Continual Disobedience – Are we singing from the same song sheet?
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Overview of the presentation

- Why did we undertake this study?
- How did we do it?
- What did we find?
- Implications and next steps
Why the study?

- Ministry of Education(2009) guidelines provide details of the legal option and duties for principals and boards of trustees on the subject of stand-downs, suspensions, expulsions & exclusions -SSEE.
- Categories of behaviours that can warrant disciplinary action.
- Disciplinary statistics
- Literature
## Percentage of Stand-downs, by behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Continual Disobedience</th>
<th>Drugs (Including Substance Abuse)</th>
<th>Physical Assault on Other Students</th>
<th>Physical Assault on Staff</th>
<th>Verbal Assault on Other Students</th>
<th>Verbal Assault on Staff</th>
<th>Theft, Vandalism or Arson</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Percentage of Suspensions, by behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Continual Disobedience</th>
<th>Drugs (Including Substance Abuse)</th>
<th>Physical Assault on Other Students</th>
<th>Physical Assault on Staff</th>
<th>Verbal Assault on Other Students</th>
<th>Verbal Assault on Staff</th>
<th>Smoking or Alcohol</th>
<th>Theft, Vandalism or Arson</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequences of disengagement

- **Social cost** of young persons disengaged from learning – anti social pathways (Skiba et al., 2014; Skiba et al. 2003; Vulliamy & Webb, 2000).

- Students who are already vulnerable in terms of their learning and or life circumstances are made **further vulnerable** (Parffrey, 1994; Monroe, 2006).

- Alienating students from the educational system through out of school disciplinary measures merely **re-locates the problem** to another part of the community rather than addressing the issues underpinning unacceptable behaviours (Dharan, Meyer & Mincher, 2011-12; Martinez, 2009; McGee, 2012).

- **Valuable loss of learning time** (APA Task Force on Zero Tolerance, 2008).
What exactly is continual disobedience?

Continual Disobedience is presented as one of the main behaviours that result in out of school discipline. It is when a student:

- deliberately and regularly fails to do what they are told;
- entrenched misbehaviour;
- harmful or dangerous example to other students (MoE, 2009, Part 1)

How do secondary schools interpret this category?
How did we do it?

Two phases

- **First phase**
  - E-survey

- **Second phase**
  - Focus group of self nominated schools

Participants

- 5 self-nominated schools
  - 4 in the North Island, 1 in South Island
  - 4 co-ed state schools; 1 private single sex school.
  - 4 currently engaged in the PB4L programme
  - Participants in 4 schools - Deans, Teachers, PB4L rep, Counselors, HODs, DP
  - Participants in 1 school - Principal & senior management
FG questions

- What behaviours does your school classify as continual disobedience?
- What are the processes within the school to identify the underlying cause or function of these behaviours for the student?
- What steps do you take to support the learning of at risk students?
- What steps do you take to support the behaviour of at risk students?
- How are students who have been stood down and suspended for continual disobedience supported in the reintegration processes in your school?
- Could you share some of the effective practices in your school that have contributed to maintain or reduce disciplinary actions for continual disobedience to a low level?
What did we find?
Ponga School – Single sex

- Saw CD as a confrontational term – preferred Gross Misconduct
  - Absenteeism; not doing as asked, rude to staff, disruptive, truant; lateness; not doing homework; not listening; (bullying and smoking).
  - Repeated pattern of behaviour – one teacher after another
  - ‘Not responding to any intervention’.
  - Clear policies in Code of Conduct & expectations for student behaviour with strict consequences.
Akatea School

- The term C&D viewed as an old term that signaled ‘authoritarian relationship’, ‘culturally incongruent’.

- Continual truancy, disruptive behaviour, not following rules on a regular basis

- Level of tolerance of disruptive behaviour very high – Rubber band principle

- “When they truant we understand why -- they are late because they had to drop their five year old sister at school”.

- 3 strikes policy.

- Problem with lack of consistency between teachers in reaction to behaviour can be confusing for students.
CD a catch-all phrase, rather than behaviour fitting into continual disobedience. Somewhat a default term.

Talking in class; not having equipment; failing to bring homework; deliberately being late; disrupting class, teacher baiting - disrupting teaching and the learning of others.

3 minor = 1 Major principle applied – 3 incidences in the same lesson.

No shared meaning, different things for different staff depending on expectations of behaviours in the classroom

Small community allowed for plenty of informal contacts with parents, often diffusing escalation of behaviours.
Koru School

- Deliberate/Intentional behaviours that challenge authority
  - Continually talking & disrupting, task avoidance, attention seeking; lateness; wrong uniform.

- Behaviours that challenge or weaken student/teacher relationships
  - Students from ‘outside’ were problematic.
  - Identified ‘problem’ behaviour occurred in the last period.
  - 3 strikes policy.

- PB4L has given a consistency to dealing with behaviours. Yet identified issues with teacher expectancy and consistency.
Manuka School

- Defiant behaviour that is ‘in your face’; Challenges teachers’ authority; (unsafe for peers and/or staff)
  - Not gross misconduct

- It is most important that teachers are consistent within themselves, thus being predictable to the students

- Small community – interactions in multiple contexts

- Respect for the teaching profession to reduce continual disobedience
Is it the same song sheet – among and within schools?

Among Schools

- Variation in defining
- Variation in application
- Variation in level of tolerance
- Student/family-centric

Within schools

- (In)Consistency of practices
- Systemic approach/Issues
Implications - Ways forward

Problematic category?

- It is not behaviours such as violent outbursts and physical assault that teachers are concerned about on a day to day basis, rather it is the frequently occurring breaches of conduct like off task behavior, talking back and talking out of turn that interrupt the learning in the classroom (Infantino & Little, 2005).

- There is a risk that the perception of behaviours deemed as ‘continually disobedience’ can be subjective leading to a large number of students being suspended for being disrespectful, noncompliant, defiant and disruptive (Bowditch, 1993; Dharan et al, 2011-12; Raffale Mendez et al, Monroe, 2005; Skiba, Peterson & Williams, 1997).

Alternatives

- Restorative practices
- Structural and curricular adjustments
- Culturally responsive pedagogy

Are we including student voices in disciplinary processes?
Is there a win-win?
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