in control of their own learning. (Garhart Mooney, 2000: 81). This recognises the constructivist perspectives of both Piaget and Vygotsky and how they contribute to our knowledge of how children learn and of how and what to teach from a socio-cultural perspective. Both theories emphasize that children construct their own knowledge, and that development is influenced by social interaction. (Garhart Mooney, 2000). Vygotsky, 1978, expands this with his notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). This represents the gap between what a child already knows and what he or she is capable of learning with assistance. Tasks in the ZPD are those that the child currently finds too difficult to accomplish alone, but which can be accomplished with the support and encouragement of a more skilled person. (Garhart Mooney, 2000: 84).

Gardner’s, (1983), work (influenced by that of Piaget and Bruner) on ‘Multiple Intelligences’ states that people have a wide range of cognitive abilities. Mainstream teachers have used this broader vision of intelligence to help plan and differentiate their lessons thereby meeting more children in their class’s individual needs and support their intrinsic motivation. Armstrong, (2000), recognised that within Waldorf Education these multiple intelligences are already covered. Therefore Waldorf Schools do not need to construct a curriculum based on Gardner’s model simply through an additive process such as extra columns on a lesson plan as seen in some mainstream schools as the Waldorf curriculum already has a deep inner vision of the child and their needs (2000).

Two levels from Gardner’s work; one of interpersonal and the other of intrapersonal skills have been recognised in other learning style theory, particularly that of Maslow’s self actualisation level, (1954), and both within Goleman’s 1995, Emotional Intelligence (EQ). Goleman, (1995), believes that traditional approaches to intelligence are too narrow and to be successful requires effective awareness, control and
management of one's own emotions and those of other people. He drew his conclusions from the work of Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) and empathy. In terms of education, EQ, has been used to help improve behaviour as it enables students to have the language to describe feelings and to be able to talk about emotions, and gives teachers the skills to plan activities with a long-term perspective. (Gilbert, 2008). It is also seen in Forest Schools, (Knight, 2009), in the UK which allow free-play in the outdoors allowing deep-level learning and a real acceptance of the elements of EQ and internal motivation. (Goleman, 1995).

Deci and Ryan, American Professors of Clinical and Social Psychology carried out research into motivation and education over the last forty years. Their 1980, Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET), looked at the factors explaining intrinsic motivation, and the variability within it to investigate the role of rewards on motivation in learning. They carried out a meta-analysis into extrinsic rewards and motivation which suggested that verbal rewards enhanced intrinsic motivation in general, but verbal rewards did undermine intrinsic motivation if they were given with a controlling interpersonal style such as within a classroom setting. (Deci, Ryan, 2001, Brandt, 1995). According to CET, tangible rewards, when connected to a task a person would not naturally choose to do, could tend to be experienced as controlling, and as a result they would tend to decrease intrinsic motivation. (Deci, Ryan, 2001). Deci and Ryan’s results suggest that educators need to focus more on how to facilitate intrinsic motivation more than on rewarding. (2001).

Although another older original piece of research, Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP), an approach to psychotherapy and organizational change, which was founded by two American’s, Bandler and Grinder, (1975), continues to have an impact on alternative ways of looking at communication. Some of their work had been inspired by Chomsky’s transformational syntax, (1957), which was Grinder's linguistics specialization. They used the term NLP to emphasize their belief in a
connection between the neurological processes ("neuro"), language ("linguistic") and behavioral patterns that have been learned through experience ("programming") and can be organized to achieve specific goals in life. (Tosey, Mathison, 2006). In terms of education it appears to provide very effective techniques, strategies, and solutions to the problems of teaching and learning, motivating and engaging students. (Benson, Carey, 2006). However, it is situated within a challenging framework, heavily criticized, as it is deemed that there is a lack of reliable experimental evidence to support its claimed effectiveness and that it is pseudo-scientific (Witkowski, 2010, Roderique-Davies, 2009).

Nevertheless, a recent report, (Benson, Carey, 2006), aimed to address these criticised gaps in the research by considering the evidence in relation to the impact of using NLP in education. It aimed to rectify the lack of any substantive teacher-led and classroom-based action research, particularly in the UK, by carrying out a teacher-led action research study in Durham. This demonstrated that these 'teachers' recognised the importance of communication in effective learning and teaching, and more so, understood the potential of the application of NLP to achieve this, particularly in relation to language and learning, rapport, interpersonal skills and flexibility. (Benson, Carey, 2006). Some of the conclusions seem to show that teaching becomes easier and more enjoyable when you have the skills, behaviours, and attitudes of NLP to help you. (Benson, Carey, 2010).

Using NLP in the classroom requires teachers having specific training and support with costs in both time and money. However as the Durham, (2006), study shows it can have a huge benefit on teaching and learning. The challenge is that this is the only study of its kind in the UK that I could find published, so in my critique is in isolation and may be biased. Other child psychologists have been influenced by NLP such as Ginnott, (1922-1973), an American, child psychologist and a parent educator who pioneered techniques for conversing with children as he was conscious that many parents were unaware of the destructive power of words. (Ginnott, Wallace Goddard, 2003:2).
work has been used in Early Childhood Settings primarily in the USA, as well as being clearly visible in the communication approaches in Faber and Mazlish’s series of books ‘How to Talk So Kids will listen’ on behaviour management in the home and in educational settings. (2001).

Non-violent Communication (NVC) created by Rosenberg, an American Clinical Psychologist in the 1960’s emerging out of his work with civil rights activists is an innovative model of communication in situations of conflict resolution. (Rosenberg, 2005). Rosenberg is clear about not using rewards and punishments and reiterates the need for both teachers and students to be speaking a process language, that of NVC which focuses on the feelings and needs motivating each person and what actions might best meet their needs at no one else’s expense. (Rosenberg, 2003). Rosenberg, (2005), also describes how conflict happens not because the needs themselves are in conflict but rather the strategy to meet the need. Conflicts occur when people think that there is only one way to meet a need. It is interesting that often in communication people say what they do not want to happen for example, “Stop running in case you fall” or they do not give a reason for their request such as “Walk, please.” Using the NVC approach a Teacher could say,

“When I see you running, I am worried, because you may fall and it is really important to me that you are safe and well,” (Fullerton, 2009: 7).

Non-Violent Communication has been used in practitioner research projects in Early Years Settings in Scotland and Hungary, (Fullerton, 2008, Ignjatovic Savic, 1996), both finding positive results in terms of conflict resolution. However, using and learning the new approach to communication proved to be challenging, as it was difficult to remember to use it consistently and in turn authentically. (Fullerton, 2009: 18). Rosenberg recognized these difficulties particularly in unlearning the language of moralistic judgements, the language of domination in which most people have grown up. (2003:12). Other educators using the NVC approach in the US have reported that in
their experience, taking time and listening to pupils as well as showing that their needs are important actually decreases the amount of behavioural problems that require the teacher’s attention. They also reported more engaged learning, which made more efficient use of the teacher and pupil time in the classroom. (Hart, Kindle Hodson, 2004). However, although research has been showing positive results, NVC, has been critiqued for lacking any longitudinal research program, or significant research and analysis of the practice and its theoretical basis, (Fullerton, 2009: 18). It is as yet a relatively new approach and studies like; Fullerton, 2009, Ignjatovic Savic 1996, are only the beginnings of this research.

Nevertheless it is worth noting here the absence of research and work on behavioural psychology in the UK. Most of the approaches and people discussed in this literature are from the USA. Why is this? If the view was taken that we don’t have such behavioural problems in UK schools then why were 5740 pupils permanently excluded from schools in 2009/10 with over 900 suspended every day during that year for verbal or physical abuse? (Clarke, 2011). As well as OFSTED results claiming in 2006/07 12% of all maintained schools had poor to satisfactory behaviour? (Adams, 2009:6). Is it that as in our society and culture behaviourist approaches are predominant: prison, bonuses etc then teachers accept these techniques in the classroom? As the current behaviour management methods used do not challenge what they know as in society and in the classroom they seem to work quickly and are effective with a high percentage of their students? It could be the larger population of the USA and the fact that education is controlled independently by each state, for example in 19 states Corporal Punishment is still legal, (Center for Effective Discipline, 2010), that has led to more research. Whatever the reason as my MA research is being carried out in the UK then an awareness of the American-centric literature on the subject is essential in any dissemination of the results.
Current situation in the UK

The present government support aspects of the behaviourist ideology to the extent that the use of rewards and sanctions are statutory. In the White Paper, released after the Second Hearing of the Education Bill on the 14th June 2011 it states, “Heads and governing bodies must (therefore a legal requirement) ensure they have a strong behaviour policy to support staff in managing behaviour, including the use of rewards and sanctions.” (Gove, Hill, 2011).

However, in terms of Behaviour Management in schools it is not as straightforward as describing educators, in 2011, as using a pure behaviourist approach; it is observable that the approach is influenced by educational psychology developments since Behaviourism, as well as current cultural understandings of education. Variations within the use of Behaviourism have also been observed. For example historically sanctions were used more then rewards and in the last ten years it would appear there is a trend toward rewards over sanctions.

The Elton Report, (1989), noted that a rewards/sanctions ratio of at least 5:1 was an indication of a school with an effective behaviour management system. Through projects such as SEAL (Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning) launched in the 2005 ‘Primary Strategy’ the previous Labour government attempted to address this balance. Large amounts of money were spent on research into new approaches: £470 million on the 2006 Behaviour and Attendance Strategy. (Adams, 2009: 6). However, although the Steer Report, (2005), into Behaviour in Schools shows that a community approach, with respectful relationships is a more effective method to manage behaviour (showing a link to social constructivism) it is still heavily influenced by rewards and punishments as the report suggests that schools, “ensure that planning about behaviour improvement is informed by statistical information about the use of rewards and sanctions” (Steer Report, 2005:18).
It could be asked why the use of rewards and sanctions are still needed and why they need to be quantified?

The rewards first approach is not supported by all, for example, Bennett (2010), teacher, author and editor of the Times Educational Supplement’s Behaviour Blog places punishment first, he explains that rewards are needed, but maintains that sanctions are essential to keep control. This is contrary to what is advised in the previous governmental research such as the Steer Report, (2005). However, it appears that his approach is inline with the Coalition government’s firmer approach to behaviour management in schools. (Departmental Advice, 2011a). It is interesting to question what the long-term effects will be in terms of school behaviour with the change in attitude by the Coalition government favouring punishments and enforceable discipline over the Labour governments interest in social skills and rewards?

Wood’s, (2010), longitudinal research into a boy who found it hard to follow the behaviourist school rules in an inner-city London Primary school concluded that: the discipline models do not seem to take account of children's emotions, that there was a sense of unfairness and bias and there could be an alternative set of rewards, punishments and moral values that children use with their peers that may conflict with those inside the classroom. These conclusions could help schools develop a more inclusive behaviour policy. However, her research does accept rewards and punishments work for the majority of pupils and was not a research project into the long term effects of the behaviourist approach on all pupils. However although she does not suggest stepping away from rewards and punishments altogether she encourages research to find more effective ways of working with children than the behaviourist approach, which I feel could be the realistic methodology for educators wanting to change mainstream practice from within.
As well as many psychologists and educationalists researching behaviour and motivation in schools others have put it into practice by establishing successful schools and learning projects without the use of rewards and punishments. In most cases these schools are independent therefore they are separate from state curriculum’s and expectations giving more freedom to the teachers on how behaviour is managed. For example the peaceful, non-violent teachings of Krishnamurti, (1955), are followed at Brockwood Park School in Hampshire. At Steiner Waldorf schools which follow the teachings of Rudolf Steiner, educators teach with a holistic view of child development and behaviour is supported through the use of curative storytelling, strong rhythms and beautiful calm environments. (Nicol, 2010). Montessori schools follow a natural and logical consequences approach instead of punishments and encourage inner self-discipline. (Isaacs, 2010). Democratic schools such as Sudbury Model Schools give independence to students by encouraging autonomous learning within a context of participatory democracy. (Sudbury Valley School, 2012).

**Direction of research from the literature review**

From my Literature Review it would appear that although there are a wide range of alternative methods for managing behaviour there have been relatively few practitioner research projects, (Ignjatovic Savic, 1996, Benson Carey, 2006, Fullerton, 2009, Hoffman et al, 2009, Wood, 2010), particularly in the UK to investigate their effectiveness in the classroom. I decided that I wanted my research to look at an aspect of these alternative approaches to managing behaviour in Early Years with a specific UK context. Although I work with all ages I chose Early Years as I feel that this is the stage to begin new approaches to communication as they have the greatest potential for long-term success on a child’s wellbeing. (Papatheodorou, 2005). I have been focussing on the under 5s within my Continued Professional Development and have completed my Early Years Practitioner Status, (2012). I have been regularly working with the same group of 2-5 year
olds at a rural playgroup where I have been able to work with other colleagues trialling the new methods of communication.

The new Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) curriculum begins in September 2012. In the guidance document, the section ‘Characteristics of Effective Learning’ gives clear suggestions to adults about what they can do to establish ‘Positive Relationships.’ (Moylett, Stewart, 2012). The new document gives examples such as encouraging open ended thinking, valuing talk and communication by not rushing toward answers too quickly, encouraging children to describe problems and suggest ways to solve them. My research could help practitioners, and in turn the settings in which they work, meet the new goals of the EYFS. Asking adults to change how they have communicated with children for a long period of time requires in many cases support and training. For example in terms of Praise the document suggests a change from praising everything to adults that are,

“Specific when you praise, especially noting effort such as how a child concentrates, tries different approaches, persists, solves problems, and has new ideas.” (Moylett, Stewart, 2012:6).

I wanted my research to have a direct impact on my ability to communicate more effectively with all the children and adults that I worked with. I knew that by running a course for other early years educators that it would be a learning journey as I had not led a training/intervention course before. The advantage of the ‘How To Talk’ book, however, is that there is an existing course with a DVD and study materials. This enabled me to be a facilitator and participant whilst improving my training skills. I hoped that facilitating the course may lead to me being able to run my own communication training courses in the future.

Children’s centres in the UK run a variety of parenting courses, one particular popular and successful stems from Webster Stratton’s work in the USA (1999,2006). These courses are similar to the ‘How to talk
course’ in having DVD’s, training materials and participant homework. The sessions similarly use activities based on differing learning styles such as interactive role-plays. However, although Webster-Stratton has written a book bringing her techniques to teachers, (1999), the course in Children’s Centres are often focussed for parents with children with challenging behaviour. Discussing attendance at these courses with my local health visitor, (2012, pers.comm.) she highlighted the challenges of getting parents to attend classes that potentially questioned their parenting. This is supported by Action for Children’s research into Children’s Centres that,

People most in need of Children’s Centres are put off from attending them due to the perception they’re either a bad parent or from a deprived background – 60 per cent of people in social class DE say that ‘being labeled a bad parent could put people off taking a parenting class’. (Action for Children, 2008:5).

I realised that the parents and early year’s educators that I was going to be running a study group for were coming out of interest in improving their overall effectiveness in communicating with all children not just those with challenging behaviour that the Webster-Stratton teacher training book concentrates on. (1999).

Although I could recognise the many benefits and similarities of the approaches in the ‘Incredible Child’, (Webster-Stratton, 2006), with the ‘How to Talk’ approach, such as viewing the world through the child’s eyes, focusing on the adult’s behaviour rather than the child, stepping stones to behaviour management, there is still the inclusion of rewards and punishments. I recognise that these are not as extreme as other schemes and again have similarities with ‘How to Talk’ as they suggest the use of only genuine praise, avoiding the use of labels and words such as ‘naughty’ and spending time to build up a relationship with your child so you are aware of their emotional needs. (Webster-Stratton, 2006). However, time out, a popular method for dealing with challenging behaviour, still has its own chapter in the book. It can range from removing a child from the situation from being alone in a separate room to having space to calm down whilst an adult is present.
However the book includes practical approaches and explains that you may need to leave a child for 40 minutes for the first couple of times before they calm down but in the future it is not effective over 5 minutes. (Webster-Stratton, 2006). I feel that leaving a child alone is a punishment and research shows that if a child has suffered from neglect then isolating them from others can have a long-term emotional impact (Purvis, Cross, Lyons Sunshine, 2007).

So within my practitioner research I recognise that I am unusual in stepping away from the respected and well-researched approaches such as Webster-Stratton. However I am clear that my outcomes for my dissertation are to investigate methods of communicating with children by moving away from the need to use rewards and punishments. As ‘How to talk’ also had a user-friendly style like Webster-Stratton then I felt this would be the most accessible of the non reward and punishment based approaches. By choosing the ‘How to talk’ approach I was not saying that it was ‘ideal’: it still had been written for an American audience with sections on topics such as smacking and the DVD was filmed in 1990 so felt outdated. However, I resonated with its theoretical background and wanted to investigate its outcomes in a practical environment. Faber and Mazlish claim the influence on their ideas came from parenting classes with Ginnott, (2003), who introduced them to new ways of communicating with children. As the literature review suggested his work was influenced by Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP). Also Ginnott and Faber and Mazlish account their approaches to parenting to be developed from the clinical and conceptual framework articulated and developed by Adler (1930a, 1930b 1963,) and his followers including Driekurs (1972,1998) and Dinkmeyer (2000).

In relation to parenting/ early education Ginnott’s approaches to communication can be seen clearly in the six key chapters of Faber and Mazlish’s book (2001). His approach to education is quite clear: he understands the need for discipline but defines this as different to punishment. He believes that mis-behaviour and punishment are not
opposites that cancel each other out; on the contrary, they breed and reinforce each other. He explains that,

“No child says to himself or herself after being punished, “I’m going to improve, I’m going to be more responsible, more cooperative because I want to please this punishing adult.” (Ginnott, Wallace Goddard, 2003:115).

The focus of Ginnott’s work was to make the ideas easily adoptable into the home life similar to that of Webster-Stratton’s, Incredible Child. (2006). This has been adapted by Early Years Educators into their work environments. (Ginnott, Wallace Goddard, 2003). Faber and Mazlish, (2001), took this further so their books help educators as well as parents to develop their communication and language skills to enable them to help children with both their feelings and their conduct, which can lead to self-discipline. Another key finding from Ginnott’s work which is visible in Faber and Mazlish’s book (2001) is that which supports a concern arising from the literature review of the connection between emotional wellbeing of the child and how much their behaviour is managed by rewards and punishments. He suggests that children’s anxiety levels mount in expectation of a punishment if they exceed an adult set behaviour limit. (Ginnott, Wallace Goddard, 2003:128).

The course covered six sessions, each week concentrating on one chapter of the book aiming to help participants to progress in dealing with the new communication approaches and to step away from using traditional rewards and punishments as they had learnt new skills to deal with regular classroom situations. The key areas were those of empathy for the child through helping a child deal with their feelings and engaging cooperation. Then by looking at alternatives to punishment by giving adults a series of steps to follow and by encouraging autonomy for the child by offering choices. The section on praise concentrates on describing what an adult sees rather than evaluating behaviour. The final chapter looks at freeing children from playing roles from gender specific to remembering previous behaviours
such as ‘silly’ or ‘naughty.’ Each session would end with homework to read another section of the book and to trial the new approaches in their classrooms. In the following session they would have the opportunity to share their results and raise any queries they had.

I aimed that by evaluating my own and other participants experiences from attending and practising the new approaches from the course I could analyse this approach and see if it could be a successful alternative to traditional methods in English Early Years settings.
CHAPTER THREE - Methodology

I approached the running of the ‘How to Talk’ course with open eyes. I was interested to see what results the research would bring, still not setting a direct question which a traditional action research model sets out, (McNiff, Whitehead, 2006), but in turn entering into a dialogue with the other course members. (Frost, 2006). I approached my research with a concern (that of the current behaviourist approach to discipline) rather than a set question, which is the usual approach with the ‘QIFI’ (Question, Inquiry, Findings, Implementation) approach to Action Research projects (Frost, 2006: 175).

As a self-employed Educator running my own projects and working as supply teacher I am not part of one school (and in turn a school’s development plan that my research could feed into). So my professional development is personal, and a research approach in which I am the centre of the enquiry, is essential. Action Research does acknowledge this focusing on the researcher by monitoring their actions and learning and then using this knowledge to influence further learning in relation with other people. (McNiff, Whitehead, 2006). Frost’s challenges to the Action Research cycle appear in project implementation and that to improve practice, “they need to be a matter of institutional deliberation” (2006: 176). Therefore as I am institution free I locate myself in the theoretical discussion differently. I do not have the same challenges of consultation and negotiation with colleagues when I set up and run my own projects. However when I work as a Supply Teacher (as I am not part of the institutions) in which I work then implementing long-term change is not possible.

Initially I approached the research for my own personal knowledge and to improve the standard of my teaching and learning in any educational setting in which I worked. This is an individually constructed world approach (Fox et al, 2007). On the other hand I recognized Frost’s argument of the strength in leading a development process rather than a research project (2006). For a development process I needed a team
with whom a wide variety of research approaches and data collection
techniques could be trialed and the learning journey followed, I created
this through running a study group. Therefore although I am myself not
employed by any organization through facilitating a study group, the
research impacted on more people’s communication skills than my
own and in turn had the potential to influence the institutions in which
they worked.

Theoretically my research is located within the Interpretivist approach,
(Vine, 2009), as I began with my concern, worked with trialing a new
method in communication and behaviour and then set that within the
current academic literature which I then went onto to analyse and
aimed to understand it within this context. Interpretivist or hermeneutic
approaches, (Vine, 2009), recognize that within research in the social
sciences, facts and values cannot be separated. Understanding is
inevitably prejudiced because it is situated in terms of the individual
and the event especially within small-scale practitioner research (Vine,
2009, Cousin, 2005). I also recognised that all participants involved,
including myself as the researcher, bring their own unique
interpretations of the world or construction of the situation to the
research and I needed to be open to the attitudes and values of the
participants and not judge them or presume they held the same beliefs
as myself (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006).

The course was run for members of a voluntary organization, teachers
and parents, interested in looking at alternative approaches to
education. The study group was advertised on the email list and by
word of mouth. There were no criteria for who could attend except
being able to be come to a session on a Wednesday evening from 8-
9.30pm. The course was free of charge to make it as inclusive as
possible.

The thinking behind my approach to running my research was
influenced by the work of the British Educational Research
Association’s (BERA) ethical guidelines, (2011), which stress the
necessity for voluntary informed consent before research begins, that participants know and understand the steps of the procedure, confidentiality and anonymity of participants data and the right for participants to withdraw at any time. Therefore at the first session the group were informed of the research and asked if they were interested in volunteering to be involved. It was explained that the research was for an MA Education (Learning and Teaching). The input would be kept confidential with no names schools or people mentioned in the research (including data collection) and that they would have the chance to withdraw from the research at any point. They were also made aware of the time commitment it would involve and how the conclusions would be shared by reporting back to the group as well as emailing copies of my findings to those involved in the research. (BERA, 2011).

At the second session there was a letter available for interested people to take away which explained the time commitment and work involved in more detail, as well as reiterating their right to withdraw from the research at any point, with a return slip to sign to gain written consent. A draft of this letter had been approved by my Tutor and a key committee member of Exploring Education in Sheffield (copy in Appendix A). To ensure Voluntarism, that of free choice and informed consent, as described by Cohen et al, (2011), from the start I made clear that members of the study group were not expected to be involved in my academic research project (in terms of completing additional work such as questionnaires for me) and that the group was not being run primarily for the personal development of the attendees. However, they were aware that I would be using my experiences and those of participants who had signed the agreement in my research.

To ensure undue pressure was not put upon people to agree to be part of the research I liaised with the manager of an Early Years Setting, using the same approach to work with her staff, if I did not get enough support from the study group. This turned out to not be necessary as enough people choose to be involved in the research.
I examined my theoretical relationship to two principles, beneficence and non-malfeasance, part of normative ethics that examine the moral right and wrong of research. (Bredberg, Davidson, 1999). In terms of the ethics of beneficence, the principle of maximising benefits whilst minimising harm, (Burton, Bartlett, 2009), the new skills and knowledge learnt from the course can be used to help parents and educators to improve their communication with other adults and children. This will hopefully lead to more empathy and understanding, thereby contributing positively to the settings in which they work. In terms of non-malfeasance, the principle of doing no harm, (Burton, Bartlett, 2009), the negative impact may be on the adults involved when they learn about the impact of poor communication skills on children’s wellbeing and their frustration that they may have contributed to this. Therefore it was essential to support the study group participants through the course especially during sections on sharing experiences, I have continued to support them with further questions and experiences, as well as extra group meetings and another questionnaire six months after the course.

I was aware in my research for the potentiality of bias. (Cohen et al, 2011, Keats, 2000). Most people who were attending the study group were already known to me or knew of my background in alternative education. However to try and avoid people not feeling that they were able to voice their opinion as they felt it may upset me I worked on creating ground rules from the initial session. I explained that the “How to talk” approach was not MY approach but one which I was investigating and that their honest opinions will help me and in turn themselves in our study of education and behaviour.

As I recognised there were many stages to my research, from establishing and running a study group to analyzing the effectiveness of the approach for the participants, I knew that reliance on one method of data collection could create bias or distortion of the results. (Cohen et al, 2011, MacIntyre, 2000). So I chose to use
‘Methodological Triangulation’ as this allowed for the use of “different methods on the same object of study” which in this case was the new approaches to language. (Cohen et al, 2011: 196). Each research method has its own challenges and benefits, so by using more than two, there is less likelihood for bias making the results more reliable. (Macintyre, 2000).

I was aware that the numbers in the study group were low and fluctuated and this could influence some of the data collected. Defining this group and my role within it, it was essential to understand my approach to the research. As a member of the study group I facilitated rather than taught the sessions as I was learning the new approaches alongside the other participants (Cohen et al, 2011). A copy of a timeline of my research can be seen in Appendix E. In choosing which methods to use to create the triangulation I had to address my theoretical approach. I acknowledged my Interpretivist, (Vine, 2009), tendencies and the role-playing element of the ‘How to Talk’ course supported this model as did the inclusion of a non-directive interview such as a recording of a Focus Group session which also mirrored the teaching style in how the weekly sessions were run. (Cohen et al, 2011).

The first method I used was a Questionnaire. I planned to carry out two questionnaires with the adults involved in the study group at different stages in the course with a space for them to write any feedback on the course contents and how they had been using it with the children they live or work with. After the first four sessions I emailed a web-based questionnaire using ‘Survey Monkey’ to all nine who had completed permission slips.

I realized that as I was trying to get a sense of trends and perspectives that a questionnaire would be an accessible way for me to achieve this. I agreed with McNiff and Whitehead that I would have to view this data, “with a degree of scepticism,” (2005:65) as I had a small data sample and also my approach was researching a concept rather than a set
question. I was also aware of concerns of bias when I was writing the questions to try and avoid framing preferred outcomes and to try and ensure the data that was created would relate to the research questions (McNiff, Whitehead, 2005).

Within the first questionnaire (Appendix B) there is a focus on open questions because I was keen to get an overview of why parents/teachers may have decided to join the group, this style of question encourages opinions as suggested by Burton and Bartlett. (2009). Although opinions are harder to analyse they do give a greater depth of information and are less directed by the researcher so in turn are less biased. The challenge is that some people can be unwilling to write long answers and fill in the form hurriedly (Cohen et al, 2011). By making the questionnaire web-based they had to type rather than write I hoped this potentially would make it easier to complete. As they completed it anonymously it encouraged honesty and the results could be more reliable than an interview (Cohen et al, 2011). Presuming that everyone has access to the internet is not ethical or inclusive so before I decided to use a web based questionnaire I made sure all involved in the focus group had an email address and access to the internet at home.

I chose to use a web-based questionnaire because all my participants were busy parents/teachers and it seemed to be the most accessible way. I also offered a paper copy but the only person who took one did not complete it. I was keen to establish anonymity in the research and by using a web-based questionnaire I do not know who completed the survey. The person who took the paper copy could have completed it online instead. This helps decrease the amount of bias on two levels – the participants have an opportunity to be more honest and when I analyse the data I do not know who wrote each comment so cannot add an additional value judgment upon it. (Keats, 2000).

et al, lay out the positives that they reduce costs as no printing is needed and there is free software available, they reduce time as they are sent to and returned from all participants with one click, as well as giving participants the chance to fill them in when they want and over several sittings if they prefer. (2005:280). Whereas Glover and Bush states that response rates are higher than paper, (2005), which is a key point as in general only about 30% of people fill in questionnaires. (Keats, 2000). So for my small study group it was essential to find means of data collection that came from the greatest number of people possible and I was aware that if I only got three returns from a paper questionnaire then my results would be from too small a section of the group and the data would be skewed. (Cohen et al, 2011). My decision to use web-based questionnaires was successful as I had a 67% return with 6 out of the 9 people returning the questionnaires.

However, my web-based research could have been vastly improved. As I used free software and didn't upgrade it, I was unable to add certain features which could have made it more accessible and ethical. For example I could only have ten questions whereas I had written more than that, so many of my questions required multiple actions to answer which are more time consuming and can frustrate the respondent. (Cohen et al, 2011). It may have been appropriate to have a SUBMIT button on each page incase a respondent did not manage to complete the whole questionnaire. (Cohen et al, 2011). If I had upgraded then I could have included a button on each page which said WITHDRAW whereby giving the participants the opportunity to withdraw at any time which is part of the ethical research agreements. (Cohen et al, 2011). However unless the participant clicked complete then I did not have access to the results so they were not part of the research until it was sent. Also I clearly stated the ethical clause of right to withdraw however it would be very complicated to return their answers, as the whole process is anonymous.

The second questionnaire (Appendix C) was carried out six months later after the end of the study group. This time, after going through the
ethical issues again, the adult participants who worked in early years education were given a questionnaire focusing on their retained learning from the course and which approaches they were still using and why. This time a paper copy was used and the group members filled it out at the beginning of a session and placed their answers in a sealed, un-named envelope.

The second method I used was a ‘Learning Journal’ (Appendix D) where I recorded each weekly session. I used the suggestions by McNiff and Whitehead, (2005), of using the Action Research Model in journaling to focus the research throughout. So I designed a proforma which set out the key content in each week’s session and then four questions to answer connected to the ‘Action, Reflection, Significance and Implications cycle’ (McNiff, Whitehead, 2005). Although I recognized I was following a practitioner research project, (Frost, 2006), not an Action Research project, (McNiff, Whitehead, 2005), as the outcomes were personal rather than institutionalized I choose to follow this approach for the journal as it helped consolidate my thinking and I was able to keep both a record of the action (the course sessions) and also of my learning and experiences of trialing the new methods together on one sheet of paper so the connections were more visually immediate. This in turn created a cycle where, “Your action can be seen as the manifestation of your learning, and can also generate new learning.” (McNiff, Whitehead, 2005: 75). This helped me have a more holistic understanding of my project and also a deeper understanding of perceived strengths and weaknesses of each session’s approaches. The Learning Journal documents would be coded alongside the Questionnaire results and outcomes can be compared. This is a key document as it allowed me to document my experiences of the new approaches to language and methods of approaching behaviour with the very wide range of children that I work with.

The third method that I used was a recorded, guided group interview (Keats, 2000). This was held at the end of the course with the focus
group of adults looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and any behavioural issues that the members still wanted time to discuss with the group. From earlier assignments in my MA Education I realized how long it takes to write a transcript from a recorded interview and this is supported by the Hall and Hall explanation that transcription can take, “from 3 hours per hour of tape to up to 10 hours” (2004:155). However I also realized how beneficial it was for people to have a chance to voice their views at a time when they had already committed to come rather than make time in their own busy schedules.

Within each session there was time to share each person’s attempts at the new approaches as a supportive team had been established. Therefore, I felt a method of data collection should mirror this collegiality and Watts and Ebbutt (1987) recognize that this type of interview was useful for groups, such as ours, who had been working together over a period of time and where it is important for the whole group to be aware of what others are saying. Therefore, I hoped that participants would be more comfortable with each other and be less likely to take the ‘Public Line’ (Cohen et al, 2011: 432) of agreeing with other participants rather than expressing their own opinions.

Before the recorded interview began I explained to everyone the process so that they would not feel nervous. I explained that I would be asking for one method that had really worked for them and then looking at challenges. I made clear it was a turn taking exercise and that I wanted everyone who was keen to participate to have an opportunity although they did not need to say anything unless they wanted to. (Bryan et al, 2010). I recorded the interview on my MacBook using WireTapPro and placed the computer at the side of the group close to me. I stated that I was following current BERA ethical guidelines in my research (2011) and explained what I was going to do with the data following suggestions from the literature. (Menter et al, 2011, Burton and Bartlett, 2009, Keats, 2000, Cohen et al, 2011). I would transcribe the interview and then let each participant check and sign the copy to
ensure that I had not included any bias by interpreting what was said in my write up before I coded and analysed the data. I would then destroy the tapes and the transcripts of the results would be kept in a locked file in my house.
CHAPTER FOUR - Findings

Within my methodology I defined that my research was following a concern, (Frost, 2006), and that I was researching a concept, (McNiff, Whitehead, 2005), - alternatives to the traditional behaviour management approaches in UK schools. This meant when carrying out my research into the 'How to Talk so Kids Can Listen and Listen So Kids Can Talk' (How to Talk) approach I was taking a flexible approach looking at all the issues that arose rather than focussing on direct questions. The raw data that I collected was from two questionnaires one at the beginning (six replies) and another six months later (six more replies); a recorded and transcribed focus group interview and an ongoing practitioner learning-journey.

The literature on practitioner research encourages data reduction as a key tool to try to understand the outcomes. (Cohen et al, 2011). I collated all the data together to become one piece to analyse, following Menter et al’s approach. (2011). As the majority of the research was qualitative I decided to code the data, which is a widely respected and concrete activity to label the data. (Punch, 2009). For any quantitative data from the questionnaires I used EXCEL to produce graphs.

Coding data takes time to reflect on the approach to be taken especially when I was starting to analyse the data, which had been collected without a set list of questions. I knew that I wanted to be faithful to the data and therefore was inspired by Cohen et al’s suggestion that the codes will derive themselves from the data. (2011). There are many different descriptions of the coding styles in the literature and names for similar categories. For example the first step which focuses on identifying and labelling what is in the data is called Descriptive by Miles and Huberman, (1994), and Topic by Richards, (2005). Then the second step which interprets, interconnects and conceptualises the data is called Pattern or Analytical Codes. I chose to use Miles and Huberman’s titles of Descriptive and Pattern codes as I felt they were more fitting with my data.
However I knew that I had to define my categories of coding to be able to start this process. So I re-examined my initial questions set in my Ethics proposal and reflected that although they had not directly influenced my question setting in my data collection their general themes, plus my working concept and concerns, could help me choose six areas for my Descriptive code. These six areas were –

CHALLENGES (Challenges with behaviour and with the course approaches to manage behaviour. Shared examples of learning), COURSE (How the course is taught? – what is it like? What do the people think? Do they learn? Can it be improved?), IMPACT (Impact on the course on the people involved and on their settings. Key learning’s from the course – explicit or implicit), OTHER (Discussion of other behaviour management approaches – both those trying to use less and those also influencing those involved. Discipline issues), POSITIVE (Favourite approaches learnt from the ‘How to Talk’ Course. Shared examples of learning), WHY JOIN? (Reasons for going on an alternative to rewards and punishments course). The idea that this first coding attempt would help get a feel for the data influenced the short, concise labels for each code. (Cohen et al, 2011).

I followed the approach of highlighting and then cutting and sticking the raw data under a heading that meets each code, except I did it on the computer rather than by hand. (Menter et al, 2011). After this initial coding I was concerned how general it had been and how subjective it was as I had defined the categories and then chosen which piece of data went in each one. I was reassured by Menter et al’s suggestion that by being aware of this interpretative selection process and making, “our analysis as systematic and as transparent as possible to allow scrutiny from others, which provides a ‘trail of evidence,’” (2011: 218), then especially after a second coding the findings can still be verified by others.

I was aware of my own positionality and the potential for bias, when setting questions and allocating data to particular codes. As I described
in my Methodology I have an individually constructed world approach, (Fox et al, 2007), and an Interpretivist position. (Vine, 2009, Cousin, 2005). So the facts and values are hard to separate in the research so the understanding is inevitably prejudiced in my small-scale practitioner research. However it is essential to keep position on the subject. So after the first coding I reflected that as I am a teacher and not a parent then I needed to concentrate on those in the group who were teachers, as the position of the research was what was the impact of the new methods on teaching, not parenting. So my final sixth-month on questionnaire was specifically for those working in education. This also meant focussing more on comments made about educational situations rather than just home-life from the earlier questionnaires and interview.

The following questions were decided upon for the secondary (Pattern) coding.

• How has the course helped?
• How successful were you in making the changes to using the techniques from the ‘How to Talk’ approach in your setting?
• What was the impact of the course on you, and on the way that you deal with children’s behaviour in your setting?
• What was the impact of the course on how the children in your setting are learning and behaving?
• Is the ‘How to Talk’ approach a realistic alternative to other ways of dealing with behaviour in the UK?

So after two stages of coding the research data and then collating answers for each of the research questions. I finalised the data into a table (Appendix Figure 1) to show the key findings from the project and have explained them in more detail below and in Appendices F to J.

How has the course helped?

Participants have gained tools to be able to communicate differently in their setting such as key phrases, “zips can be tricky” and “I can see
that you are upset." As the course was very practical it was commented on how helpful it was that each approach had steps to follow and they felt it gave a “framework/scaffolding” for the adult to be able to implement the approach.

The data also mentioned that the style of the course gave the participants a real understanding of why there was a need for a change in how they communicated with children. Role-plays enabled the adults to feel the effect of "unhelpful" language often used in traditional educational settings and helped the adults grow in empathy towards the students and help inspire them to want to change their communication methods. This was especially once they realised that the language they used could damage the children’s self esteem. For example one adult commented, “I realised how many ‘regular’ words with children cast them in negative roles – such as bully, naughty, silly, stupid, fat, cheeky, stubborn…”

As well as gaining empathy with the students, learning new skills and approaches to communication a key helpful factor was the opportunity that the course gave participants, “a chance to stop and think” about the impact of their behaviour on the children they worked with, and in turn inspired many to trial the methods themselves and some to read more about communication in education. Appendix F describes how some respondents felt about how the course has helped.

**How successful were you in making the changes to using the techniques from the ‘How to Talk’ approach in your setting?**

The first questionnaire taken after the first four sessions of the study group showed that 100% of the people had tried the following approaches - Identify the feeling, offer a choice, describe how you feel, help children to help themselves. The results also showed that 83% had tried; Oh…hmm…I see, Give information, describe how you feel, state your expectations, express your anger, and do not rush to answer
questions. The techniques not attempted by anyone in the group after
four weeks were; write a note and encourage children to use sources
outside the home/teacher. Feedback from this questionnaire gave
reasons preventing people from trying these approaches were, “hard to
implement”, “often designed for small groups of children” and “the
approach is more for older children.”

The results from the second questionnaire, (Appendix Figure 2), show
that 58% of the skills  (so 18 of the total 31) covered on the course
were still being used by 100% of the people (6) who completed the
second survey. The skills still being used were -

- From the session dealing with children’s feelings:
  “oh…hmmm…I see’ and ‘identifying the feeling’ (2 out of the 3
techniques covered in this session).

- From the session dealing with Engaging Cooperation: ‘Describe
  what you see’, ‘give information’, ‘offer a choice’, ‘say it with a word’
  and ‘describe how you feel’ (5 out of 6 techniques covered).

- From ‘Alternatives to Punishment’: ‘state your expectations’,
  ‘experience the consequences of behaviour’ and ‘describe how you
  feel’ (3 out of 7 techniques).

- From ‘Encouraging Autonomy’: ‘help children to help
  themselves’, ‘give information’ and ‘don’t take away hope’ (3 out of 6).

- From ‘Praise and Self Esteem’: ‘describe what you see’,
  ‘describe what you feel’ and ‘sum up the child’s praiseworthy
  behaviours’ (3 out of 3).

- From ‘Freeing Children from Playing Roles’: ‘let children
  overhear you saying something positive about them’ and ‘model
  behaviour you would like to see’ (1 out of 3).

These results indicate the impact that the course had on the
participants particularly to new approaches to ‘Praise’ as it is the only
section where all the new techniques are all still being used. This is
very relevant in national terms as the new Early Years Foundation
stage, (2012), also advises educators to approach praise descriptively
and these new techniques may help these teachers in meeting this
standard.
Of the 58% of skills still used by everyone the results showed that people used ones that they felt were effective and easy to use. Some techniques people admitted they were using already but this was never more than 50% (3/6) of those surveyed. People were also aware of the benefits of some techniques even if they were rarely using them at present, as they were harder to use.

There was one technique that was not used by anyone. This was write a note and all people completing the questionnaire were working with under 5s so commented that they had not felt this approach was suitable for their age group.

The data discusses the issues that were faced by the teachers in making these changes to communication in their settings and ones which needed more mentoring or were challenging to follow or may have been tried but were not regularly implemented. For example some of the approaches required more time to think and process a sentence in advance which often is not possible in a fast paced classroom. Also some people were still lacking in confidence with certain approaches and did not have a situation suitable to trial it out. Another thing was actually ‘remembering’ to do it. Appendix G describes how some of the respondents felt about the changes.

**What was the impact of the course on you, and on the way that you deal with children’s behaviour in your setting?**

Words and phrases used by respondents to describe the impact of the course on their practice are listed in Appendix H Example 1.

Once those involved realized they could step back from the situation they were in, before they reacted, they began to be able to use the new approaches more effectively and also have the chance to think about what they were hearing as well. One course member described this as, ‘I think this whole thing is retraining the way we speak and think and
taking a deep breath and stepping back.' They realized that when they spoke to the children if they separated the child from the behaviour they had a more successful outcome in which the child talks more such as ‘I feel this…when…’ instead of “when you do this… I…”

So with these new personal skills plus the supportive steps of the new approaches course participants began to deal with the children’s behaviour in their settings differently. One claimed that, “if I use Encouraging Cooperation then I am less likely to go as far as punishing.” Another recognising that it takes a while to learn the new approaches, showed humility to herself in her work, “I found that the right question was really important and I also forgave myself for sometimes taking time to formulate that sentence…” Offering choice to children where both options are equally preferable to the teacher was a very popular approach with the research group.

The words and phrases describing the impact on the adults suggest that there is a different mind-set in which the teacher works in the setting. For example when viewing pupils with respect and as capable, a teacher does not need to shout, accuse, tell off or be overtly wordy in their instructions to the class as they are already communicating with more empathy. Some examples of this from the research data are included in Appendix H Example 2.

A major learning curve for the whole group was related to praise and following the theme of stepping back and this time giving descriptive praise aimed at leading to a discussion with the child and their own self praise. One teacher summed this up as, “my biggest shift has been recognising that children want our attention, and not necessarily our praise. They bring something to show you, and we fob them off with praise because it’s easier than giving our full attention.”
What was the impact of the course on how the children in your setting are learning and behaving?

The data is very clear on improvements to the children’s behaviour and wellbeing. In the ‘Sixth-month on’ questionnaire 3 out of the 6 people completing the open ended section said that the children were calmer and 2 out of the 6 said that their concentration was better. Evidence for a calmer classroom environment was ‘less shouting’ by the children, ‘quieter and more aware of each other,’ they had ‘improved listening skills’ and were ‘more patient’ and ‘cooperated better with each other.’ Improvement in concentration was backed up by observations of the children being able to sit for longer during group activities and growth in self-confidence seen by the children being proud of their work and not needing adult praise to gain this.

Another key impact is the copying of the methods used by the staff by the children in their own interactions with each other. They are beginning to be able to use language much more instead of actions. An example a Teacher gave was, “a child will now ask another child to use a toy as language has been modeled for them.” Appendix H includes a description of the Encouraging Autonomy approach giving a clear example of the impact of ‘How to Talk’ on children in a particular setting.

Is the ‘How To Talk’ approach a realistic alternative to other ways to deal with behaviour in the UK?

It was said by one person that, ‘the “traditional” methods (positive reinforcement, punishments etc) can work short term but not necessarily the best solution.’ It was also mentioned by another that it does not usually even work on a short-term basis for their whole class. A discussion of rewarding techniques was discussed from people’s experiences in a variety of schools in the area and examples given were – golden time, stickers, rocket charts, a Friday afternoon prize giving trolley connected to good behaviour points to a more uncommon
example where, “one child sat at the front with a whiteboard with a good…. a smiley face and an un-smiley unhappy face and sat there and watched the kids and wrote down the good children and wrote down the bad children.”

It was because of these approaches that many of the people had joined the course in the first place. They realized that, ‘these children are trained to behave because of a sticker,” and as educators they were becoming uncomfortable with that idea. The initial questionnaire showed that 50% of the people surveyed were not happy with the effectiveness of their current behaviour management approaches.

Another participant mentioned that although the methods got them to do what she wanted she, “felt that they were not respectful,” and she joined the course to allow herself, “to communicate in a way that improves self esteem and confidence.”

At the Foundation unit where one group member worked they do not use the traditional rewards and punishments approach. Her superior had stated that to, “use them effectively, you spend half the time thinking you have given it to encourage good behaviour, so the children who are sat there always doing good sitting never get any praise so it is much easier not to.” Appendix J Example 1 describes a discussion on the groups views on the rewards and punishments approach in their settings (where they still used it).

In terms of ‘How to Talk’ as a realistic alternative it was discussed it depended on your role within a school; for example those in Senior Management had more potential to make major changes and those working as Supply Teachers the least. It was also discussed that overall the new techniques were much easier to implement for those working within a stable setting. Those working as a day-to-day supply teacher (like the one carrying out the research) were in a much more difficult situation to be able to make long-term changes. However the skills learnt on the course may not free the Supply Teacher from using the Rewards and Punishments model already in the classroom but give them new communication skills to augment their behaviour.
management of the group and may in turn lead to more respect and therefore less need for traditional methods of controlling the class. An example of this approach being effective in a classroom is described in Appendix J Example 2.

A Nursery manager using the ‘How to Talk’ approach in her setting explained how regularly it is actually used, “a lot of things… have embedded without me being particularly conscious of it…about 20 –30% of the time we are using good language and 70- 80% of the time we are using previous scripts…” However, this approach has enabled them to be free from the rewards and punishments approach.

It also worth recording here that other methods apart from the traditional rewards and punishments and the ‘How to Talk’ approach were discussed by the group as other possibilities to managing behaviour. For example one group member explained that she was a Steiner Waldorf Teacher and their approach was, “you take the class and you basically engender respect and love so it is an entirely different approach”. Another was interested in Non Violent Communication and others influenced by many parenting books and courses they had been on with for their own children or work.

It was summed up that the ‘How to Talk’ course had helped them gain confidence in themselves, learn and trial new ways of communicating and really reflect on how they behave in their classrooms. However, they still needed more help, skills and training to deal with more challenging situations.
CHAPTER FIVE - Discussion and Conclusions

I began this research as a teacher frustrated by the cultural norm of behaviour management through rewards and punishment, but not having any alternative skills and techniques that were as effective in maintaining order and ensuring that the majority of the class were in an environment that enabled them to learn. I was also interested in finding out more about motivating factors for children and methods to help them become responsible citizens.

The findings from my research into the ‘How to Talk’ approach to communication, (Faber, Mazlish, 2001), showed that the course helped the adults involved become reflective of their own practice and gain new skills in communication. It also gave them a chance to develop some empathy with students. They began to think about the psychological and emotional effects of the language they used, and how they might want to change and improve it. (McEachern, 2008).

The questionnaire carried out six months after the course showed that participants were still following 58% of the skills they had been taught, particularly the ones that were easy to remember and carry out and those that they felt were effective. However, as Fullerton, (2009), also recognized, by others who were making changes to communication in their settings an issue was remembering the more complicated approaches in challenging situations and not resorting to the traditional language.

Burch’s learning model from the 1970s, (Hawkins, 2009), helps practitioners reflect on their learning journey with a new skill set. This model is particularly relevant to the results from those on self-development courses, such as ‘How to Talk.’ This cyclical model has four stages of growth from Unconsciously incompetent (stage 1), to Consciously incompetent (Stage 2), to Consciously competent (Stage 3), to Unconsciously competent (Stage 4). (Hawkins, 2009). At the beginning of the course participants were at stage one and by the end
of the course many were at stage 2 and by the six month on questionnaire for some skills participants were as far as stage 3 whereas they were still at stage 2 for others hence the frustrations and challenges in remembering to use the new approaches. This progression through the stages from the research is shown in Appendix Figure 3.

A major impact the research indicated on the teachers and on the way they dealt with behaviour in their settings was that they had become ‘a lot calmer’, ‘more understanding of the students’ and ‘more likely to take a step back from the situation before speaking’ and therefore ‘punishing less’. This ability to step back and to retrain the way that adults speak and think in order to make positive changes to the children’s lives was recognized by Rosenberg, (2003), and Deci and Ryan in their work on motivation, (2001). Being more engaged with the children was also recognized as a positive outcome in other practitioner research into changes in how you communicate in the classroom. (Kindle Hodson, Hart, 2004). This ability to meet the child through being more aware of the child’s feelings was also seen in Non-Violent Communication research carried out by Fullerton, 2009, Ignjatovic Savic 1996. This flexibility was also seen in how praise was successfully used – descriptively leading to self-praise which supports Kohn’s work, freeing adults from using any rewards (1999). Benson, Carey’s (2006) research project using Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) approaches in schools in the Durham area results agree with mine of the benefit of having new communication skills that help the teacher to be more confident and effective at their job.

Interestingly the ‘calming’ impact on teaching staff was mirrored by that of their students. My research describes the students as ‘calmer’, with ‘improved concentration’; listening skills and they seemed to be ‘more aware of each other.’ Recognizing Dreikurs’s, (1972), analogy that behaviour is communication; this suggests it is of the upmost importance to recognise the classroom as a holistic space where both the teacher and students are part of the same micro-system.
(Brofenbrenner, 1979). Therefore it is not surprising that the children imitate those role models around themselves as Nicol, (2010), suggests. The research also demonstrated that the children were adopting the ‘How to Talk’ language in their own interactions with each other and there were more cases of children choosing to use words rather than actions. A direct link could be seen here to Vygotsky’s, (1978), work on scaffolding as the adults have helped model the preferred behaviours to the students and to that of Emotional Intelligence where students have the language to describe their feelings. (Goleman, 1995).

The big question lies in whether the ‘How to Talk’ method demonstrates a realistic alternative to the more mainstream ‘rewards and punishments’ model of behaviour management in the UK? The discussion so far indicates that all who participated gained new skills, which in turn made their teaching and learning environments ‘calmer’, more considerate, and less damaging places to work.

My experience as a supply teacher, using the new approaches, showed me that I did not need to be part of a school to be able to make an immediate difference to individual children in my lessons. Using the skills learnt in the ‘How to Talk’ method meant that I could deal with difficult situations at a point before a punishment needed to be imposed, for example engaging co-operation rather than punishing a child for not co-operating. This means that a supply teacher, or regular class teacher, whilst still following the school Behaviour Policy can use the approach. My research also showed that one preschool found the ‘How to Talk’ approach so successful that they no longer needed to use rewards or punishments to manage behaviour, despite evaluating themselves as only using the techniques 30% of the time.

However it must be recognized that this is a very small-scale piece of practitioner research and as Frost suggests, ‘The reality is that the outcomes of practitioner research are context-specific and subject to continuous interpretation,’ (2006:181). Therefore coming up with a
realistic respected alternative from my small-scale project is optimistic. However with the links between particular Behaviourist approaches to managing behaviour and emotional and psychological long term effects on children and our role in safeguarding all young people, (Hyman, Snook, 1999, Benbenishty et al, 2002, Nesbit, Philpott, 2002, Shumba, 2002, HM Government 2005, McEachern, 2008), I feel it is fundamental that this debate is entered into further and more training in communication for effective behaviour management is available for teachers particularly within early years settings so that staff can meet the new standards of the Early Years Foundation Stage (2012) requirements on ‘Characteristics of Effective Learning.’

By approaching the results in a more holistic way I have developed the diagram in Appendix Figure 3 which aims to show links between the effect of attending the training course that I ran for adults in the ‘How to Talk’ method and their movement away from traditional Behaviourist system for managing behaviour.

A major challenge throughout this dissertation is the positionality of the government and mainstream education in their approaches to discipline and behaviour management and my own. As I work between the mainstream and alternative sectors I need to be able to function effectively in both. It comes down to why are we educating and I take very seriously the Steiner Waldorf approach of working with the whole child, (Steiner, 1996), that of creating intrinsically motivated young people, (Kohn, 1999, Adler, 1930), and helping to create responsible citizens. (Chomsky, 2003). I have however the freedom of not being part of an organisation, not having the pressures of a full time teaching job so I have the time to think and process how I will be with the children I work with and in particular the settings that I chose to work in. So I can choose not to work regularly in mainstream settings and then when I do I now have access to new methods of communication so that although I am still abiding by the school’s behaviour policy I am less likely to need to use their methods as I have greater empathy with the class. This freedom was not so accessible for those involved in my
research as they were all working within organisations so it may have been more challenging for them to trial to new methods.

Mainstream schools on the other hand have to get as many children as possible to a level in which the teacher can teach and the children can learn for example, Education Secretary, Michael Gove (2011) has stated that, “Improving discipline is a big priority. Teachers can’t teach effectively and pupils can’t learn if schools can’t keep order,” (the base level). For the purpose of this dissertation I have defined the base level of behaviour as the level at which a teacher is comfortable to do their job (I am aware this changes from teacher to teacher) but generally where children will follow instructions and be quiet enough for the teacher to be able to conduct the lesson. If OFSTED can recognise that behaviour is good or outstanding in 93.7% of maintained Primary schools in the UK in 2010, (Shepherd, 2011), then it could be said that behaviourism is working at getting most children to a base level of learning.

However, as my research and other practitioner research looking at communication and behaviour management has found, (Benson, Carey, 2006, Fullerton, 2009, Wood, 2010), it requires a higher level of skills by a teacher to enable progression past a base level, as well as time constraints in their busy days, and for mainstream teachers the pupils they are working with may be conditioned to work within the externally motivated rewards and punishments framework.

Appendix Figure 3 shows the impact and benefits my small-scale practitioner research had on training teachers in new communication skills in improving their health and job satisfaction. From being stressed practitioners using Behaviourist, (McEachern, 2008), approaches to using only 58% of the skills learnt from the ‘How to Talk’ course they have become healthier with more job satisfaction, able to work as reflective practitioners and have chosen to communicate differently with their classes. (Rosenberg, 2003).
The ‘How to Talk’ course has empowered the teachers involved in the research to work differently within their mainstream setting. The impact that the changes in the teacher has on their students is dramatic, from being in a classroom environment which could have quite disruptive behaviour, (Gove, 2011a), where psychological and emotional abuse is possible, (Hyman, Snook, 1999), and many are extrinsically motivated, to being much calmer and cooperating better with each other. This has meant that less rewards and punishments are used. The children can develop their own self-realization, (Maslow, 1957), and intrinsic motivation, (Deci, Ryan, 2001), especially as the children are now showing imitation of the new skills themselves in their interactions with each other. It is also worth noting that at this level with the teachers using more of the new methods of communication then the children are less likely to receive unintentional emotional abuse, from some aspects of behaviourism, (Hyman, Snook, 1999) and teachers are meeting their safeguarding role. (HM Government 2005).

Only the highest level in Appendix Figure 3, is hypothetical, as it exceeds the achievements of practitioners involved in my research. However I think it is important to be included to see where continued use of the new approaches could lead. Teachers at this level would be dynamic, they would use all the ‘How to talk’ approaches in all appropriate situations, would have further adapted and modified the techniques to match their personal teaching style and would have, alongside this, used their own research and Continual Professional Development on classroom management. They would have become Stage 4 consciously competent practitioners. (Burch in Hawkins, 2009). In turn, the pupils would be intrinsically motivated in a learning environment free from any emotional or psychological manipulation or abuse.

**Conclusion and reflection**

In conclusion my project has given me the confidence and ability to augment practice in all settings in which I work, from being a frustrated
teacher without the skill set to change how I manage behaviour, to someone who does not need to rely on rewards and punishments, freeing myself from having to automatically resort to traditional behaviour management techniques. The approaches have also impacted on the many different settings where course members work in turn leading to more children learning in classrooms at the middle level of Appendix Figure 3 rather than at the bottom.

However with such positive results in line with the questions I developed whilst coding my data, reflections still must be made on the process of research and how it could have been improved especially if further research is to be undertaken. Throughout my research there has been an ongoing challenge with bias as those adults coming to the study group knew of me and of my position within alternative education. This may have influenced their attendance, and they may have felt obliged to be involved within the research, even though I categorically explained it was free choice. It could be said that the successes of the research were linked to the fact that the adults attended in their own free time as they had chosen to learn new skills in communicating with their classes. In comparison a top-down, compulsory approach (enforced by Senior Management), within a setting may have led to different results. (Rhodes, 2012).

Having an awareness of this, further study could involve running similar trainings on communication in places where the facilitator is not known to the group. The research in this dissertation could be described as a feasibility study for the need of communication training for teachers particularly relevant now with the new Early Years Foundation Stage requirements on ‘Characteristics for Effective Learning’. (2012). Realising that there are many links from the ‘How to Talk’ approach to other alternative approaches to communication (shown in Appendix Figure 3) it suggests a possibility of further work looking at developing the most effective strategies and understandings on effective communication from all of them before creating a new training course.
I recognise that this project is only a first step towards answering the question of creating a complete alternative to Behaviourism in UK classrooms but it may lead to the need for longitudinal study if enough people agree with my view. Additional practitioner research projects would support this research project particularly if senior management are involved compared to individual teacher as in the majority in my research. Another multi-agency approach working with schools, parents, the wider community and health professionals may lead to more sustainable results. My work focused particularly on early years and primary settings. It would be interesting to research the impact of changes to communication further up the educational system. It must also be recognized that if my hypothesized Higher Level in the diagram in Appendix Figure 3 is to be realized then communication is only one method of classroom management. More research linking together classroom environment, the teaching styles, the curriculum, the sociology of how the classroom is run alongside the way the adults and students communicate with each other is essential.

As a practitioner I now feel much more confident working in mainstream settings within my own ethical views of behaviour management as I can augment practice rather than contradict the status quo. I have also had the opportunity over the last academic year to work regularly in an Early Years setting using the ‘How to Talk’ approach allowing me to move from my theoretical understanding and support of the new techniques to see the practical, long term, incredibly positive implications on the effective communication between the children and staff. This experience, plus my continual interest in reading about different approaches to effective communication has led me to think about designing my own course combining the most successful approaches and techniques from ‘How to Talk’ with a more UK-focused approach which I could trial in other settings, as my dissertation has made me increasingly interested in sharing my new skills with others, particularly if it means that it could improve the long term emotional health of more children in the UK.
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APPENDIX FIGURE 1.

Figure 1. Table to show the summary of the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>APPENDIX REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has the course helped?</td>
<td>Adults have tools to communicate differently. Gained an understanding of the impact of 'unhelpful' language on children’s self esteem. Gaining empathy. Opportunity to reflect on own practice.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How successful were you in making the changes to using the techniques from the ‘How to Talk’ approach in your setting?</td>
<td>6 months after the course 58% of the skills learnt still used by 100% people surveyed. Effective yet easy to use approaches continued. Challenges in remembering more complicated approaches and not resorting to traditional language.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the impact of the course on you, and on the way that you deal with children’s behaviour in your setting?</td>
<td>Patient, understanding, confident, listen more, think before speaking, talk less, calmer, more engaged with the children, aware of the language using and its impact, less shouting, viewing pupils with respect and as capable. Able to step back from the situation before reacting, 'retraining the way we speak and think.' By using the ‘How to Talk’ approach gained a set of flexible skills and strategies so less likely to resort in punishment.</td>
<td>H Example 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the impact of the course on how the children in your setting are learning and behaving?</td>
<td>Calmer, concentration improved, quieter, more aware of each other, improved listening skills, more patient, cooperate better. Children adopting the How to Talk methods into their own interactions with each other. Using words rather than actions.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the ‘How to Talk’ approach a realistic alternative to other ways of dealing with behaviour in the UK?</td>
<td>Educator’s interested in gaining skills for 'respectful' behaviour management strategies, which build self-esteem, confidence and internal motivation. ‘How to Talk’ give teachers (including Supply) a new skill set to use with their classes which will augment and potentially reduce the need for traditional approaches. A setting using the How to Talk approach 30% time does not need to use rewards and punishments as well. It was also made aware that How to Talk’ is only one method of improving communication and other approaches may also help.</td>
<td>J Example 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FIGURE 2 – Number of educators using the new techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Tick ✓</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
<th>I was doing it already</th>
<th>Hard to use but I try this method out as I feel it is beneficial.</th>
<th>Other (Please explain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Dealing with Children’s Feelings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh… hmmm… I see</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the feeling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a child in fantasy what you cannot give in reality.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 Better for older children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Engaging cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe what you see</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a choice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 Very effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say it with a word</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you feel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a note</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 Only with older kids, children not able to write/read, not done this yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Alternatives to Punishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express your anger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State your expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 Not always effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show how to make amends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a choice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience the consequences of behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you feel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solve.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Only with older kids, children too young for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Encouraging autonomy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help children to help themselves</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't ask too many questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't rush to answer questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage children to use sources outside the home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Useful with older children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't take away hope. Don't prepare for disappointment.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Useful with older children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Praise and self esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe what you see</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe what you feel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Have to remember to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum up the child’s praiseworthy behaviour in a word.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Freeing children from playing roles**

<p>| Look for opportunities to show the child a new picture of himself or herself. | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>Score 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put children in situations where they can see themselves differently.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not really used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let children overhear you say something positive about them.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model behaviour you'd like to see.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a storehouse for your child's special moments.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Don't use often… Birthdays etc…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the child acts accordingly to the old label, state your feelings and/or expectations.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted results show where all 6 respondents are still using the new techniques six months after the training course.
**APPENDIX Figure 3.** Diagram showing links between the effect of attending the training course that I ran for adults in the How to Talk method and their movement away from traditional Behaviourist approaches for managing behaviour. (References in brackets are from discussions of similar outcomes in other situations from the Literature Review Chapter 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioner Skill Level</th>
<th>Teacher (Impact/ emotions)</th>
<th>Skills used.</th>
<th>Impact on the children in the class.</th>
<th>Competence (Burch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH (hypothetical)</td>
<td>Dynamic. Made the skills their own.</td>
<td>Able to use all How to Talk methods in appropriate situations. Able to incorporate other approaches to communication learnt from further CPD. Aware of the sociology of the classroom.</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation (Ryan, Deci, 2001) Freedom (Chomsky). An ideal learning environment.</td>
<td>Stage 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58% (percentage from level that 100% of those surveyed were at 6 months after training)</td>
<td>Reflective practitioners. Understanding of the emotional impact traditional language has on children. Chosen to change (Rosenberg, 2003). Patient, understanding, confident, think before speaking to the children, calmer, more engaged with the children.</td>
<td>Used new skills to communicate differently with the class. Used skills felt were effective yet easy to use. (Fullerton, 2009). Empathy (Maslow). Less likely to need to use Rewards and Punishments.</td>
<td>Calmer, increased concentration, quieter, increased listening skills, patient, cooperate. Using How to Talk skills in own interactions. (Vygotsky, 1978, Goleman, 1995). Learning skills to be able to behave through imitation of adults. A learning environment freer from emotional abuse.</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDED 6 WEEK COURSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 1
Dear How to Talk so Kids will Listen and Listen so Kids will Talk participant,

I am currently completing a Masters degree in Education, with Sheffield Hallam University. As part of my final dissertation I am undertaking a research project, investigating more progressive ways to behaviour management which move away from traditional approaches to discipline such as rewards and punishments. I am interested in how the “How to talk” course may play a role in this.

I am writing to ask your permission as a member of the How to Talk course for you to work with me on my research. I assure you that the project will have a firm ethical basis; no names or settings will be identified in the research. Also at any point if you are welcome to withdraw from the research please let me know immediately. You will need to attend an additional fifteen minute meeting on my project and then undertake two questionnaires over the course period and then meet for a review session of the focus group which will be recorded.

The project will last until April 2011. If you are interested in being involved please give your permission by filling in the reply slip below and bring it to our next How to Talk session.

Thankyou in advance. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require any further information. Or my tutor xxxxxxxx on xxxxxxxxx@shu.ac.uk

Yours sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

I …………………………….. give permission for my self to be involved in the research project on behaviour.

I understand that I can withdraw my permission at anytime.

Signed ……………………………………….  
APPENDIX B
How to talk study group questionnaire Survey
From http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/69M8YDP last accessed 26/01/2012 14:26

How to talk study group questionnaire

1. Why did you decide to join this course?

2. Before this course which aspects of discipline did you struggle with?

3. Before this course which aspects of discipline did you feel comfortable with?

4. How effective do you feel the methods that you used prior to this course were?
   Sometimes
   Not effective
   Rarely effective
   Mostly effective
   Always effective
   Effective

5. What do you think about the new techniques presented in each session?
   Poor
   Adequate
   Good
   Very good
   Excellent
   Please explain your answer...

6. The follow techniques are from session 1 - Dealing with Children's Feelings. I am interested to find which techniques you have tried, ones you haven't tried but would like to and ones that you haven't tried and probably will not.

   I've tried Hope to try Probably wont try Undecided
   Oh.. hmmm.. I see..
   Identify the feeling...
   Give a child in fantasy what you cannot give in reality.
   Please give examples...

7. The follow techniques are from session 2 - Engaging Cooperation. I am interested to find which techniques you have tried, ones you haven't tried but would like to and ones that you haven't tried and probably will not.
I've tried this. I hope to try this. I probably won't try this. Undecided.

Describe what you see.
Give information.
Offer a choice.
Say it with a word.
Describe how you feel.
Write a note.
Please give examples...

8. The follow techniques are from session 3 - Alternatives to punishment. I am interested to find which techniques you have tried, ones you haven't tried but would like to and ones that you haven't tried and probably will not.

I've tried this. I hope to try this. I probably will not try this. Undecided.
Express your anger.
State your expectations.
Show how to make amends.
Offer a choice.
Experience the consequences of behaviour.
Describe how you feel.
Problem solve.
Please give examples...

9. The follow techniques are from session 4 - Encouraging Autonomy. I am interested to find which techniques you have tried, ones you haven't tried but would like to and ones that you haven't tried and probably will not.

I've tried this. I hope to try this. I probably will not try this. Undecided.
Help children to help themselves.
Give information.
Don't ask too many questions.
Don't rush to answer questions.
Encourage children to use sources outside the home.
Please give examples...

10. From the course which technique that you have tried has been the most successful for you and why?
1. Which (if any) of the following approaches covered in the course are you using in the workplace? (Please tick and then tick why you are using this approach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Tick ✓</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
<th>I was doing it already</th>
<th>Hard to use but I try this method out as I feel it is beneficial</th>
<th>Other (Please explain - overleaf if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dealing with Children's Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh… hmmm… I see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a child in fantasy what you cannot give in reality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engaging cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe what you see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say it with a word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a note.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alternatives to Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express your anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State your expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show how to make amends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience the consequences of behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encouraging autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help children to help themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t ask too many questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t rush to answer questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encourage children to use sources outside the home

Don’t take away hope. Don’t prepare for disappointment.

**5. Praise and self esteem**

Describe what you see

Describe what you feel

Sum up the child’s praiseworthy behaviour in a word.

**6. Freeing children from playing roles**

Look for opportunities to show the child a new picture of himself or herself.

Put children in situations where they can see themselves differently.

Let children overhear you say something positive about them.

Model behaviour you’d like to see.

Be a storehouse for your child’s special moments.

When the child acts accordingly to the old label, state your feelings and/or expectations.

2. Do you feel that these techniques have made a difference to behaviour in your setting? Please elaborate.

3. How has using the techniques effected your behaviour as an adult?

4. With hindsight how do you think the course/approaches could be improved for other adult learners?
APPENDIX D

LEARNING JOURNAL
Session Number
Date

Attendance (Numbers, Sex, Parents, Teachers, Number of sessions attended)

What was taught in this session?

How was it taught? And how did the group cope with the approach?

Significance/insights from this approach? What are my initial thoughts/feelings?

Implications of the approach – Experiences from trialling the ideas
- What new questions arise/ reflections.
### APPENDIX E

**Timetable of project and data collection.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research approach/ methods of data collection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WB 7\(^{th}\) Feb | • Confirm people attending course.  
                     • Make sure all resources are available.  
                     • **Ran introductory session** with group explain about my research and found out that people were interested in being involved.  
                     • Notes and reflections will be taken by the group leader after each session in the form of a **Learning Journal**. |
| WB 14\(^{th}\) Feb | • Gained ethical approval for project, sent letters to gain written consent from adults to be involved in the project.  
                     • **Ran second session**.  
                     • **Learning Journal** section completed. |
| WB 21\(^{st}\) Feb | • **Ran third session**.  
                     • **Learning Journal** section completed. |
| WB 28\(^{th}\) Feb | • **Ran fourth session**.  
                     • **Learning Journal** section completed. |
| WB 7\(^{th}\) March – WB 14\(^{th}\) March | No sessions. (I was working away) |
| WB 21\(^{st}\) March | • **Ran fifth session**.  
                     • **Learning Journal** section completed  
                     • Sent out first questionnaire on |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WB 28<sup>th</sup> March  | • Ran 6<sup>th</sup> Session.  
• Learning Journal section completed.  
• Sent out Questionnaire reminder. |
| WB 4<sup>th</sup> April   | • Focus Group Recorded Interview Session reviewing the whole course.                                                                          |
| WB 11<sup>th</sup> April – WB 18<sup>th</sup> April | • Observed a playgroup using the How to Talk Approach.  
• Questionnaire data collated and processed. |
| WB 25<sup>th</sup> April – WB 18<sup>th</sup> September | • 53 minute group interview transcribed.                                                                                                     |
| WB 18<sup>th</sup> September – WB 10<sup>th</sup> October | • Final questionnaire written and meeting with participants organized.  
• Initial coding of qualitative data from the first questionnaire and group interview. |
| WB 10<sup>th</sup> October | • Six month on questionnaire for those using the approach in education.                                                                        |

Coding – STUDY GROUP SESSIONS, LEARNING JOURNAL, OBSERVATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, and RECORDED INTERVIEW.
APPENDIX F

How has the course helped?

One teacher explained this as it, “Felt good to think about how much I speak in the classroom – realising it is OK to listen or to say um…” Another recognised that the course’s “message was enough to warrant a different way of thinking and actually developing awareness of what are your needs and their needs and how much are you putting upon the child that is unfair or not beneficial to them or the situation and how developing awareness is key.”

APPENDIX G

How successful were you in making the changes to using the techniques from the How to Talk approach in your setting?

It was recalled that many group members were now much more aware when they used ‘traditional language’ and that sometimes it upset them now they were aware of its negative qualities but it also meant they often more likely to remember the new approaches next time. One participant described this as, “a little bit sad in a way and part of me is thinking a lot of it feels quite unnatural to do so I’d quite like to integrate it slowly rather than always have to think about how I am being with them.”

APPENDIX H

What was the impact of the course on you, and on the way that you deal with children’s behaviour in your setting?

Example 1.
Patient, understanding, confident, listen more, think before speaking, talk less, calmer, more engaged with the children, aware of the language using and its impact, less shouting, less punishing, respecting children and viewing them as capable, recognizing limits as an adult.

Example 2.
When reading to a class a boy sat on my ankle. I said, “That’s my foot…” and he said “Oh sorry” and moved off. (Give information).

A member of staff came into the room and she said, “I can see silks on the floor and I can see some animals over here that need to go home to their basket and then she just started to tidy up and every child in the room picked up the silks or took them off and hung them up on hooks and put the animals away. And it was brilliant it was really, really good and she hadn’t had to tell them to do anything um.. That was “Engaging cooperation” – describe what you can see.
A Foundation One boy kept running off to explore on a countryside walk including near a stream which he had been told to keep away from. I went over to him and explained that when he went near the stream and I couldn’t see him I was scared that he might fall in. He was surprised to hear my feelings/concerns and said, “OK” and ran off another way. (Describe how you feel).

APPENDIX I

What was the impact of the course on how the children in your setting are learning and behaving?

I have three boys…who are totally convinced that they cannot possibly put on their own shoes. They get their shoe and wave it at their foot, “I Caaaan’t” (whiney voice) It’s too hard”. So there is lots and lots of, “if we pull the tongue out and you can hold the front and the back then sometimes it can be easier if you stand up and wiggle your foot in.” There is absolutely no question that these children are not putting their own shoes on but it is done really well. And we do hear the kids say, “ oooh this is a bit tricky..” instead of “I can’t do it” which is really nice.

The teacher also explained that had they continued to mess around and not put their stuff on and for example the children in their class were only outside to play for ten minutes then as they know the rule is that you cannot go out if you are not ready then they might not get a chance to go outside to play on this occasion and this following the How to Talk Approach is Logical Consequences. The outcome makes sense to the adult and the child and is directly related to the incident and is not a punishment.

APPENDIX J

Is the How To Talk approach a realistic alternative to other ways to deal with behaviour in the UK?

Example 1 “Encouraging them to be naughty in order to get a sticker when they are good. And then if you get into the habit of giving a sticker to the naughty child every time they are good you cant withdraw the sticker ‘cos as soon as soon as you withdraw the sticker they go straight back to the naughty behaviour so that child is dependent on getting a sticker every half an hour for behaving the way that everyone else behaves for getting nothing.”

Example 2 “I started describing certain things in his picture and he started talking and he hadn’t spoken… in educational terms all day he had just been upset all day so it was really exciting to see that I could engage with a child that didn’t engage in school really in by just by speaking to them directly about their work and not just saying, “Good boy! Well Done! Wonderful drawing which would have been the end of the conversation.”