An Evaluation of the *Stand Out Boys Project (SOBP)*

A Boys Development Project

Simon Forrest

January 2014

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcomes of an evaluation of the *Stand Out Boys Project (SOBP)* undertaken by the *Boys Development Project* between September 2012 and July 2013. SOBP targeted boys in reception and year 1 of three primary schools in South London who 'stood out' because they lacked the social and behavioural skills required to succeed at school. SOBP involves a tripartite intervention with boys, their parents and teachers, equipping each with skills to enable these boys to achieve an increase in their skills for learning, their achievement levels, and a significant reduction in the number of behaviour-related incidents within both the classroom and the playground.

The evaluation is multi-source, bringing together data from interviews, field diaries and administrative sources to examine process and particularly outcomes in relation to the following measures:

- The behaviour of 30 children who 'stand out' in the 3 primary schools would be improved and they would be actively engaging in their learning;
- 21 parents/carers would have increased understanding of and increased confidence and skills to address these children's behavioural issues;
- 6-10 KS1 teachers and teaching assistants in the 3 primary schools have an increased understanding of, and skills to manage the behaviour of children who 'stand out';
- And, the 3 primary schools would have a system in place for identifying and addressing the behaviour needs of children who 'stand out'.

This evaluation found that the intervention was highly acceptable, accessible and was perceived by parents to have positive outcomes for both them and their children. Amongst a randomly selected 14 of parents (associated with 12 children) 12 reported rises in confidence, skills and understanding around parenting their children. The same number reported improvements in their children's behavioural and/or attitude and capacity to learn.

There was also evidence of increased understanding and skills to manage children in the classroom among teachers and teaching assistants.

With respect to the primary outcome measure, impact on children, detailed data were available on 16 children, which showed the following:

- Attainment and performance as measured by 'levelling' improved from a below average for age to equal to or above average for age pre and post intervention;
- The average gap in points between 'stand out' children and their peers at entry was 1.21. Post intervention the greatest difference was 0.6 of a point (making relationships) and on 6 other measures stand out children were scoring above average;
- The average increase in proportion of 'stand out' children attaining to age-expectation over the year was 54.1% with the most marked increase relating to the item 'managing feelings and behaviour' where there was an increase by two thirds in the proportion attaining to age-expectation (from 12.5 to 78.6%).

There are grounds both for confidence about the generalizability of these findings and that they are associated with participation in SOBP. This is because the processes and mechanisms by which this impact might be attained are clear and consistent across the sample.

The evaluation found a high degree of commonality in concern and behavioural manifestation at home and school and also in commitment to support stand out boys. SOBP provides material evidence that behaviour at home influences engagement and behaviour in school and that both a mutable thorough intervention for the majority of children in a short period of time (around one school term).

There are some characteristic forms of 'standing out' centred around problems with compliance, forming and managing relationships with adults and especially other children and communication. The latter may be distinctive in some cases relating to children where English is not the language commonly spoken at home.

There are grounds for asserting that while not confined to, children from households with lower social and economic capital, and with more complex needs may be particularly likely to need support with transition to school and with settling in. SOBP may be a particularly appropriate intervention in schools providing for localities in more deprived areas.

The evaluation suggests that there is scope to develop SOBP, including consideration of roll-out aiming to achieve capacity and form suitable for mainstreaming. Key considerations to enable this are to test the viability and impact of training workers to deliver SOBP and to produce a manual of operations and packages of resources to support parents and teachers. Any developments should reflect what appear to be important characteristics of SOBP:

- It is an 'in-school' intervention which both reflects what goes on in the classroom and comprised intervention in the classroom. It also brings parents into school to access support with their parenting helping both to achieve focus on the child in the context of the classroom and also, practically, enabling positive contact and engagement around the child between teachers and parents.

- SOBP seeks to address behavioural and other challenges experienced by children around settling in school in a concrete, practical fashion, which partakes of evidence and practice and does not pathologise. This helps to allay parental concerns about labelling and also mitigate against the need for costly independent therapeutic intervention.

- Data from this evaluation suggest that around 10% of children in early years education may at some point 'stand out'. There is the potential for standing out to have short and long term negative impact on their education, and also on that of their peers because of their potential needs for additional support and intervention. SOBP progresses a model for identifying and understanding 'standing out' which enables effective early intervention. The typology of compliance, relationships and communication as the focus for both assessment and intervention, the process involving advising and supporting adjustments to practice at home and school in line with this is simple and effective.

List of tables

Contents

The *Stand Out Boys Project (SOBP)*

SOBP is an intervention targeting boys in reception and year 1 who 'stand out' because they lack the social and behavioural skills required to succeed at school. The intervention draws on evidence and practice which suggests that early and coordinated support to parents and teachers can alter children's behaviour in ways that help them to adjust to school and avoid them falling behind educationally. *SOBP* encourages parents and teachers to adopt strategies at home and in the classroom, respectively that help these boys to achieve an increase in their skills for learning, their achievement levels, and a significant reduction in the number of behaviour-related incidents within both the classroom and the playground.

SOBP seeks to achieve these outcomes for boys by increasing both parental understanding of their sons and also confidence to deal with their behaviour and learning. It seeks to increase their involvement and engagement with their sons learning in and out of school. SOBP also aims to increase teachers' understanding of and skills to manage 'stand out' behaviour and to reduce teacher time spent on behaviour-related incidents the consequences of this behaviour.

Scope of intervention

The intervention was undertaken in two consecutive cohorts of children aged 4-5 years old in 3 primary schools located in the London Borough of Lewisham (Childeric, Beecroft Gardens and Myatt Gardens). Recruitment of the first cohort took place in September 2012 and the second in February 2013. The intervention around each child was projected to last between one and one and half terms.

Outcome measures

It was anticipated that the SOBP intervention would achieve the following:

- The behaviour of 30 children who 'stand out' in the 3 primary schools would be improved and they would be actively engaging in their learning;
- 21 parents/carers would have increased understanding of and increased confidence and skills to address these children's behavioural issues;
- 6-10 KS1 teachers and teaching assistants in the 3 primary schools have an increased understanding of, and skills to manage the behaviour of children who 'stand out';
- And, the 3 primary schools would have a system in place for identifying and addressing the behaviour needs of children who 'stand out'.

The Evaluation

Scope and content of this report

This evaluation is focused on assessing the impact of the SOBP and as such takes as the major influence on its scope and content the anticipated outcomes stated above. The evaluation also involves descriptions of intervention process and aims to stitch together process and outcome such that inferences can be drawn about the relationship between them. This report also contains recommendations on the future implementation and evaluation of SOBP. The analysis reported here has been undertaken by Simon Forrest.

Evaluation instruments and measures

This evaluation draws on data drawn from the following sources:

Detailed descriptive notes

Detailed descriptive notes that record the nature, scope and content of interventions made with parents, teachers and 'stand out' boys. These notes record the advice and support given, and perceptions of its impact on the child. These detailed descriptive notes are supported by 'pen pictures' which describe the principle 'stand out' issues identified at home the main focus of the interventions with the child's parents. Detailed descriptive notes and pen pictures contribute to the description of process as well as measurement of impact on parents, teachers and children

Levelling data.
Levelling data relating to a sample of 16 children. These data record in detail each child's achievement and progress against a range of items organised into domains appropriate to their level of study. Progress is recorded in the form of a numerical score that is allocated according to performance against expectations for age. At any point in time a child can be identified as either working below, at, or exceeding expectations of children their age. Levelling data are available pre, during and post the intervention period for a sub-sample of children involved in SOBP and also their peers enabling us to examine SOBP impact on children's engagement with learning and involvement with school.

Interviews with parents
Interviews with parents exploring their perceptions of impact of the intervention on them and on their child(ren). For the full interview schedule, see appendix 1. For this evaluation we interviewed 14 parents of 12 children involved in *SOBP*. Interviewees were randomly selected subject to achievement of representation from all schools.

Interviews with teachers
Interviews with teachers sought to evaluate any increase in their understanding of, and skills to manage the behaviour of children who 'stand out'. These interviews also contributed assessment of intervention impact on classroom incidents and the amount of teacher time spent on behaviour-related incidents. These interviews were conducted to a schedule comprising questions relating to two broad areas of interest: changes in a pupil's behaviour and engagement in class as a result of the intervention; and, the contribution of *SOBP* to the range of strategies available to teachers to manage stand out pupils. For the full interview schedule, see appendix 2.

Data analysis and presentation
Data from pen pictures and detailed descriptive notes have been analysed alongside data yielded by interviews with parents and with teachers. All analysis was guided by interest in the expected outcomes outlined above and processes associated with it. Information has been collated into a combination of tables (where appropriate) supplemented with qualitative data. Quotations and summarisations drawn from individual interviews and detailed descriptive notes are included to illustrate aspects of the findings. Names have been removed to protect confidences of the participants in the project. Data relating to 'levelling' have been subjected to simple statistical analysis appropriate to their volume and nature. Tables reporting statistical data are supported by in-text commentary.

Background and context

School and sample characteristics
Table 1 reports selected characteristics of the three schools involved in SOBP. It shows that both Childeric and Myatt Gardens are above average in terms of total pupil roll. Childeric School massively exceeds the local and national averages for proportions of children eligible for free school meals and from whom English is an additional language. Beecroft also exceeds both averages but to

a lesser degree while in contrast Myatt gardens sits under the local averages in terms of pupil eligibility for free school meals for pupils for whom English is an additional language.

All three schools are also notable for above average enrolment of pupils with a statement of special educational need and both Childeric and Beecroft Gardens receive a disproportionately high intake of pupils from black and ethnic minority backgrounds.

Table 1: School characteristics

School	Roll	% of roll eligible for free school meals	Learning English as an Additional Language
Childeric Primary	467	42.6∗∗∗	65.4
Beecroft Garden Primary	311	45∗∗∗	47.9
Myatt Garden Primary	513	21∗∗∗	24.9
Lewisham average		*27.1∗∗*	*32.7 ∗*
England average		*19.2 ∗∗*	*16.8 ∗*

∗ http://www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-statistics/eal-pupils (2011)

∗∗ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schools-pupils-and-their-characteristics-january-2013

∗∗∗ http://schoolguide.co.uk/

Sample demographics

Table 2 reports the sample of children involved in SOBP with regard to ages, ethnicity and eligibility for FSM. The total number of children engaged by the project was 31. Sixteen children participated in cohort 1 and a further 15 in cohort 2[1]. Distribution between schools was as follows: 11 from Beecroft (6 and 5, in cohort 1 and 2, respectively); 10 from Childeric (5 in each cohort); and, 10 from Myatt (5 in each cohort). The ages of children participating in SOBP have been calculated as or enrolment in September 2012.

---

[1] Note that cohort 2 also involved a child rolled over from cohort 1.

Table 2: Sample characteristics

Sample (age, ethnicity and FSM) (n =31)		
Age (years)	**N**	**%**
4-5	25	*81*
5-6	6	*19*
Gender		
Male	27	*87*
Female	4	*13*
Ethnicity		
Black African	9	*29*
Mixed	7	*23*
Black & Black British	7	*23*
White British	3	*10*
White European	3	*10*
East Asian	1	*<1*
Other	1	*<1*
FSM	15	*50*

Table 2 shows that in terms of eligibility for FSM the sample sat above average for the Borough. Data on the ethnicity of pupils are not available at school level. However, when compared to data for the sector schools across the Borough while the proportion of Black & Black British pupils is in line with the average, the sample contains a higher presentation of Black African (29% versus a Borough average of 14%), and Mixed ethnicity pupils (23% versus a Borough average of 14%), and a lower proportion of White British and White European children (20% versus a Borough average of 35%).

'Standing out' at school

Table 3 describes the sample in terms of the 'stand out' issues that resulted in their identification for involvement the project. In this context 'standing out' is taken to mean those children to whom an observer's attention will drift within a short period in a classroom. As table 3 indicates this might be because they fail to comply with instruction and/or interact less well with their peers. As the data show, children who 'stood out' frequently did so in more than one way. For example, failure to comply in class might be coupled with a tendency to show too much emotion and to give up too easily. As result, these 'stand out' children can be said not to have settled into school: not to have started to make friendships with other children; and, do not have a relationship with adults in the room.

The table reports standing out in terms of a typology of issues reported as compliance, relationships with other children, motivation and communication. Table 3 shows that 70% of the sample was identified as having issues with compliance in the classroom. Characteristically, these children were unwilling to take or act on instructions delivered by the teacher or teaching assistants. Around two thirds of the sample displayed problems in forming and maintaining relationships with other children. Figuring prominently here were challenges around managing emotions in interaction and especially over-expression either producing or resulting from conflict that might then be characterised by excessive and in a few cases aggressive physicality. Large minorities of 'stand out' children displayed either problems with motivation and engagement with learning and/or

communication (45% and 39%, respectively). These were diverse, including displaying a lack of concentration and motivation to persevere but also inattention and in one case lack of punctuality and attendance at school. With respect to communication these children stood out either they displayed limited willingness/ability to verbalise, or in contrast, too much enthusiasm for speaking coupled on occasion to use of inappropriately adult language.

Table 3: 'Stand out 'issues at school (n=31)

Issue in class	n	%	
Compliance	22	*71*	Not willing to be told what to do Challenging instructions Not listening/ignoring instructions
Relationships with other children	20	*66*	Emotions boiling over in conflict Difficulties sharing/playing with others Violent play/play becoming too physical
Motivation and engagement with learning	14	*45*	Lack of concentration Giving up too easily Not sitting still Attendance
Communication	12	*39*	Low language use Reluctance to talk Use of inappropriate language

Standing out at home

Table 4 reports parental perceptions of the challenges around stand out boys' behaviour in the home. The table adopts the typology developed in table 3. Table 4 shows that every parent recorded a concern about compliance in the home. Typically, these related to either/and their child not responding to requests or instructions and showing a lack of responsiveness to sanctions threatened or imposed for this non-responsiveness. There was similar universality of experience associated with concerns about children's relationships with others. The majority of these were connected with displays of behaviour perceived to be injurious to formation or maintenance of relationships including displays of excessive emotions, verbal and rarely physical aggression. Almost half of the parents reported having concerns about their child's communication. In most cases these concerns were associated with reluctance to talk to people outside their immediate family circle. A much smaller proportion, around 16%, felt that their child lacked motivation or concentration.

Table 4: typology of issues identified by parents/carers

Issues at home	n	%	
Compliance	31	*100*	Child does not respond to requests/instruction Child does not respond to sanctions
Relationships with others	31	*100*	Child is too emotional/moody Is rude/verbally aggressive Is physically aggressive
Communication	15	*49*	Does not talk to people outside then family: talkative at home, shy outside Not talking in school
Motivation	5	*16*	Lacks concentration Lacks attention/focus

Interviews with parents provide some illustrative elucidation of these experiences. For example, this mother said of her son:

> 'He's real handful. [He] has tantrums when he doesn't get what he wants. He's bright and clever but doesn't cope without his routine. That's where we've had problems. He won't sleep without me being there and so getting to bed is difficult. He gets upset and I can't just let him cry can I?' You should try listening to him screaming and smashing his room for three hours.'

Compliance around every day routine was also an issue at home for this mother:

> 'In the morning was an issue, I tell him to brush his teeth or get dressed and he'd want to debate everything. I'd want to avoid him starting to cry or get emotional because that always went on to an argument or fight between us. He hates tidying his room too. However much I ask or tell him he won't do it.'

In contrast, a third mother highlighted challenges around her son's behaviour in the company of other people and his motivation:

> 'He won't concentrate on one thing. That's kind of the main thing but he also acts up quite a lot especially around other people. I think it's connected; he's too busy concentrating on other people sometimes and swings from being babyish to like a teenager. He does play with older children and so he can be physical, like too rough physical, and that's because he's around older kids with the TV and X-box.'

Interventions: process and impact

SOBP involved a tripartite intervention targeting parents of 'stand out' boys with practical advice and strategies for addressing behaviour and issues through the home, teachers and other adults in the classroom with strategies for responding to the child's behaviour in class and in-classroom intervention with the child.

Interventions with parents

The interventions with parents focused on equipping them with advice and practical strategies that would affect their children's behaviour at school. The interventions took the form of meetings with Trefor Lloyd (the project worker) who, having contacted parent(s) and shared concerns about a child's behaviour in school, agreed a plan of parental action and support to implement it. In the vast majority of cases, interventions with parents were perceived as acceptable, accessible, practical and feasible and to produce positive results both at home and at school.

Acceptability and accessibility

Perceived acceptability and accessibility of the intervention was very high. Twelve of the 14 parents interviewed in the evaluation were clear and happy about its purpose, recognised the challenges being experienced by their child at school and understood the rationale for and mechanisms by which the advice that they were asked to adopt could have a positive impact in addressing it.

Examples of parental recognition of concerns about their child are illustrated by the following comments from a mother whose son was experiencing challenges around communicating both with

other children and also adults (he would play alongside but necessarily with or include talking to other children) and demonstrated a tendency not to pay attention or listen. She explained that:

> 'I wasn't surprised to hear that [my son] wasn't playing with other children and was quiet and reserved. He can be like that at home. He only really talked to his cousins and has always been reserved with other people. He was like it at nursery as well.'

This mother reported a similar level of recognition of her son's problems at school which included primarily difficulties with compliance, and also some challenges with use of language, giving up too easily and becoming too emotional:

> 'My main issue was that he wouldn't concentrate on one thing. I recognised that instantly when they said he was like it at school. He could also be either a bit babyish or go the other way and act too old. He does 'act up' sometimes so I do tend to let him get his own way on some things. I was a bit surprised about his language because he is always talking but I could see that he didn't use many words really. When I heard about him at school I thought about things we'd done…maybe it was to do with his being with child-minder when he was little…he also spends time at his dads at the weekend where he plays with other kids and maybe that's not good for his routine.'

In both of these examples the tendency of parents to begin to link problems with settling in at school to aspects of home life is very evident. This was recurrent theme in accounts with 10 interviewees making these links. In some cases interviewees made it very explicit that this was an important element in the acceptability and accessibility of the intervention because they saw it serving dual, allied purposes of helping their child to settle at school and also providing them with some recognition and especially some supportive and concrete help with concerns and challenges being experienced at home. This mohter put it as follows:

> 'No brainer. I thought, if this helps him at school and that means changing a few things at home that's fine by me. Who doesn't want the best for their child? And, I needed a bit of support to get things sorted here too.'

Another point alluded to here and made clearer by another 6 interviewees was that the intervention did not imply or involve any stigmatising judgement about either their son or about their parenting:

> 'I liked that it was clear from the start that this was about helping my boy and helping me to help my boy. When you get told there's problem you tend to immediately think, 'what's he done wrong', or, 'what I am doing wrong?' This wasn't like that. It was all about wanting to get him settled. It was very clear for me – if settling him there [school] meant helping me to settle him here then that's a win-win.'

The final point made by interviewees with regard to accessibility of the intervention was practical: that advice and support was made available to them in ways that were convenient and timely:

> 'It was good that we got the support so easily. I would sometimes meet at school, either at the beginning of the day. Trefor would also call me which was good because we could just check-in and I could tell him how I was doing or if I had a question... It made it very easy, you know, when you're busy…not easy to squeeze another thing in.'

Although this example places particular emphasis on the value attached to the logistical aspects of the delivery of the intervention, it is important to note that the creation of a supportive dialogue figured very prominently for other 9 interviewees. This could be particularly important given that managing the transition to school was potentially freighted with emotion for both parents and children:

'It was easy. Easy to talk and to understand what was being suggested to me. It all made sense and I liked that I felt involved – not being told what to do. You are quite highly strung out when your first son goes to school because you're just worrying for them and the last thing you need is to feel like it is all going wrong.'

Practical and feasible advice

Interviewees also commented on the practical nature of advice given and the feasibility of implementation. The important points made in the illustrative data cited below, were made by 12 of the 14 interviewees, and relate to the concrete nature of advice, its clarity and the way that it was perceived to be proportionate, relevant and meaningful in terms of the challenges or issue it sought to address.

'What I liked was that it addressed the specific thing that was concerning us. The morning was an issue. I used to tell him to get dressed and he wouldn't. We'd end up shouting at each other. I took the advice gave him a list of things that ticks off as he does them, like his instructions for the day. He likes ticking them off. He feels in control and it makes him proud when he's done them all.'

This mother was given advice to help encourage her son to better manage his relationships with his peers in school:

'What we had to try was to just play together and get him use to not always having it his own way. We started playing snap and we got him use to losing. At first he was upset but he got used to it…I could see straight away how it might help him at school – if he couldn't play very nicely we could help him to learn to enjoy playing and not being so hung on winning. It wasn't much to do and it was so simple – play games together!'

Other strategies connected to communication and relationships included creating opportunities for a child to gain confidence in speaking and listening by talking to adults other than members of the family by, for example, helping to handle the exchange of money when shopping, or asking about bus times. In one of these cases a parented noted, neatly summing up the appeal and ease of acting on the advice:

'It was things like get him to help me pay at the checkout and speak to the person on the till and also ask people at the bus stop. I realised that I had not really given him these opportunities before and so he wasn't used to talking to people other than me and the family and was nervous. Doing these things was exciting for him and also interesting. I felt it was easy and safe.'

As is implied here, feasibility was connected in important ways to the provision of advice that could be acted on as part of everyday life (even it was focused on positively altering a problematic routine or habit). For example, with regard to advice typically focused on the (re)establishment of parental control over a variety of trigger situations which habitually led to stress and conflict with their child. Parents reported the following suggested approaches: adopting greater clarity and brevity in instruction; changing vocal tone to 'slow and low' rather than responding to rising emotion; and, creating routines that made compliance an act of taking independent responsibility on the part of the child. Where the focus was on managing emotion and relationships, advice included to introducing role play around teacher-pupil interaction into playing at home; increasing opportunities for 'play-dates' with peers from school; and, intervening in sibling relationships where children were either over or under-confident. In a significant minority of cases a child's challenges with communicating at school were connected with a lack of familiarity and confidence about speaking in

English. Indeed, in at least 6 cases English was either not the first language spoken at home and/or rarely spoken at home. Advice to parents in these cases often included suggesting and supporting them to increase the extent and frequency with which English was spoken at home.

Supportive and available advice

Interviewees also mentioned the importance of ongoing support and feedback. As the following illustrates:

> 'I liked the way that I felt like Trefor was involved. He would call and we'd talk about things were going, how I was coping and if things were working. I did feel that I could always call him if I needed to, needed a boost in confidence or support.'

The importance of this feedback including reflections on positive changes in a child's experience and engagement with school was also identified as important by several interviewees. This feedback provided encouragement to maintain action at home which was especially important where this involved changing parental practice in ways that felt demanding. As this mother noted:

> 'It was very hard sometimes to keep going with changing things at home. We had habits that were hard to break and stopping and thinking rather than getting angry or frustrated – well I didn't always manage. It helped when I heard how things were at school. My son got better behaved there and because that was important I did feel encouraged to keep trying.'

And, with regard to an issue around communicating, another father said of his attempts to maintain impetus in trying to ensure that his son spoke in English more often:

> 'It was good when I knew he spoke more in school because we were speaking and reading English at home. It was good for me to keep going.'

Parental perceptions of intervention impact on home life

Twelve of the 14 interviewees reported some positive impact of the intervention of their home lives. Documentary evidence provided through detailed descriptive notes confirm the breadth and depth of impact indicating perceived improvements in parental experience of their relationship with their child and home life for at least 28 of 31 children. Accounts of impact tended to draw attention to the multi-faceted nature of positive impact: on children, on parents and on their relationship. For example, this mother talked about reductions in impulsive, demanding behaviour of her child as a primary outcome:

> '…more helpful at home. Likes doing things when I asked, but also joining in. To start it with it was chores like tidying up but we also started to do things like get meals ready together more. I could also leave them to do things while I got on which had been a huge problem.'

She went on, highlighting the affective benefits for her child,

> 'They're happier. Definitely. More calmer and settled and easy-going. By like weaning ourselves off me always responding to demands for attention and babying them, they got happier which was I suppose a surprise because I felt like it might not work like that.'

And, finally, mentioned the benefits to herself and her relationship to her child:

'I think we got into habits that were stressful. Although we didn't always kind of know it because we didn't know any different. I think we have a better relationship now. You have to make that because when they go to school they have to begin to grow up more and that's sudden so you learn, need to learn, to be together differently and relate differently. I think we're both happier.'

Another mother was positive about the results of finding new ways to manage compliance:

'Getting ready in the mornings was a problem. I'd lose my cool and we'd end up in arguments and tantrums and totally stressed. I did a thing with a whiteboard list of things we needed to do to be ready and [my son] had to tick off his jobs. He loved the feeling of having done things. We also got an alarm clock which we set to get up. We'd do that together in the end.'

The primary outcome for her was a renewed sense of control over the morning routine and indeed over her relationship with her son.

'Much better at home now. I feel in control and that we know where the flashpoints are and have a way round them. I am the boss again. You don't notice you've lost that really but like in the mornings before I was thinking I was the boss shouting sometimes and making things happen but I wasn't because it was a clash of wills. Now I am controlling things but easier and in ways that work for us both.'

Critical in facilitating these outcomes but also regarded as an outcome in itself was, for some parents, a perception of increased understanding of how their children thought, felt and experienced their parenting. This is well illustrated in the following comment:

'Actually, I understand better what he thinks and how he feels. This made it easy to see why I needed to be firmer with him and clearer in what I asked him to do. You have to realise that they are children and boys not adults so they think differently.'

Interestingly, in the few cases where interviewees mentioned that they found it difficult to apply advice provided through *SOBP*, positive accounts were still discerned even if to a less dramatically positive degree. This mother had not been convinced of the value of advice relating to managing her son's tantrums and 'acting out'. She wondered if it required a medical rather than behavioural response. Nevertheless, despite coping with the frustrations associated with parenting her son and trying to gain for him a diagnosis of an autistic spectrum disorder, she tried to follow advice and did report some limited positive impact. She began by explaining the kinds of behaviour she was faced with and her response prior to intervention:

'I hated having to shut him in his room when he kicked off. But what could I do? He would kick and fight and trash the place. If I put him in his room I'd have three hours of him smashing about up there while I was supposed to sit and listen. It hurt me to do it. It hurt me.'

She went on to talk about her feeling that SOBP was focusing inappropriately on supporting her with skills to parent her son:

'…his problems are not with what we do at home but he's bright and I think it's autism. He needs help not from us. It's no good focusing on what we do…'

But, concluded pointing out that she had followed some advice and seen some benefit:

'I did try it though and I will try and stick with it. I just try and ignore the trouble and I suppose it maybe helps. It's just not the whole answer at all.'

Parental perceptions of intervention impact on their children's 'settling in' at school

Ten of the 14 interviewees gave positive feedback about impact of intervention at home on their child's engagement and learning at school. The nature of parental perception was highly dependent on what the challenges being experienced in school were, and the extent to which change was discernable to them. In a number of cases, interviewees mentioned that impressions of positive impact were derived from feedback rather than direct personal experience. For example,

> 'I knew things were better at school because Trefor told me. Basically, he was saying what I was doing at home was working because things were better for my son at school.'

It is important to note that some parents the reporting of improvement was important because the issue at school was not manifest at home. This was particularly the case with respect to children who communicated well at home in a language other than English but were less confident and/or communicative at school in English. For example,

> 'We were surprised that he wasn't talking much at school. He never stops at home. I suppose it's because he's speaking English all the time at school.'

In a few cases, interviewees had seen changes that they regarded as indicative of better engagement and learning at school. For example,

> 'I think he's got more into school. We have been reading and he does things about words now I think are from school. So we're talking about things he's doing and kind of working alongside that.'

A few others had access to direct experiential evidence. For example, this mother had seen changes in her son's sociability and ability to form relationships with peers in the course of dropping him at school.

> 'I noticed things changing quite quickly. We would get to the playground and he'd be waving at people and I'd ask who they were and he'd tell me their names. He'd come home and talk about people he'd played with during the day and at first I'd be 'like who's that?'. Before he never talked about school at all.'

Another, from whom the process of leaving him at school had been the source of difficulties, reported the following:

> 'It was dropping him off that was difficult. He'd get upset and I would too. I found it hard to recognise that I was making too much of it sometimes and winding him up. But now it's better, generally. I am calmer and so he is. I think I'm less bothered because he's less bothered and visa versa.'

Impact on parental relationship/involvement with their child's education

The impact of *SOBP* on parental relationship and involvement with their child's education is connected and overlaps with the issue of perceptions of impact on children's experience of and at school. In addition to the instances and examples mentioned above, interviewees' comments fell into one or both of two broad categories. First, enhanced understanding of the positive impact that approaches to parenting can have on a child's experience of engagement with school; and second, in a few cases, evidence of increasing direct personal engagement with school. It is important to note

that all parental feedback was predicated on positive commitment to their child's education and welfare at school. Examples of accounts related to the first category of impact included the following which succinctly points to an enhanced understanding of learning:

> 'I knew but still was surprised how much difference was can have at home on how things are at school and how he is at school. I don't mean I didn't think it existed like that, but you kind of assume you'll be helping him to learn and less about helping him to be able to learn.'

And, this is similar vein came from a father:

> 'You know it matters right. The way that you bring your boy up, but it's still quite impressive how much difference things can make. I suppose, to be very honest, it's quite a discovery to see that harsh [discipline] doesn't really help because you're not matching what he's going to get off the teacher. He needs to come to see that he must do as he says even when he's asked as well as when he's told.'

In relation to enhanced parental engagement with school itself, direct accounts were harder to find in the interview data. However, some interviewees referred to conversations with teachers and/or teaching assistants suggestive of a degree of interaction around their children's needs at least partly influenced by the SOBP intervention. For example, this mother spoke about talking to a teaching assistant about getting additional books to read with her son over a holiday:

> 'We are doing more reading and I am hoping to be getting some [more] books from school. I spoke to [teaching assistant] about it. Trefor had mentioned to them to see….if I could have more extra books to read with my son over the holiday.'

Comments also suggested two further ways in which parental engagement and perhaps particularly potential for engagement with school was greater, better or both as a result of SOBP. First, there is some evidence of rises in parental confidence about communicating with school. These seem to be about whom to communicate with, the legitimacy of doing so and enhanced confidence that concerns would be seen as shared. Second, some parents reported that anxiety about being judged by teachers because of the challenges faced by their sons was allayed.

Despite the predominantly positive feedback on these issues in interviews with parents, there was one example of parental dissatisfaction with *SOBP*. This is a very important case for the evaluation drawing attention to the importance of ensuring parents are clear about the focus of the intervention and its purpose, are able to invest and engage with it. For these parents *SOBP* was not able to bridge the gap that they wanted closed:

> 'My son is an average kid. He's nothing out of the ordinary and I was very disappointed in the school. I said that I knew what I was doing and had raised other kids, that my son was learning to be a man and to be moral. I wanted for my son an assessment and to know what they were going to do about it. I never got that even when I asked. Trefor was nice guy and all that but all he did was want to focus on home and that's not right or fair on us, my son or his mother. I am waiting for someone to tell me what school is going to do. What are their goals, plans and what's in place.'

Challenges and complications in interventions with parents

Despite the predominantly positive reflections from parents on interventions with them and subsequently by them with their children, interviews uncovered some important challenges and complications in parental engagement with *SOBP*. These fell into the following categories:

Anxiety about the intervention

A small number of interviewees recalled a degree of initial anxiety about engagement in SOBP. As one interviewee put it, 'I was quite worried when I get a call and it was like there's this behavioural intervention for my son. I thought that sounded pretty serious and I didn't know anything was wrong It was fine when I got into it but It did make me feel very anxious to start with.'

Another reflected that initial her concerns were that she was being identified as being at fault:

> 'I was worried at first that they were concerned about my son because I am young mum. I was really pleased to be told that it wasn't about me it was about us helping my boy to settle in.'

Parental resistance

There were indications that a few parents felt some more profound resistant to engagement in SOBP. One questioned the viability of changing their parenting style and another was unsure if they could maintain any change in their practice. One parent felt that the intervention placed too much emphasis on the home. Their engagement with SOBP support was mediated by feelings that school should accept more responsibility. Nevertheless, they pointed to value in the intervention:

> 'I didn't agree with it all. But I do understand the point behind it and can see how it might work or at least help. That's what it was for me. One more thing to try. I do appreciate the time to help and I do feel I have a different way of seeing what is going on. That's been good.'

Making and maintaining contact

There is evidence that making and maintaining contact with some parents was challenging. Many parents have busy, complex lives that involve managing work, study and domestic commitments. It could be difficult for them to find time to answer 'phone calls, and in some cases to make or keep commitments to meet. This certainly required a high degree of flexibility in delivering the intervention and may have led to delays in making progress and providing support to parents.

Adopting advice and maintaining practice

Some interviewees reported that adoption or more particularly adherence to advice was difficult. This might be, as this mother commented, because it produced some upset or conflict which was a disincentive to action. This was particularly the case with action relating to managing compliance.

> 'It wasn't easy to be firm. At first especially it felt like it was too difficult to manage the fallout. He just got stroppy and I thought this is not better than before.'

However, the challenge might also arise because adopting a new strategy was in tension with what other people involved a child's care were doing. This mother identified a challenge with ensuring that the father of her son was consistent with her approach to parenting:

> 'I needed to persuade his dad to do the same. If he didn't then my son would just face me out and say that he wouldn't listen to me because he didn't have to do this for his dad. That

was quite difficult but actually explaining to his dad was harder. He got it in the end because I said just try it and if it doesn't work then let's back to your way.'

Time pressures could require management of negotiation. This was especially the case for interviewees who were trying to introduce new activities into their relationship (reading together, social engagement with other children, etc.). A few commented that consistency could be hard to achieve and with new routines without thinking through wider implications. For example,

'We got to be good at reading. But it needed me to think about managing my day differently so that there was time to wind down before bedtime. Sometimes it's just not going to happen. You need to be realistic and not too hard on yourself'.

Where parenting and childcare were shared, management of time could be further complicated.

For at one parent, adoption and maintenance of new action was made very difficult because of relationship breakdown and for another a bereavement during the intervention period. The emotional as well as practical demands made it difficult to focus on the child and also achieve consistency in approach. The impact of other structural factors should also be noted with one parent reporting difficulties with widening opportunities for their son to have social engagement with other children outside school (as a way of enhancing and confidence in relationships within school) were limited by social and geographic isolation from family networks and being in poor quality housing inappropriate to entertaining.

Interventions with teachers

The interventions with teachers and teaching assistants focused on equipping them with practical strategies that would allow them to better manage and respond to children's behaviour in the classroom and to modify it such that they settled in to school. The interventions took the form of advice from the worker sometimes supported by demonstration of a specific intervention with a child.

Perceived impact on children

Termly reviews undertaken with classroom teachers and teaching assistants suggest that within one term 18 'stand out' children were settled in as a consequence of SOBP intervention and that for all the remaining children progress was being made.

Interviews for two teachers relating to six children provide some illustration of the nature of progress and impact.

For example, Child A had been initially observed to refuse to comply with teacher's instructions and to get very upset. His use of language was poor and when frustrated with other children he would be physical rather than express himself through speaking to them. His teacher observed post-intervention that he was much more readily compliant, that partly through concerted work on his vocabulary, he both talked more and also talked more to other children including when frustrated with them.

Child B was also standing out because he had difficulties complying with instructions. He could be challenging asking why he should do something he was told to do. He was too boisterous in his play with other children and used some inappropriate language in his interactions. Post-interventions

teachers reported that he was much more compliant and does not show dissent. He has learned to play and has moderated his language.

Teachers found Child C standing out because he had difficulties with compliance. He was very vocal and either did not understand or could not control his calling out. His relationships with other children were poor and his play could be rough. Post-interventions they reported that Child C had acquired the capacity to be stiller and calmer. He might still call out but it would be related to the topic, he had learnt to control his physical play in which he indulged less often as a consequence of greater engagement in productive activity. His circle of friends has widened. He shows remorse for occasional lapses in speech and behaviour.

Teachers had found Child D to be challenged around compliance but also a poor communicator with limited vocabulary and hence resorting to physical attention-seeking and other children rather than talking with them. He also showed low independence and resilience. Post-intervention he had progress showing greater willingness to comply although sometimes still giving babyish response. His language had improved and he had become less physical in interaction with other children. He shows more independence of mind and greater confidence in speaking.

Child E had initially displayed bossiness in his interactions with teachers and peers. Reports followed him of violent behaviour in the past. He could be very vocal and demanding. Post-interventions Child E showed progress on compromise and compliance. He could take instruction but needed occasional reminders of the teacher's authority. There has been an increase in his use of language rather than physicality when upset or frustrated and greater control of emotions.

Child F had stood out predominantly because of problems with compliance and language use. Post-intervention teaches found him to be more compliant and also noticed enhanced language use.

Perceived impact on teachers

Detailed accounts of the impact of classroom-based aspects of SOBP were available for two teachers. These are strongly indicative that SOBP makes a positive contribution to their classroom experience and practice in a number of ways.

SOBP as assessment

Both interviews suggested that SOBP made a valuable contribution to the identification of stand out boys and assessment of their needs. This included acting as, 'another pair of eyes' but also providing a link between issues at home and school and hence informing teachers' responses to children. This was particularly valuable in terms of providing explanations for 'standing out'.

Enhancement and development of skills

Teachers also referred to development of pedagogic skills as a important outcome of involvement in SOBP. In particular the modelling of interaction was regarded as useful in demonstrating approaches to handling stand out children.

Increased confidence

Perceptions of increases in confidence were closely connected to development and deployment of skills. It was especially evident that teachers benefited from reassurance about the being firm and that adoption of firmness had no negative consequences for forming positive relationships with children and the class as a whole. An important component in confidence-building was 'being

backed up' especially in situation where a firm line needed to be adopted with a child and also not feeling judged but supported.

Special attention to children

Interviews with teachers also pointed to the importance of SOBP in providing additional intervention with stand out children. In particular, where it happened, taking children out of the class for short periods to work on vocabulary or behaviour was appreciated in terms of its positive impact on children's engagement and learning.

<u>Impact on children's achievement and engagement with school</u>

Further indication of the impact of the *SOBP* on children's engagement with school and learning was provided by comparison of pre- and post- intervention data on attainment (so called 'levelling' data). This analysis is based on a sample of data relating to assessment on entry (prior to intervention) at early, mid and end points of the academic year (October, February and June) for 16 children representing both cohorts of intervention.

Levelling involves assessment via in multiple items grouped under domains. This analysis focused on the three domains (personal, social and emotional development (PSED); communication and language; and, physical development) for which there are data at all four assessment points. PSED includes assessment on items relating to 'making relationships; self confidence & self awareness; and, managing feelings and behaviour'. Communication skills comprises: 'listening & and attention; understanding; and, speaking'. Physical development includes: 'moving & handling'; and, 'health & self-care'. These domains and items are of course, highly congruent with the assessed needs of stand out boys as outlined in tables 3 and 4.

Table 5 reports data on children involved for each of these domains and items at the assessment prior to intervention and the two or one assessment points after intervention (there are one assessment points for cohort 1 and one for cohort 2). For every item there is a marked improvement over the course of the academic year on the numbers and proportions of 'stand out' children achieving at the level expected of their age.

Table 5: change in achievement to age-expectation over the period of intervention

| Domain | Item | Achieving to expectations for age | | |
		Prior to SOBP (n=16) N %	1st post N % (n=16)	2nd post N % (n=11)
PSED	Making relationships	4 25	6 37.5	8 72.7
	Self confidence & self-awareness	7 43.8	9 56.3	10**100
	Managing feelings & behaviour	2 12.5	5 31.3	7* 77.8
Communication & language	Listening & attention	5 31.3	6 37.5	8 72.7
	Understanding	5 31.3	6 37.5	10** 100
	Speaking	6 37.5	8 50.0	10** 100
Physical	Moving & handling	9 56.3	11 68.9	11 100

development	Health & self-care	7	43.8	9	56.3	10** 100

* Percentage reflects the fact that data are missing for 2 cases making this 7 of 9.
** Percentage reflects the fact that data are missing for 1 case making this 10 of 11.

In summary:
- At entry, 'stand out' children were performing significantly under expectation for the age on items in all domains. Achievement was particularly poor on 'managing feelings and behaviour' with only 12.5% (2 of 16) of 'stand out' children meeting expectations for their age;
- There was improvement in the proportion achieving to age-expectation at every assessment point across the year;
- And, by the end of the year, after the SOBP intervention, 'stand out' child were at or above age-expectation on five items;
- The average increase in proportion of 'stand out' children attaining to age-expectation over the year was 54.1% with the most marked increase relating to the item 'managing feelings and behaviour' where there was an increase by two thirds in the proportion attaining to age-expectation (from 12.5 to 78.6%).

This evaluation is not designed to enable disaggregation of changes resulting from the SOBP intervention from impact (either positive or negative) of other factors. However, the plausibility of intervention effect may be indicated by comparison of data on degree of change in performance to age-expectation among the 'stand out' children and their peers. This is reported for each item in table 6 below. This table shows that on each item 'stand out' children achieved a lower average score than their peers prior to intervention but were performing around or indeed above average on every item post-intervention. This is highly suggestive of a value-added intervention effect.

Table 6: comparative average level scores for SOBP cases and peers

Domain	Item	Average score			
		Prior to intervention		Post intervention	
		SOBP	**Peers**	*SOBP*	**Peers**
PSED	Making relationships	*7.6*	7.8	*10.1*	10.7
	Self confidence & self-	*7.3*	8.3	*11.1*	10.5

	awareness				
	Managing feelings & behaviour	*6*	7.9	*10.7*	10.5
Communication & language	Listening & attention	*6.6*	7.9	*11.1*	10.6
	Understanding	*6.6*	7.9	*10.2*	10.3
	Speaking	*6.4*	7.7	*11*	10.3
Physical development	Moving & handling	*7.4*	8.6	*10.9*	9.9
	Health & self-care	*7.5*	9	*10.9*	10.7

In summary, table 6 shows the following:
- The average gap in points between 'stand out' children and their peers at entry was 1.21. Post intervention the greatest difference was 0.6 of a point (making relationships) and on 6 other measures stand out children were scoring above average.
- The greatest gap pre-intervention related to 'managing feelings and behaviour' where the difference between 'stand out' children and their peers was 1.9;
- The greatest closure of the gap was in respect to 'managing feelings and behaviour' where there was average improvement of 2.1 points.

Sub-set analysis found no significant difference between schools or between cohorts.

Discussion and conclusions

This evaluation provides good evidence that SOBP represents a feasible, plausible, acceptable and accessible intervention which has positive impact on children who stand out in early years education. The evaluation shows implementation of the project to time and to projected scale. That is, it engaged more than the projected target of 30 children in three primary schools. There is evidence that SOBP may be associated with raising stand out children's engagement and attainment at school from below average expectation for their age to around average.

With respect to other expected outcomes, this evaluation has also demonstrated positive impact for parents in terms of perceptions of increases in their confidence, skills and understanding to address their children's behavioural issues.

There are also strong indications that teachers and teaching assistants have an increased understanding of, and skills to manage the behaviour of children who 'stand out'.

SOBP is structured around a tripartite intervention which provides parents with advice and practical strategies which serve to address issues faced by children both at home and school, teachers with strategies and support to settle the stand out children in class, and intervention directly with children in the context of the classroom.

This evaluation suggests that the predication underpinning this approach, that effective, coordinated intervention is possible and that changes effected at home have a discernable impact on standing out at school is tenable.

Alongside this predication, there are a number of other characteristic dimensions particular to SOBP:

- SOBP is an 'in-school' intervention. The interventions with children reflects what goes on in the classroom and take place in the classroom; teachers are supported in

their classroom practice; and, parents come into school to access support with their parenting. In may be that the setting helps both to achieve focus on the child in the context of the classroom and also, practically, enables positive contact and engagement around the child between teachers and parents.

- SOBP is not a pathologising intervention. It seeks to address behavioural and other challenges experienced by children around settling in school in a concrete, practical fashion which partakes of evidence and practice. Parental concerns about their children are evident in the evaluation as too are indications that they are anxious about their children and indeed themselves being pejoratively labelled. SOBP allays these concerns by inviting collaborative engagement on matters of behavioural intervention.

- SOBP is an extremely early intervention. Data from this evaluation suggest that around 10% of children in early years education may at some point 'stand out'. There is the potential for standing out to have short and long term negative impact on their education, and also on that of their peers because of their potential needs for additional support and intervention. SOBP progresses a model for identifying and understanding 'standing out' which enables effective early intervention. The typology of compliance, relationships and communication as the focus for both assessment and intervention, the process involving advising and supporting adjustments to practice at home and school in line with this is simple and effective.

The evaluation also suggests that there is fairly high degrees of alignment and recognition of issues and challenges for stand out children at home and at school. That is, issues about compliance, formation and maintenance of relationships and communication figured with roughly equal frequency and in common across both settings. This seems to have contributed to intervention effectiveness and also accessibility since it was the same category of issue being addressed in both settings and could also be approached and understood by both parents and schools.

However, it is important to note that this alignment and congruence was not always present or so evident with respect to the specific issue of communication where it had as a component English as an additional language. In particular, there were cases where parents were not aware that their child was experiencing any challenges around communication in school because they communicated effectively in another, first, spoken language at home. There were no apparent problems around achieving recognition of these challenges but there might not be self-evident to parents.

The intervention is regarded as proportionate and appropriate by the majority of parents and both teachers who contributed to the evaluation via interviews. Scrutiny of a randomly selected sample of 10 packages of intervention suggests that quantity of input is fairly consistent comprising weekly contributions to classroom coupled with parental support. There was some variability in length of the Interventions packages however with the majority clustering at around one term (approximately 10 weeks) but several lasting into 2 terms and a one running for 3 terms (more than 30 weeks). Length of intervention is related to assessment of a child's progress.

The evaluation naturally raises the question of whether SOBP is a transferable intervention. There are reasons to think it might be and it is certainly the case that mechanisms and implications for doing so could be explored through further iterations of the programme and their evaluation. Any such roll-out and development is likely to be dependent on the understanding revealed here about the key features of the intervention: that it is positive, supportive, concrete and targeted, characterised by transparency and collaboration and adopts a single, simple focus on aiding boys to settle in school. It would also require the better capture of practice through, for example, the production of a manual of operations and resources.

If the interest was in mainstreaming this intervention then any future iteration should also explore the possibility of training workers to deliver SOBP. The issue of whether SOBP can be sustained as an adjunct to already existing roles in schools warrants further investigation.

There are indications that the profile of 'stand out' children may be different to their peers and as such point to background factors which may be important in intervention targeting at the level of schools. Specifically, there may be indications that the children targeted by SOBP experience were from more disadvantaged backgrounds than their peers as suggested by the higher than average proportion entitled to free school meals. Whether socio-economic hardship is also reflected in lower social capital and other forms of vulnerability is not clear. Future interventions and evaluation could provide opportunities to examine the profile and stand out children more systematically and carefully.

It is also notable that while this intervention targeted boys, four girls were involved in it. This raises interesting questions about the extent to which 'standing out' may be gendered and/or interventions in respond have a gender dimension. With respect to the first issue, the fact that 27 or the 31 targeted children were boys is suggestive that there may be particular adjustment issues at transition to school for boys and/or that these may be manifest in more visible ways. It may also be that expectations of the behaviour of boys has part to play in their identification as 'standing out'. It may be that behavioural expression has a gender dimension such that stand out boys are more likely than girls to display excess physicality and aggressive displays of emotions than girls who stand out. The small numbers of girls involved the intervention mean that identifying common issues is not possible. Whether intervention strategies are directly transferable or are modified according to a child's gender warrants further exploration.

Interventions with parents primarily involved mothers. Although robust data on family composition and living arrangements are not available, there are indications that this reflects the fact that a significant proportion of the stand out boys were being parented primarily or solely by their mothers. However, fathers and other male family members were involved in the intervention. This generally happened in two ways: they might be parent primarily actioning support advice from SOBP or drawn into interventions through the mother. It is important to note that SOBP adopted a pragmatic approach to targeting parents working with whosoever was best placed and available to receive advice and support.

Finally, there are a number of methodological issues associated with evaluation which warrant attention. The process of implementation of the intervention was not independently observed or recorded. This may have an impact on the quality of information capture and more particularly on interpretation. The evaluation of impact on pupil attainment and engagement with school is based on a sub-sample of children. This means that inferences must be drawn about impact and outcomes for other children. While indications from the evaluation as a whole and relating to the entire sample are strongly suggestive that outcomes are generalisable it is clear that future evaluations should be organised and oriented towards whole sample assessment of intervention impact and outcomes.

Appendix 1

Parent interview schedule

Preamble
The purpose of this interview is to see whether we have addressed the concerns we had about your son at the beginning of last term. I am interested in two issues, what changes you have seen in your son (in school and at home) and whether this means you are dealing with issues differently at home.

Tell me about the background to involvement with Trefor?
Who raised the issues about your son/child?
When and why?
How did that feel to you?
How was Trefor's involvement with your family explained to you?

Now let's talk about your son:

Read targets (from pen picture) and use as a basis for discussing boy's progress:
Is that a fair description of what we discussed?
How has that changed (behaviour, consistent, momentum)?
Have you seen consistent change at home? (if yes, give example's please)
How would you describe him now?
Can you give me examples of changes you have seen in him?
Is there anything else about him?

Let's move on to you:
What strategies have worked at home?
Has you become more confident?
What made the difference?
Was it difficult?
What have you learnt?
Have you adapted or changed the way you manage behaviour at home as a result of this intervention?
If you have adapted or changed, can you give examples please?
Do you have any other thoughts about this intervention?

Thank you for your time.

Appendix 2: Teacher interview schedule

Introduction

The purpose of this interview is to see whether we have addressed the concerns we had about [boys name/s] at the beginning of last term. We are particularly interested in two issues, have we dealt with the boys issues and what impact this has had on how you approach him and other boys / children in your class. Let's start with the boys:

Read pen picture and use this as a basis for discussing boy's progress:

Is that a fair description of what we saw?
How has that changed (behaviour, consistent, momentum)?
Have you seen consistent change in the classroom, playground and other parts of the school? (can you give example's please?)
How would you describe him now?
Does that mean he is more engaged in the class?
If he is more engaged, in what ways?
Has there been a reduction in incidents involving boy?
Has their been a reduction in your (and other staffs) time in dealing with incidents?
Is there anything else about him?

Let's move on to you and other staff:
What strategies have worked in the classroom?
Have these made you more confident?
What made the difference?
Was it difficult?
What have you learnt?
Have you adapted or changed the way you manage behaviour in class as a result of this intervention?
If you have changed or adapted, can you say in what ways?
Do you have any other thoughts about this intervention?