What Did Disruptive Students Say They Wanted From Their Classes? A Survey of Student Voices

Merv Lebor
Leeds City College
HUDCETT

Abstract

This paper draws on data from over 60 students in order to find out how disruptive students viewed disrupted classes. The purpose of this research was to prepare training for tutors who were finding disruptive classes difficult to teach. Classes were identified as 'disruptive' by their tutors and then the researcher was asked by managers to give some training to the relevant tutors. The scope of this small-scale research was to report on the findings of what students said about disruptive classes. The rationale behind the research was that if we could find out what disruptive students said they wanted, teachers might be in a better position to teach them. The problem then was how to frame questions so that they would be understandable by the students and yet produce meaningful, authentic data. The findings showed that several students from these classes said that they had been involved in physical and verbal violence in class and that learning was compromised. From this research it emerged that the sample of students from classes identified as disruptive by their teachers said that their preferred sessions would be supportive, respectful, one-to-one; they would learn more, be involved in discussions and enjoyed practical work. In other words all the features that would be associated with normative good practice in teaching and learning. The consequent challenge implicit in this research is how to help teachers communicate these strategies, attitudes and values in a disruptive and challenging environment.

There has been much written about how teachers should respond to difficult or disruptive students by classroom strategists (Dreikurs et al, 2005; Wong, 2009) but also specifically in the Lifelong Learning Sector (Wallace, 2003; Vizard, 2009). The problem of disruptive students is arguably the biggest challenge teachers face (DfE, 2012) and seems to be constantly in the news (Hannah, 2012; Spiers, 2011; Mulholland, 2012). It is impacting negatively on teacher stress levels (ATL, 2008) and, despite counter voices (OECD, 2011) and calls on government for a return to traditional methods of discipline (Gove, 2014), it is arguably getting worse (ATL, 2008; 2010; 2013; Sellgren, 2013; Townend, 2013). Yet many view these problematic scenarios as part of the teaching of groups marginalised from education (Bathmaker, 1999; Atkins, 2013). In this context, it seemed important to follow Wallace (2003; 2007) who writes about these problems in a Lifelong Learning context and directly questions students who behaved in a way perceived by their teachers to be disruptive to learning. This would also be in line with the norms of college quality procedures and Ofsted good practice (2013) of listening to student voices, even when students spoke about their own and other classroom experiences; this could be understood as a highly-complex philosophical process (Fielding, 2004). Would there be any activity that a teacher could do that would engage these students? Or was their experience of education so alien, they so vulnerable and damaged, that teachers would have to use more therapeutic approaches in order to attract these students into a more positive relationship with the learning process (Ecclestone, 2012)?

As a Teacher Educator there are some problematic aspects of carrying out research with Lifelong Learning students who are not actually in the researcher's classes (Lankshear and Knobel, 2004) in terms of practicality, ethical dimensions (Gallagher et al, 1995), and accessing and selecting the sample (Cohen et al, 2011). What paradigm of research would I use (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011; Guba, 1990; Creswell, 2013)? How was I going to define disruptive students (Wallace, 2003)? Would students wish to identify themselves as being disruptive? Was it a badge of courage or shame? What was their experience (Agee, 2009)? The solution for this paper was that teachers had identified these classes as disruptive themselves and they or their managers wanted me to offer training on these issues. The managers and institutions concerned gave me permission to research and speak on this area (BERA, 2011). The problem was whether, ethically, students might feel I was intruding, or even wishing to punish them in some way for their non-conformist behaviour (Cohen et al, 2011; Lankshear and Knobel, 2004), rather than just questioning them on these concerns with the purpose of ultimately working on ways to improve teacher/student relationships. In fact, all students and teachers engaged in this project gave their written permission to answer questions and be involved.

Although my current teaching role does not bring me in to direct teacher/student contact with the students whom I was going to research, I had observed sessions where students were un-co-operative, rude, or socially unpleasant. However, the catalyst for the proposed research and training were a series of incidents in classes at different colleges where violence flared. Many of the incidents described below could be understood as part of a deficit model of education, where vulnerable learners struggle in an alien system (Bates and Riseborough, 1993) more in need of therapy than disciplinary regimes (Gove, 2014).

Thus, teachers reported that a female student in her mid-20s tried to strangle a male in class, and could not be disengaged for several minutes; a 30-year-old male student screamed abuse at a female teacher and stormed out. In an observation, I witnessed a student tearing up another student's work and observed another class where a 35-year-old student came in late, screaming, and only sat down quietly after the teacher asked her gently to do so three times. A manager wrote me a long letter outlining incidents of verbal and physical violence in her department, mentioning "*…regular fights between students...*". Once it became known within the three colleges that I was researching this topic, managers asked me to carry out training with their tutors, hence my wish to research the views of students in the hope of working out more strategies (Wong, 2009), solutions (Iveson et al, 2012) or humanistic and therapeutic approaches (Ecclestone, 2012) to these situations.

The students selected in this research were mostly Level 1; many were aged over 20 on short, two-week, rolling mandatory Not in Education or Training (NEET) courses (Simmons and Thompson, 2011). Questionnaires were used as a way of taking a snapshot of students' perspectives without unnecessarily intruding into their limited time in college (Agee, 2009). The advantages of questionnaires are that they offer a quick, economic way of questioning a group and accessing a range of attitudes, feelings and experiences. Their disadvantage is that the researcher cannot ask follow-up questions or explore the group's perspectives in depth (Denscombe, 2010). Nevertheless, this was a small-scale project set up through tutors and managers who asked me for training on this issue within their departments. There was little time or accessibility to the students themselves other than through their tutors.

From a reflexive point of view (Cunliffe, 2004), my current role is in Teacher Education, where all students in my classes are engaged, inquisitive, and involved. I also work as a

quality reviewer of Initial Teacher Training (ITT). Through these sources of information, I am aware of the continuing problems many teachers face with respect to difficult classes. But researching students' views through questionnaires raised issues about producing rich data. I was concerned that data might include fabricated stories, possibly even inauthentic, rehearsed or copied attitudes (Cohen et al, 2011). However, it could be argued that even this language would reflect students' life experiences (Shacklock and Thorp, 2005), thus making the research meaningful at least in terms of hearing student discourse (Creswell, 2013).

Furthermore, there were ethical concerns. As mentioned, I obtained written permission from the institutions concerned and asked students, teachers, and managers to sign the relevant ethics forms (Blaxter et al, 2001). Permission was sought and ethics forms were signed by everyone involved; no-one was asked to participate against their will. Everyone spoken to was over the age of 18. The fact that students were mostly Level 1 to 2 suggested a level of vulnerability (Atkins, 2013); however, getting parental permission was not appropriate as many of the students were at least in their 20s, living independently or were parents themselves (Wellington and Cole, 2004).

The research process involved producing questionnaires to be given to these teachers' current students. As part of the arranged training session, I also group interviewed the relevant teachers on their own prior training and attitudes towards these challenging classes (Cohen et al, 2011).

It was problematic producing an appropriate student questionnaire. If questions were too complex, students might not understand or be able to relate to them. If they were too simplistic, they might not produce information-rich data. The questions could be insensitive (Cohen et al, 2011), assume a negative, condescending tone, or lead students into expressing material they would regret or that was fictitious, imagined or had no basis in reality. I gave my first pilot version of the questions (ibid) to 25 teachers who were currently working in the Lifelong Learning Sector and asked for their feedback before attempting to try the questions on students. They were critical of my first attempt, suggesting a series of improvements so that I could approach disaffected students (Cf. Atkins, 2013) in a more sensitive way.

I decided to ask a mixture of open-ended and closed questions (Cohen et al, 2011). These were all classes which had been defined by their teachers as disruptive but the actual sample was not necessarily the same people who had been reported to have carried out dramatic acts of disruption. The challenge of approaching students who I did not know was that anonymity could give them the confidence, licence and freedom to speak out about their feelings freely, but they might also just consider the research as a continuation of the schooling process which they might be determined to subvert or undermine. In-depth interviews might have been a better way of approaching the problem (Cf. Atkins, 2013), but the teachers' needs were desperate, time-limited, and the students were in college for less than three weeks.

The Data Collection Tool
The challenge of writing a questionnaire to extract information, attitudes, opinions, thoughts and feelings from disaffected students was going to be highly problematic. Would they answer in a genuine way? If speaking directly to students, difficult words or ideas might need to be re-phrased or made understandable to the interviewee; follow-up or subsequent questions could be asked to determine nuances of attitude. I was going to use questions as the basis for a brief survey. But if the questions were given out as

questionnaires, words like 'disruptive' might be outside the normal language of the students. Hence, I decided to use several terms, such as 'mess around', 'behave badly' and used 'disrupt' to be synonymous with stopping learning taking place, so that the students would have a better idea of the field of discussion. I also did not want to start with negative assumptions or leading questions, so after a brief explanation that this was going to be anonymous research and that I was interested in improving their teachers' lessons, my first question asked about their favourite lessons or what they enjoyed in class. The idea behind these questions was to present a positive frame of reference (Hidi and Harackiewicz, 2000) with respect to the classes they were currently attending. 80% of the sample questioned were mandated students (LSIS, 2012) who had to attend college or have their benefits cut. There was an assumption here that they had not totally rejected education nor refused to turn up, but that they had some engagement with representatives from college, schooling and education. Students with particularly negative attitudes might express anger, rejection or even a wish not to co-operate with this research, but at least through these questions I gave participants the freedom to respond '*…in private, in depth and with honesty*' (Cohen et al, 2011: p. 176). It was possible for the students to say that they disliked classes or, consistent with BERA (2011) recommendations, that they did not want to participate in the research at all. It is notable that in Wallace (2003), disruptive students, when interviewed, were sufficiently co-operative to be able to say what they thought of their teachers (ibid, p. 23). The fact that Wallace's students of over a decade ago were prepared to engage with the world of institutionalised education and researchers might elicit differences in attitude and perception separated by time and space, which, in turn, could reveal different results.

On interviewing teachers of students mandated to attend literacy, numeracy and vocational classes, or return to, or start, work, these classes were often described by teachers as fraught. Through interviewing several tutors teaching classes at a range of institutions, henceforth known as The Wayforward College, The Allwelcome Institute and Everyone's Teaching Academy, it emerged that there were violent incidents, student outbursts of anger, violence, fights between young men and women, and problems of class management. All six tutors interviewed either said or agreed with the interview statement: "We are being faced with difficult classes for which we have been insufficiently trained". Thus, even asking such students to fill out questionnaire forms might be difficult to manage. Nevertheless, I wanted to proceed into the centre of the storm and ask difficult questions that would have implications for training, policymakers, strategies and theories of teaching and learning.

The Findings
I surveyed around 60 students from six different classes and six tutors from different courses and colleges. 60% of the students were Level 1 students; 40% were Level 2 or above. All were over 18 and many were in their 20s or 30s. All were currently on basic literacy courses or in vocational training. 55% were male; 45% female. Their all-white teachers identified the student sample as white European with around 10% from Black and Asian backgrounds. All research has an ethnic/race dimension either through inclusion or exclusion, but teachers did not interpret disruptive behaviour as being aligned with any specific ethnic or racial group (Gunaratnam, 2003). The teachers said there were no statemented students (those with diagnosed special educational needs) in the research samples; merely that these were disruptive classes.

The first question was open-ended and asked what the students enjoyed doing in lessons. The answers were surprisingly positive, varied, and almost sounded like an intensely vibrant model curriculum. Answers ranged from Student A: "*learning and thinking*" to

Student B: "*projects*"; Student C: "*practical work*"; Student D: "*handson* [sic] *lessons*"; Student E "*more maths*"; Student F: "*computers*"; Student G: "*writing*"; Student H: "*workshops*"; Student I: "*writing stories*"; Student J: "*learning in new ways*"; Student K: "*I like the whole thing*"; Student L: "*getting on with my work*"; Student M: "*speaking and listening*"; Student N: "*grammar tests*"; Student O: "*discussion*"; Student P: "*work which makes you think*"; Student Q: "*learning as much as possible as I need skills and information to find good* [sic] *working place*". Student R said: "*I enjoy staying in a lesson that I will learn from. The teachers smile and the help they give up to help ower* [sic] *work*". Student S said: "*nothing*" whilst Student T said: "*I don't enjoy lessons*" but these explicitly negative views were in a minority of two.

However, when asked whether they had disrupted their current class, messed around or behaved in a disruptive way most students replied that they had. Students U, V, G and L admitted that they had been late, which they interpreted as disruption, but then Student D said he had thrown "*rubbers*", Student O threw "*putty*"; Students B and W "*stopped work*" whilst Students C and T "*argued with other students*" or "*shouted out*". Student X "*set fire to a bench*" whilst L, F and O admitted to hitting "*teachers*" but F had only done this at "*Hight School* [sic]". Student H had blown "*the Bunsen burner in the teacher's face*". Many said "*swearing*"; for some this was at teachers. "[F]*ighting*" or "*playfighting* [sic]" were common terms. Student Y said he threw a chair and swore at his teacher. Others had started fights or "*started with someone*" Student I: "*spoke over people*". Student Z said he had "*stabbed a student in the neck….because he was annoying me*". Students said they "*laughed*", "*shouted*", "*disturbed others*", "*threw papers*", let their "*phones go off*" and finally one "*fell asleep*".

When asked through a closed series of questions why they had acted in these negative ways, most answered that they were "*bored*" or they "*didn't like the subject*". Student M had started a fight as a result of "*stress Because* [sic] *of spelling and writing*". Fighting was conflated with boredom in several instances. However, many explained their disruptive activities as resulting from "*anger towards another student*" or "*anger towards the teacher*". The reason for hitting a teacher was identified as the fact that Student Z had been "*bullied by two* [other students]". Another reason for disruptive behaviour was that Student P had "*things on* [his] *mind*". Sometimes the problem was that the student was feeling "*tired*"; Student J was angry because of being "*teased because of* [his] *southern accent*"

Finally, when asked what would make classes better, answers were revealing. Students A, C and D said "*more help*" or "*one-to-one support*". Student F said "*teachers that help you learn*". Others definitely wanted more practical or physical work, whilst Student J wanted "*more challenging theory lessons*". Several objected to teacher attitudes in the department, whilst others wanted "*a better teacher*", "*no teacher*", "*more professional teachers*" or "*more interesting lessons*". For some this meant "*more videos and presentations*", others wanted "*smaller groups*", "*more resources available*", "*topics fit for daily life*", whilst others were just "*not sure*". However, Student A1 poignantly said "*teachers should love teaching not just have it as a job*" and furthermore they "*…should talk with students like* [sic] *they are equal*".

When six teachers who had identified disruptive classes were asked about their responses to the student perspective in a focus group discussion during the planned training session, the salient points to emerge were Teacher A saying that "*…although we have all done Cert Eds, we feel ill-equipped for dealing with these challenging situations*". Teacher B said: "*we need much more daily support from managers and other staff in dealing with these problems*". Teacher C said: "*Can you please run more sessions going through strategies*

and interventions for coping with class management issues". As mentioned, all agreed with the statement: "*we are being faced with difficult classes for which we have been insufficiently trained*".

Analysis

It must be admitted that there were limitations to this research; its small-scale nature, the fact that I had been asked to prepare training for the self-selected group of tutors meant that the sample of students was pre-identified as disruptive and that there was an inbuilt bias (Cohen et al, 2011) that these students sampled were thought of by their tutors as disruptive. This was a snapshot of student attitudes from classes where the researcher was asked to support a range of tutors who were involved with challenging/disruptive classes. The groups were characterised by their tutors as disruptive, but there were individuals in each group who probably would not have identified themselves, or had not been identified as, difficult or disruptive members of the class. Nevertheless, 48 out of 60 students did answer the question about disruptive activities they had carried out, offering examples of their own negative behaviour. Was it true? Had they been as destructive as they said or was this bravado? Fabricated stories might have been interpreted as more subversion. However, when interviewed, their teachers confirmed that in general, these potted autobiographic incidents were true (ibid).

There was an element of convenience sampling in that the researcher was aware of these classes and had spoken personally to teachers involved in these contexts. The question that emerges is whether more random sampling would have produced similar results (Cohen et al, 2011). An alternative method would have been to set up an online questionnaire, blog or website for teachers or students to recount their experiences and express their views on disruptive classes they had attended. Alternatively, I could have gone into more depth and interviewed students, producing more data-rich results. To avoid getting teachers to identify and possibly stereotype individual students as being disruptive and then ask them questions as to why they behaved in the way they did (ibid, p. 395), I could have run group interviews (ibid). The problem was that this might actually have made the learning situation worse with little benefit for either the students or teacher (Denscombe, 2010). Crucially, there were time factors. Students were in college for a limited time; justifying spending it on interviews and research was not really appropriate for students who were engaged so little in education. By using the limited method of a survey before carrying out the required tutor training was a simple, effective way of finding out information. Ethical issues of intruding into the lives of students were also minimised.

The outcomes of this research reflect an interesting range of views. Some significant strands to the survey emerged. Thus, though many of these students had been involved in fighting, swearing, had thrown chairs at teachers, and had hit teachers, most students had normative suggestions about how lessons ought to be conducted. Smaller groups, one-to-one teaching, more practical sessions, and more interesting sessions were all positive ideas. Teachers should treat students as equals, act in a more professional manner and love their jobs rather than being there just for the pay cheque all seemed laudable aims. Nevertheless, some of the negative behaviours encountered now seemed to be far more extreme than those reported by Wallace (2003; 2007). However, it should be said that the contextual circumstances were considerably different.

The positive outcome of this research is firstly that this is an example of student voice, expressing what some students characterised by their teachers as disruptive, said what they had done in sessions, but also what they wanted from sessions. Secondly, the significance of the research findings was that students who said they had carried out

destructive acts in class were also the same people who said they wanted what amounted to engaging sessions, professional teacher behaviour and basically good, individualised teaching. In fact these students seemed to be vocalising the agenda of the key standard textbooks on teaching and learning (Petty, 2009; Curzon, 2004).

Eventually I used the research material in the colleges mentioned for training sessions to groups of seven, 12 and 15 tutors. In the sessions, I went through a range of strategies for engaging and building relationships with learners, working out support systems for staff, exploring case studies for interventions, but ultimately discussing students' perspectives and exploring teachers' ability and resilience to support students' personal growth and advance their academic and/or vocational careers in the sessions available.

Conclusion

The key focus of this research was to listen to the voices of perceived disruptive students. The findings were that the students surveyed said they had carried out some very negative acts in class. They gave a range of reasons why they had acted in this way, including boredom, anger at other students and the teacher, provocation, stress, tiredness, dislike of the content of lessons, and a response to bullying. It would be difficult to arrange all sessions so that none of these feelings emerged or legislate that classes could be set up that stopped any of these emotional or psychological events from taking place. However, it is reasonable that these students wanted to be treated respectfully, have engaging/interesting sessions, have more personalised learning and learn more in their current contexts of study.

The way forward in these situations might just be better communication between teachers and students, a more humanised approach, and more training for interventions, all of which might bring out better results for both sides of the classroom desk. Achieving this should go to the centre of all debates on teaching and learning.

References

Agee, J. (2009) 'Developing qualitative research questions: a reflective process', *International Journal Of Qualitative Studies In Education* Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 431-447. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390902736512

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL) (2008) 'Nearly A Third Of Teachers Face Physical Aggression At The Hands Of Pupils', Annual Conference Press Release, 20 March.

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL) (2010) 'Over A Quarter Of Education Staff Have To Deal With Physical Violence By Pupils', Annual Conference Press Release, 29 March.

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL) (2013) 'Disruptive Behaviour In Schools And Colleges Rises Alongside Increase In Children With Behavioural And Mental Health Problems', Annual Conference Press Release, 24 March.

Atkins, L. (2013) *'Researching "with", not "on": engaging marginalised learners in the research process', Research in Post-Compulsory Education* Vol. 18, No. 1-2, pp. 143-158. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2013.755853

Bates, I., Riseborough, G. (1993) *Youth and Inequality*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bathmaker, A. (1999) 'Managing Messes and Coping with Uncertainty: reviewing training for teachers in post-compulsory education and training', *Journal of Further and Higher Education* Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 185-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0309877990230203
Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., Tight, M. (2001) *How To Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

British Educational Research Association (2011) *Ethical Guidelines For Educational Research.* London: BERA.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods In Education.* London and New York: Routledge and Falmer.

Creswell, J. (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cunliffe, A. (2004) 'On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner', *Journal of Management Education* Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 407-426. http://dx/doi.org/10.1177/1052562904264440

Curzon, L. B. (2004) *Teaching In Further Education: An Outline Of Principles And Practice* (6th ed.). London: Continuum.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *The Good Research Guide* (4th ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y. (2011) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). London: Sage Publications Inc.

DFE (2012) 'Pupil Behaviour In Schools In England' *DFE-RR218* https://www.education.gov.uk/publications [accessed 6 Nov 2012].

Dreikurs, R., Cassel, P., Dreikurs, E. (2005) *Discipline Without Tears: How To Reduce Conflict And Establish Co-Operation In The Classroom.* New Jersey: Wiley.

Ecclestone, K. (2012) 'From Emotional and Psychological Well-Being to Character Education: Challenging Policy Discourses of Behavioural Science and "Vulnerability"', *Research Papers In Education* Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 463-480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2012.690241

Fielding, M. (2004) 'Transformative approaches to student voice: theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities', *British Educational Research Journal* Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 295-311.

Gallagher, B., Creighton, S., Gibbons, J. (1995) 'Ethical dilemmas in social research: no easy solutions', *British Journal of Social Work* Vol. 25, No. 3. pp. 295-311.

Gove, M. (2014) 'Securing Our Children's Future' Speech given to London Academy of Excellence on 30.02.14. https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-speaks-about-securing-our-childrens-future [accessed 10 Feb 2014].

Guba, E. (1990) *The Paradigm Dialogue.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gunaratnam, Y. (2003) *Researching 'Race' and Ethnicity: Methods, Knowledge and Power.* London Sage Publications Ltd.

Hannah, V. (2012) 'How To Teach Behaviour Management' http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/aug/27/pupil-behaviour-management-teaching-resources [accessed 20 September 2012].

Hidi, S., Harackiewicz, T. (2000) 'Motivating the academically unmotivated: a critical issue for the 21st Century', *Review of Educational Research* Vol. 70, No. 2 p.151. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543070002151

Iveson, C., George, E., Ratner, H. (2012) *Brief Coaching: A Solution Focused Approach.* Routledge: East Sussex.

Lankshear, C., Knobel, M. (2004) *Teacher Research: From Design To Implementation*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

LSIS (2012) 'Skills And Employer Responsiveness: Framework For Providers To Assess And Develop Strategies For Getting People Into Work' http://www.acer.ac.uk/Framework%20for%20Providers%20to%20assess%20and%20develop%20 strategies%20and%20provision%20for%20Getting%20People%20into%20Work.pdf [accessed 14 March 2014].

Mulholland, H. (2012) 'Millions Paid Out To Teachers For Classroom Assaults And Accidents' http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/apr/05/teachers-classroom-assaults-accidents [accessed 12 Sept 2012].

Ofsted (2013) 'Good Practice Resource - Raising Standards Through Professional Development: Perry Beeches The Academy.' http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/good-practice-resource-raising-standards-through-professional-development-perry-beeches-academy. [Accessed 29 Jul. 2015]

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2011) 'Has Discipline In School Deteriorated?' PISA in Focus 2011/4, May, Paris: OECD Publishing http://wwwoecd/dataoecd/18/63/47944912 [Accessed 29 Oct. 2014]

Petty, G. (2009) *Teaching Today: A Practical Guide* (4th ed.). London: Nelson Thornes.

Sellgren, K. (2013) 'Disruptive Behaviour Rising, Teachers Say' http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-21895705 [accessed 28 March 2013].

Shacklock, G., Thorp, L. (2005) 'Life history and narrative approaches', in Somekh, B., Lewin, C. (eds), *Research Methods In The Social Sciences*, pp. 156-163, London: Sage.

Simmons, R., Thompson, R. (2011) *Education And Training For Young People At Risk Of Becoming NEET: Findings From An Ethnographic Study Of Work-Based Learning Programmes*. London: Routledge.

Spiers, E. (2011) 'Bad Behaviour In The Classroom Is Not The Problem', http://www.guardian.co.uk/teacher-network/2011/nov/03/bad-behaviour-classroom [accessed 12 Sept 2012].

Townend, M. (2013) 'Massive Rise In Disruptive Behaviour, Warn Teachers', http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2013/mar/24/schools-disruptive-behaviour [accessed 28 March 2013].

Vizard, D. (2009) *Meeting The Needs Of Disaffected Students*. London: Network Continuum.

Wallace, S. (2003) *Managing Behaviour And Motivating Students In Further Education*. Exeter: Learning Matters.

Wallace, S (2007) *Managing Behaviour In The Lifelong Learning Sector*. Exeter: Learning Matters.

Wellington, J., Cole, P. (2004) 'Conducting Evaluation and Research with and for "Disaffected" Students: Practical and Methodological Issues', *British Journal of Special Education* Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 100-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0952-3383.2004.00336.x

Wong, H. (2009) *The First Day Of School; How To Be An Effective Teacher*. California: HarryWong Publications.