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Abbreviations and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Educational Psychology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP(s)</td>
<td>Educational Psychologist(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS</td>
<td>Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>New Approach (Research school’s personalised approach to teaching Emotional Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Emotional Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Mayer, Salovey and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ</td>
<td>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD model</td>
<td>Affective-Behavioural-Cognitive-Dynamic Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>Special Education Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>Key Stage Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHCE</td>
<td>Personal Social Health and Citizenship Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paper One: Teachers’ Perceptions of Promoting Emotional Literacy.
Abstract

Teachers are an essential part of teaching emotional literacy (EL) in school, however little research has been carried out to explore their views of teaching EL. This research has focused on gaining an insight into teachers’ perceptions on the processes and content of a specifically designed EL curriculum. The aim of the study is to gain the teachers’ perspective so as to better understand the realities they face when teaching EL.

A grounded theory approach was taken using semi-structured interviews with four key stage two teachers from composite classes involving years 3/4 and years 5/6 children respectively. The teachers were asked about their experience of teaching the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies Programme (PATHS) and their experience of teaching a specially designed EL curriculum called the New Approach (NA) which was heavily influenced by the school’s PSHCE objectives.

The research findings identified the strengths and limitations of both the PATHS and the NA approaches. The PATHS curriculum had benefits for the children, for example there was a reported improvement in their emotional language. It improved the teacher’s understanding of EL in addition to their EL teaching skills. The discrete PATHS lessons was viewed as a strength as it assured EL was taught but it was also viewed as a limitation as the teachers reported that there was not enough time to address issues that arose. One of the main limitations of PATHS was its material. The material was described as ‘babyish’ and it presented foreign situations to the children at this school. This resulted in a large portion of the material being adapted.

The NA made up for PATHS’ shortcomings in that EL teaching was not confined to lessons
and instead was taught throughout the school day. However, it was reported that it did not allow for explicit EL teaching. As NA is a personalised approach, the teachers did not have to adapt ‘ready-made’ material and it was better suited to the children. The teachers reported some difficulties in teaching PSHCE objectives through certain lessons and that they felt the objectives they used did not address certain undesirable behaviour.

The recommendations and advice these teachers give to other schools considering using the PATHS curriculum was to consider whether the PATHS material would be appropriate for the children they teach. They also advised schools with little experience in teaching EL to consider PATHS.

The significance of the study was that it provided insight into teachers’ views on teaching EL where past research focused on the children’s outcomes. Moreover, it highlighted strengths and limitations of a ‘ready-made’ programme and a personalized approach of teaching EL. Also, it allowed for a comparison to be made between explicit and implicit teaching of EL which reflects the reality of decisions schools make. For this school, the significance of research findings suggest that seeking the teachers views will allow them to continue improving the NA.

**Section One: Introduction**

**1.1 Purpose**

Personal, social and emotional development is as much a concern as academic development in children. Research suggests that social and emotional skills are needed to succeed in school (Thompson, 2002) to establish and sustain relationships and to reduce aggressive behaviour (Nagin & Tremblay, 1999).
This research is focused on teachers teaching emotional literacy (EL) in schools. The aim is to gain an understanding of the perceptions, understandings and experiences of teachers who teach EL in terms of issues relating to the emotional literacy curriculum encompassing input, processes and outcomes.

1.2 Context

1.2.1 Policy

The development of social and emotional literacy is evident on a national and international level. On an international level, UNICEF (2007) calls for indicators of children’s well-being, similarly, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development claim that well-being is a key outcome of learning in progressive societies (OECD, 2001). These examples demonstrate a multifaceted interest in well-being that goes beyond the educational realm.

As this research takes place in the UK, it is important to also consider the development of social and emotional literacy on a national level; its transition into political institutions in the United Kingdom has been very recent. Nurture Groups is an example of early identification and intervention for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties as cited by the DfEE’s “Excellence for all children: Meeting Special Educational Needs” (DfEE, 1997). In 2002, the DfES commissioned a study into how children’s emotional and social competence and well-being could be best developed which lead to the development of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning programme (SEAL). The study resulted in recommendations that included prioritising work in this area as well as emphasizing the importance of a holistic and developmental approach that starts early in a child’s life (Weare & Gray, 2002).
The outcome of this study has raised awareness in this area in education which in turn has driven educational policies. For example, EL reflects three of the five outcomes for “Every Child Matters: Change for Children” (DfES, 2003):

1) To be healthy
2) To enjoy and achieve.
3) To make a positive contribution.

The five outcomes for Every Child Matters are statutory demands on educational institutions and welfare services. Since EL is reflected in the outcomes, it suggests that EL itself needs to be addressed.

The notion that emotional and social skills can be taught has political relevance. It complements the Education Act (1996) which states that all children have a right to education. It is further strengthened by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (2001). This warrants political and educational bodies’ interest and research in this field. EL is also reflected in the legal framework for the associated reform that is set out in the Children Act (2004) and the DfES (2005), now the DCSF (2008) that has resulted in emotional competence and emotional well-being becoming an integral part of SEAL. The political context also has direct implications for EPs as in 2004 the DfEE stated that EPs should apply psychology to promote the attainment of children and young people, as well as to promote their healthy emotional development.

**1.2.2 Practical**

National policies, initiatives and research have influenced the development of curricula in EL. Examples of commonly used EL programmes in the UK include: Nurture Groups, Circle Time, PSHCE and SEAL. Although schools have the responsibility to teach and develop EL
skills in children, they are not restricted to ‘ready-made’ curricula. Some schools choose to teach EL through a personalised approach. These differences in approaches are addressed in this research as they reflect real decisions schools have to make in how to address the teaching of EL.

1.2.3 Personal

As a TEP, I recognised that research in this area would enhance my training experience as social and emotional difficulties were a common occurrence amongst the children in the borough. I was also particularly interested in this area of research as my own personal school experience was solely focused on academic achievement and not social and emotional learning. The EP that played a key role in introducing and supporting the school with the implementation of PATHS, a ‘ready-made’ EL curriculum, was very enthusiastic about evaluating the programme, which encouraged my interest as I translated her enthusiasm to mean I would receive better support as I am a novel researcher.

1.3 Rationale

The significance of this research is that it addresses a gap in EL literature. Research in the past has tended to only focus on children’s outcome measures of EL programmes. Therefore there is a need to shift the focus onto teachers in order to understand at a level of detail the difficulties involved in implementing and teaching EL. This is necessary to make a contribution to theory and practice at both a micro level (schools and EPs) and a macro level (researchers and policy makers).

This research challenges the top-down approach by investigating the teachers’ views about teaching EL which can inform theory and practice and be fed back into policies and future
research. It also allows for a more holistic view of the context in which EL is taught and presents the teachers as important agents within the process of teaching EL. The findings can be used to help other schools and EPs to make more informed decisions on the approach they take to teaching EL. This research also has direct implication and relevance on the research school as it provides a source for future evidence based-strategic planning.

Section Two: Literature Review

The literature review has been composed of multiple components with the aim to highlight gaps in the literature that this research addresses. A historical background of emotional intelligence (EI) is presented together with a critical review of two theoretical EI models. The review then draws attention to the implications of a lack of consensus of the definition of EI. A critical review of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) programme and associated studies is then presented to make the case for shifting the focus to teachers in evaluative studies of EL programmes. In addition, an outline of a personalised emotional literacy programme is presented as both approaches to teaching EL are used to focus the research on the views of teachers teaching EL.

2.1 Methods for Searching

Information for the literature review was gained through access to online journals through both the University of Exeter portal and public access sites. The search was based on the theoretical models of emotional intelligence and research studies on PATHS programme. Keywords for searches included: emotional intelligence, emotional literacy, promoting alternative thinking strategies, social and emotional aspects of learning, model of emotional intelligence, emotional development, emotional well-being and teacher perceptions. Articles
that were relevant from the search were also used as references for a further search of primary sources, and key words were then able to be more refined. The literature was finely selected in order to highlight the key concepts relevant to Paper One of the research.

2.2 Historical Background to Emotional Intelligence

Intelligence was a term that was originally limited to cognitions such as problem-solving. Non-cognitive aspects to intelligence were first raised in the 1940’s. Wechsler (1943) questioned whether affective and conative abilities should be included as part of general intelligence and that total intelligence could not be measured unless tests included measures for non-intellective factors. It was not until the 1980’s that this view of intelligence resurfaced. Gardner (1983) proposed the theory of multiple intelligences and identified eight distinct intelligences among these are inter-personal (understanding the emotions of others) and intra-personal intelligence (understanding the emotions of oneself) which are collectively more commonly known as emotional intelligence (EI). The popularisation of the EI concept can be attributed to Goleman’s claims that EI ‘matters twice as much as IQ’ in predicting outcomes in the work place (Goleman, 1998, p. 31).

The theory faced a lot of criticism, namely that it did not expand on the definition of intelligence but merely referred to abilities as intelligences (Sternberg, 1991), it lacked empirical evidence (Waterhouse, 2006), and that it did not consider the effects of process that effect all domains of intelligences such as speed of processing and working memory (Demetriou, Mouyi & Spanoudis, 2010). However, the main strength of Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligence (MI) is its subsequent influence in the development of theories and
application regardless of its inability to meet the standards for reliability and consistent measurement (McMahon, Rose & Park, 2004).

This historical outline demonstrates how intelligence has evolved from a purely cognitive concept focusing on rationale thought to a multiple concept incorporating the affective. When critically reflecting on the EI concept, it is important to accept that it is firmly embedded in the main stream educational system, regardless of the criticisms it has received. This may be explained by the ease in which the EI concept can be rationalised by the average person, along with media coverage. However, given that the EI concept has received such little challenge, there are ethical questions about its existence in education and policies that should be raised.

2.3 Theoretical Models of Emotional Intelligence

There are various theories pertaining to EI which offer different views. Two models of EI have been selected for critical discussion as they are the most recognised models. The ability model and the mixed model of EI are presented in order to highlight the various perspectives of EI and the strengths and limitations of their associated measures. This serves to present the lack of consensus of theorising EI as a problem that is critically reflected in Section 2.4.

2.3.1 The Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence

Mayer and Salovey (1990) introduced the concept EI as an ability and defined it as “The ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p.5)
The most basic skill is the ability to perceive emotions. The second set of skills involves using emotion to facilitate cognitive activities like problem solving or achieving an intended goal. The third set of skills includes understanding emotions, emotional language and slight variations of similar emotions (e.g. anger and frustration). It also includes the understanding that emotions are rule-governed, for example, anger is usually experienced in response to an injustice. The final set of skills involves managing and regulating emotions within oneself and with others, for example, to know how to comfort a friend who has lost her job.

The ability model views EI as it does any other intelligence as it meets three empirical criteria; mental problems have right and wrong answers, the measured skills correlate with other mental abilities and absolute ability level rises with age. The model predicts what an emotionally intelligent person is able to achieve and execute. Examples include being able to communicate and discuss feelings, develop expert knowledge in a particular emotional area as well as having had an emotionally sensitive upbringing (Mayer & Salovey, 1995).

The Mayer, Salovey and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT, 2002) is consistent with the ability model and their proposal of the need for mental abilities to process information is reflected in their approach to assessment. It tests abilities of the four branches of EI and generates a score for each as well as a total score. The MSCEIT is a performance-based measure where a correct answer is identified when deciding on which emotion best describes how an individual feels in a hypothetical situation. The scoring criterion determines a person to be emotionally intelligent if the majority of a sample have endorsed the responses. This means that it is impossible to create questions that only a minority can solve thus challenging EI as an ability. Moreover, Fiori (2008) argues that the scores from a
performance-based test do not differentiate between declarative and procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1985). Thus, an individual may score high on the test as he/she has high declarative knowledge, knowledge of ‘what to do’ in a hypothetical situation but lacks in procedural knowledge, knowing ‘how to do’ in an actual situation.

Based on Mayer and Salovey’s conceptualisation of EI, Fiori (2008) believes that the underlying assumption regarding EI is that it is a conscious process. Their definition of EI as an ability assumes that people are aware of their emotional experiences and can consciously regulate their emotions and use them to facilitate thought. She suggests that it is also necessary to consider the automatic processes involved. This critical reflection of her suggestions has implications for assessments. It suggests limitations of tests such as the MSCEIT which do not account for the automatic processes thus raising the question of the accuracy and reliability of the assessment.

2.3.2 The Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman’s mixed model of EI (1995) is a competencies based model and puts forward five competencies: knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognising emotions in others and handling relationships.

Mixed ability models generally define EI more broadly than the ability model because they encompass a mixture of abilities in addition to personality traits. This presents a dilemma because the broader definition of the mixed model of EI suggests that its strength is that it incorporates more than just abilities. However, this also means that the mixed ability model labels an increased number of attributes under EI. This is misleading as it assumes that
abilities and personalities come in a package that can be taught and developed when they are to some extent independent entities.

The assessment tool used for the mixed model view of EI takes the form of a self-report. With it individuals can rate how well they identify with their emotions. Although this model makes the bold assumption that the subject is aware and able to label their emotions, absolute answers can be discerned.

2.4 The Lack of Consensus in Defining Emotional Intelligence and its Implications

The two competing EI models presented above demonstrate a lack of consensus, with regards to the definition of EI itself and the terminologies that surround it. Given this lack of consensus, the same terminology, may in fact, have different meanings depending on who has used it. This is common place in research and policies and the issues surrounding this and its implications are discussed below.

The lack of consensus on an emotional intelligence definition results in criticism and debate over its measurement and the elements that should define an EI model. This can be interpreted as a weakening of its construct validity, or even, challenging its existence (Locke, 2005). However, the nature of its varied theoretical approaches can be seen as a healthy developmental process to define and refine EI. One of the more recent developments of EI is in its preferred terminology. The educational field prefers to use the term ‘emotional literacy’ (EL) as opposed to ‘emotional intelligence’ as the word ‘literacy’ implies an intelligence that is not fixed (Burton & Shotton, 2004).
Haddon, Goodman, Park and Crick (2005) views EI as one’s emotional abilities, whereas EL is perceived as the internal and social process as well as the interaction between both. This implies that EL holds a more social constructivist connotation than EI which is more individualistic as it is focused solely on the internal process. In keeping with this view, teaching EL in schools would mean addressing children’s emotional abilities within themselves (internal process) as well as between their peers and teachers (social process).

Perry, Lennie and Humphrey (2008) draw attention to the limitations of evaluations carried out on EL programmes. They claim that research has centred its focus on the pupils and that ‘Studies exploring the role of the teacher in promoting emotional literacy are, by contrast, few and far between’ (Perry et al., p.28-29) probably as a consequence of views that EL can have positive effects on children’s academic performance in addition to preventive factors and teaching emotional well-being.

It can be argued that evaluations of EL programmes should also focus on the teachers as they are an integral part of the process and implementation of the programme. The need to focus on teachers can be further argued as a means to reach a consensus about the definition of EL. Although such a definition would be confined to education, it would have the advantage to serve as an informative tool for educational practice. In order to achieve such a definition, teachers’ perceptions of their experience of teaching EL needs to be explored. This would mean that EL would bare a more holistic definition, as it recognises and identifies teachers as agents in the process of teaching EL. In addition, by shifting the focus onto teachers and creating a definition that is specific to education, the terms EI and EL would no longer be used interchangeably.
Emotional well-being is another term that is used within the educational context on an international level; UNICEF (2007), as well as nationally, The Children's Plan: Building Brighter Futures. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families, (DfCSF) (2007). It has been suggested that the term ‘emotional well-being’ is used by educational professionals to refer to a similar group of concepts such as EL and EI (Weare & Gray, 2003). This suggests that EWB encompasses EL and that perhaps EL incorporates a much broader view by incorporating emotion health and emotional well-being.

Without a clear definition upon which everyone can agree, decisions about assessment and the tools used to assess children’s emotional literacy are difficult. However, this has not stopped a large number of EL programmes penetrating the mass education field such as Nurture Groups, SEAL and PATHS.

2.5 PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies Programme)

Although there are many EL programmes available to schools the PATHS programme is selected for detailed discussion as it is a reputable EL programme with universal status. In addition, PATHS is a good example of a ‘ready-made’ programme that is used by schools and was the programme used by the school in this study.

The PATHS curriculum is a preventative intervention that was developed by Greenberg and Kusché (1994) in the US in response to the criminal violence epidemic in the 1990’s (Blueprints for Violence Prevention, 1998, 2002). It is a comprehensive, developmentally-based curriculum, aimed at teaching emotional and social competence and reducing behaviour and emotional difficulties for elementary students (Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2). The curriculum covers four conceptual units: readiness and self-control, feelings and
relationships, problem solving and supplementary lessons. The programme is taught three times a week for a minimum of 20-30 minutes per day and is also meant to be integrated into the regular yearlong curriculum. Appendix 1 contains more details of PATHS. Its key features are described below:

The PATHS curriculum is based on four conceptual models:

1. Affective-Behavioural-Cognitive-Dynamic model of development (ABCD). This is a hybrid model which takes account of developmental integration of affect, behaviour and cognition in terms of social and emotional competence.

2. An eco-behavioural systems model where simultaneous focus on the child and the environment are deemed important to bring about positive change via teaching skills, creating meaningful real-life opportunities to use the skills and reinforcement for applying the skills effectively. PATHS focuses on promoting developmental skills and changing children’s behaviour as well as changing teachers’ behaviour, so that the teacher-child relationship and the classroom and school-level procedures support the children’s needs (Greenberg & Kusché, 1993).

3. Neurobiology and brain organisation that incorporates vertical communication between the limbic system and the frontal lobes as well as horizontal communication between the left and right hemispheres.

4. Applied psychoanalysis, where the psychoanalytic theory is central to the development of PATHS, thus distinguishing it from other social learning curricula. It moves away from a teaching model to one that provides opportunities for internalisation, personality maturation and cognitive growth.
The underlying psychology of interventions such as PATHS resonates powerfully with the popularised therapeutic ideas that are promoted through the media and self-help books. Placing PATHS into this context warrants a critical look of the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks put forward by the programme developers. For example, the psychoanalytic model of PATHS that makes up part of the conceptual framework and theoretical rationale distinguishes this programme from others. This feature of the programme makes it even more marketable in a therapeutic culture. However, it has been argued that psychoanalysis is a pseudoscience because its claims are not falsifiable; they are not testable and cannot be refuted (Popper, 1990). Furthermore, Freudian theories were meant for the minority but the strategies and theories in the PATHS programme are encompassing the majority as it is a whole school approach to teaching EL.

There are many theoretical orientations of psychoanalysis, most stem from the Freudian psychoanalysis, yet the developers have not been explicit of the exact sources and theories they have used to derive their conceptual models. This poses a limitation to the transfer of knowledge to schools that wish to develop their own personalised approach to teaching EL. The psychoanalytic model that stems from Freudian theories aim to make the subconscious, conscious. This is featured in many aspects of the PATHS curriculum, for example, children are taught to label emotions and use the ‘turtle’ (a strategy that makes children stop and think about an emotional situation by ‘going within themselves’ like a turtle before they respond as a means to express their feelings. See Appendix 2 for more information on the turtle). Westen and Gabbard (2002) state that technical strategies that are likely to produce change in the conscious-affect-regulation are different to the unconscious-affect-regulation. The former involves executive functions that require working memory such as self-distraction strategies
and the latter involves neural defences that become a routine such as procedural knowledge, the knowledge of ‘how to’ in regulating affect unconsciously.

They go on to explain that these differences exist because they are directed at changing structures that are functionally and neuro-anatomically distinct. However, the ability to regulate does not occur automatically since it needs to be learnt in the first place. This concept is reflected in PATHS as it teaches children to practice conscious strategies for self-control as well as labelling emotions to help manage emotions and behaviour. Based on the third model mentioned above; neurobiology and brain organisation, PATHS is able to theoretically rationalise the use of Feeling Face cards, the Turtle Technique etc. as a means for children to verbalise and label their emotions in order to strengthen the neural interconnections and help manage their emotions and behaviour.

A critical reflection of PATHS is that it views its four conceptual models as a strength since it presents itself as a hybrid model. Conversely, it can also be viewed as a weakness of PATHS. For example, it is not clear what conceptual model is responsible for the success of techniques such as the ‘turtle’ or if in fact it is the integrated nature of the conceptual models that has made it a success. Understanding which aspects of PATHS deems it effective on a universal scale has the potential to assist in the development of other EL programmes. However, most research on PATHS has typically been an evaluation of the programme in terms of its outcomes for children and not an evaluation of the programme itself. The section below critically analyses research on PATHS and highlights the gap in previous studies which this paper seeks to address.
2.6 A Critical Review of Research on PATHS

The aim of this section is to critically review the research on PATHS and identify the gaps in these studies.

One of the earliest evaluation studies of PATHS focused on evaluating its effects on academic achievement of a sample of 57 deaf children (Greenberg & Kusché, 1993). This study raises two critical issues. Firstly, as the PATHS programme denotes itself as a curriculum that promotes EL and reduces behavioural and emotional difficulties, the choice of cognitive and academic skills assessments; the Performance Scale of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R; Wechsler, 1974) is in conflict with its purpose. However, as its core assumption is that schools are the central locus of change and given that the main role of schools is to provide education with the intent of achieving academic success, therefore making their choice of measure logical.

Recent evaluative studies of PATHS however have used instruments to measure change in behaviour and/or emotional understanding. This coincides with recent examination of studies on PATHS that regard academic development as a secondary function (Riggs et al., 2006). A possible rationale for the evaluations to be centred on behaviours is firstly that social and emotional development has a more prominent role in education and this is supported by a plethora of policies and initiatives. This reflects the change in perception towards education that it encompasses the ‘whole’ child. This means that education is no longer only focused on the academic achievements alone and aspects such as emotional development are considered as required for learning to take place.
The second explanation is its acquired universal status as a result of it being selected as one of eleven Blueprint programmes for violence prevention and its statistically evidenced success in its ability improve behaviour. As a consequence, there is a greater focus on evaluative studies that assess the change in behaviour and not academic achievement.

The second critical issue is that the sample choice was not the most appropriate as it suggests that deaf children are more at risk of developing behavioural and emotional difficulties. If this assumption was true, then why is PATHS marketed to mainstream schools? This is not to suggest this sample should not have been considered, on the contrary, research has shown improvements for this sample as well as SEN children and children in regular education of different ages.

Evaluative studies of PATHS in the UK have been very limited despite its universal status. Two studies from the UK have been selected for critical discussion. The first study is an early evaluation of PATHS in a Scottish primary school which has shared characteristics and qualities with the primary school used in this research project. The second study was a recently published evaluative study of PATHS at the time this research project was proposed.

In 2004, Kelly, Longbottom, Potts and Williamson, investigated the introduction of PATHS material with seven 9-10 year olds in a Scottish primary school. The researchers reported that the school was located in a disadvantaged area with various factors impacting its school culture, organisation and children’s attainments. The researchers described the school as having a commitment to educating the ‘whole’ child. The school chose the PATHS programme as it could be used as a whole class or whole school approach as well as its success reported in previous research evaluations demonstrating its benefits in enhancing the
ability of managing emotions in children. The study aimed to investigate the impact of the PATHS programme on children with behavioural difficulties. The assessments used were both at an individual and whole class level. The individual assessment used personal profiles developed by the school using a 10-point scale before and after PATHS was implemented. The Kusché Affective Interview (Kusché, Greenberg & Beikle, 1988) which assessed their emotional understanding in a range of affective states and situations was also used. The whole class assessment involved the Taxonomy of Problematic Situations (Dodge, McClasky & Feldman, 1985) which is a context specific assessment of social and emotional competence in children using a checklist that is completed by teachers. In addition, the class pupil’s completed a questionnaire on PATHS.

The results demonstrated that PATHS had a positive effect on the children’s emotional understanding, emotional vocabulary, recognising emotions in others, managing emotions, problem solving and even other areas of the curriculum such as written work. The results of the evaluation of PATHS support the concept of EI/EL and that when used in a highly structured and organised curriculum it can be beneficial. The teachers commented positively on the PATHS curriculum’s tight structure, material and the progressive development of each topic. Though they recommended PATHS to other teachers in the school they did comment on the need for a high level of commitment in its implementation and the need for sufficient time to do so. They also emphasised the need for a supportive school ethos and felt that it is important that prior experience on discussing emotions is needed. Therefore, it can be argued that all these additional aspects to the PATHS programme itself pertain to its success or that without these aspects, such results may not have been found. Thus, questioning the nature of evaluative studies of PATHS which have been focused on the children’s outcomes and not the other potential influential factors. This warrants a different approach to evaluative studies
of PATHS and perhaps other EL programmes as well.

Kelly et al.’s research study suggests that PATHS is a successful intervention programme that may have a place in the educational system in the UK. The study has had a role in encouraging other schools in the UK to use the programme even though the sample used in this research was extremely small and the absence of a control group meant that the natural course of emotional and social development cannot be ignored. A good example is taken from the EPS in Hampshire which introduced PATHS to a few schools in 2002 and has continued to expand its application on an annual basis.

Curtis and Norgate (2007) conducted an evaluation of the PATHS curriculum at Key Stage One in five Hampshire schools. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as part of the evaluation with 17 teachers from the PATHS schools. Pre and post measures using a behavioural screening test; the strengths and difficulties questionnaires (SDQs) were taken and compared to three control schools where the children were matched for age and catchment areas (See Appendix 8 for overview of the SDQ). Results showed a significant improvement on all five emotional and behavioural constructs in the PATHS group. These results were echoed in the teacher interviews. Unfortunately, the results revealed that due to the matching criteria, the control group were of lower levels of behavioural and emotional difficulties at the pre-test stage which was later acknowledged by the researchers as a possible explanation for the non-significant SDQs results for the control group.

Curtis et al’s study presents a number of critical points for discussion. Firstly, not only were the researchers unable to anticipate differences in the matching criteria for both groups, they did not account for the differences within the control group. It is not clear whether any of the
control schools addressed social and emotional needs, or if they did, what approach was taken. Therefore, it is not clear if PATHS is significantly more effective than other social and emotional programmes or if it is merely more effective when no other social and emotional programme is implemented.

Secondly, their study, like other studies, was not implemented at a whole school level, as intended by the programme, which implies that for PATHS to be effective, a holistic approach is not necessary but favourable. Evidently, the EPS in Hampshire holds the PATHS programme in high regard but is this enough to declare that PATHS is suitable for all schools and all children? The consideration that PATHS may not be suitable for all schools lends itself to the need to understand the reasons why that may be in terms of assessments tools and measurements used when evaluating EL programmes.

A key feature of the above critical review of studies on PATHS is the absence of focus on teachers’ views and experiences. This is a pertinent gap in research that needs to be addressed. As established earlier in the literature review, EL incorporates both inter and intrapersonal intelligences. The social processes (interpersonal intelligence) would pertain to the interactions between the children and their peers as well as the children and their teachers. Past research on PATHS has conventionally focused on the children’s outcomes and the critical review of PATHS in this section suggests that teachers that implement PATHS are in a position to provide information on the effects of PATHS on the children and also provide their perceptions of PATHS itself, thus strengthening the research rationale.

Teachers have influential roles and can be regarded as significant as the children’s parents (Wentzel, 2002). Thus, teachers’ perceptions are invaluable in gaining insight into what they
view is needed to teach EL effectively. For example, Male (2003) sought teachers’ perceptions of challenging behaviour. The findings suggested the potential significance of the teachers’ perceptions and its influence on their actions. Parallels can be drawn from the rationale of this research and applied to the current EL research, as there are not enough studies that focus on the context in which EL is promoted or the views of teachers that promote EL. It is important that this shift of focus is not limited to future PATHS research but takes account of other EL programmes that are being used including personalised approaches to teaching EL.

### 2.7 Personal, Social, Health and Citizenship Education (PSHCE)

Although there are many EL programmes available to schools, for the purpose of this literature review a national guideline that addresses EL is selected and presented as it is relevant and accessible to schools in the UK. Also, PSHCE forms the basis of the research school’s personalised approach to teaching EL.

The Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) which is now, Personal, Social Health and Citizenship education (PSHCE) is a non-statutory guideline developed for schools to help them achieve the aims set out by the Education Act (1996). The guideline includes a list of objectives and identifies what should be taught to children. These are presented in detail in Appendix 3.

According to the Education Act (1996) the school curriculum should aim to:

1. Promote the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of children
2. Prepare children for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life.
The school curriculum needs to provide opportunities for all children to learn and achieve. This is not limited to academic learning (e.g. literacy and numeracy) and should include the development of children’s identity, their creativity and problem solving skills. The curriculum should also develop the children’s understanding of differences between right and wrong and their awareness and appreciation of different cultures and beliefs. It should also develop the children’s emotional well-being in order to help them have good relationships based on respect and respond positively to challenge and to cope with change and adversity. The aim is to help the children to become responsible citizens that are in a position to contribute to the development of society.

A critical reflection of PSHCE is that although it addresses developing EL skills in children it includes other objectives such as maintaining personal hygiene. So, unlike PATHS which focuses purely on developing EL, it may be contested that PSHCE takes on a more holistic view and is focused on developing the children’s emotional well-being.

2.8 Focus of this Research

The critical review of PATHS and the theoretical models of EI identify the gap in literature and research that presents the significance of focusing on teachers’ perceptions of teaching EL. Therefore, this research project is aimed at investigating teachers’ views and experiences of teaching EL through a ‘ready-made’ programme (PATHS) and a personalised approach.

Section Three: Methodology and Methods

3.1 Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this research is to investigate teachers’ perceptions of teaching EL programmes which are explored through the research questions presented below:
1. What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing PATHS?

2. What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing the new personalised approach?

3. What are the implications of these understandings? How can they be used to inform other schools in their efforts to teach EL?

3.2 Context: Evolution of the Research

The literature review identified gaps in the literature and research in teaching EL in schools which have focused primarily on the outcomes of children. This research aims to expand the focus of evaluative EL studies by focusing on teachers. This study is illuminative in its nature and has the potential to serve as a platform for further research.

My original plan was to evaluate the PATHS programme in an inner London city primary school. The baseline measures for the emotional literacy inventory and the strengths and difficulties questionnaires were completed and collected in 2009. Unfortunately, the school later decided to discontinue the PATHS programme and replace it with a more personalised approach. Due to constraints of my doctoral course, I was advised by the university to utilise the baseline data. This presented a unique scenario in that the school had voiced their opinion of PATHS not working, which goes against universal research of PATHS. The research had then evolved from an evaluation of PATHS to one that sought the perceptions of teachers on teaching EL by investigating their experiences to gain an understanding of what they consider is needed to teach EL. The school’s decision strengthened the need for research that focused
on the teachers as very little is known about the teacher’s perceptions of teaching EL. In summary, their decision had a considerable effect on the research as it not only forced a revision of the initial plans of evaluation of PATHS, but it also had an impact on the methodology, method and measures used.

Section three presents the aim and research questions, the methodology and method for this research. This includes the research design, the participants, measures, data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.3 Ontology, Epistemology, Methodology and Research Design

The purpose of this section is to explain how the experiences and understanding of EL teachers were studied in order to address the above mentioned research questions. For this I drew upon a grounded theory methodology as this approach allowed the voices of the teachers to come to the forefront so as to allow for their interpretation. My choice of methodological approach is elucidated and justified in following paragraphs before I go on to detail the methods I used within this framework.

My interest was to capture the experiences of teachers who used and sometimes prepared curricula materials in order to teach EL to their pupils. This research is therefore more attuned to a nominalist, as opposed to a realist, ontology, in the sense that it rejects the belief that human nature is governed by general, universal laws and characterised by underlying regularities (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). This ontology implies that the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the ongoing action investigated. The model of the person is an autonomous one, where an individual’s behaviour
can only be understood by the researcher sharing their understanding of the world around them. It therefore implies that the researcher cannot be objective and distant from the research focus; instead this research is a subjective undertaking, investigating the direct experience of people in specific contexts.

A strictly nominalist view however does not see the structural concerns raised by theorists, such as class, race and gender as a fixed reality. This tension has been overcome in this study by assuming a relativist ontology which accepts multiple realities (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) and importantly is less concerned with the battle over truth and objectivity waged between realism and nominalism. Relativist interpretations of reality are not truer or falser in any formal sense, but different understandings are merely more or less informed or advanced (Rorty, 1991). In line with a relativist worldview I assume that the EL teachers participating have their interpretations of reality that should to be listened to, after all their view is informed, and by collecting many such interpretations, a more informed and advanced understanding of their views and experiences of teaching EL to primary school children can be reached and shared.

The epistemology used in this study refers to how the participants’ views of the world were captured. It must fit with the relativist ontology outlined above; indeed, the insinuation of multiple views reflects this. The epistemology that fits with both relativist ontology and allows understanding of the experience of these teachers of EL is constructivism. Constructivism ‘is the view that all knowledge and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent on human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context’ (Crotty, 1998, p42). Meaning is not discovered, nor is it objective or even subjective; it is
constructed by people as they engage with the world. This implies that the teachers participating in this study construct meaning as they live out their lives. They may reconstruct their understanding when recalling their interpretations (Seidman, 2006), but the meanings participants report are not subjective as they are ‘relational, social and cultural to the core’ (Neimeyer, 2009, p ix).

The methodology that most comfortably fits the above ontological and epistemological positions is interpretivism (Lincoln & Guba, 2003). Interpretivism concerns itself not with scientific accuracy and significance testing to prove relationships between variables. Nor does it strive to uncover an objective truth, instead this methodology realises the necessary subjectivity involved in interpreting often qualitative data, in order to reach a deeper understanding of the variables or the phenomenon under scrutiny. Interpretivism attempts to discover meanings by comprehending the whole subject in all its richness, depth, and complexity. As such the interpretive approach would appear adept at uncovering a detailed understanding of teachers who teach emotional literacy.

Interpretivism sees people actively constructing their social world and implies the use of methods that examine situations through the eyes of participants. Situations are seen as fluid and changing rather than fixed and static, and therefore events and behaviour are richly affected by context. Language and discourse delimit people’s understanding of their social world thus, many of the methodologies associated with this approach capture how participants construct and make meaning of their worlds. Events and individuals are unique and largely non-generalisable, as the social world should be studied in its natural state. Multiple interpretations of, and perspectives on, events and situations can and should be
sought as reality is multi-layered and complex, meaning thick descriptions of events and understandings are preferred. Interpretivism clearly fits with the particular ontology and epistemology outlined above and directs the methodology and methods that ought to be used to understand the teachers’ views on EL in this paper.

The methodology for this research thus holds a social constructivism orientation as the focus of the research is to gain an understanding and insight into the perceptions of teachers on teaching EL. Social constructivism is based on several assumptions of which have been identified by Crotty (1998). For instance, meanings are constructed and developed by people from their experiences and objects they encounter. These meanings are varied as people engage with their world based on their own personal historical and social perspectives and the meanings are developed and constructed socially. This research is aimed at investigating the teachers’ perceptions (meanings) of their experience of PATHS and NA which reflect these assumptions. The methodology used for this paper has direct implications of the choice of method used and the data collection and analysis are chosen to give insight into the research questions. The best way to achieve the meanings the teachers give to their experiences is to employ a qualitative method which is in line with the research purpose and research questions.

The methodology also includes interpretive elements. It is important to note that the interpretations made by the participants are dependent of their understanding of their experience and the meaning they attach to it as well as their ability to articulate their thoughts. Equally, the interpretations made by the participants of their experiences are then also interpreted by the researcher. These interpretations depend on the researcher’s ability to analyse and interpret the information.
A qualitative flexible design was employed to investigate the perceptions and experiences of teachers teaching EL by generating themes from the data. The design is aimed at focusing on a multiple of realities where the researcher is the instrument for data collection. This means that the researcher needs to be able to go beyond merely recording the teachers’ views and interpret the information by having a good grasp of the issues which have been presented in the literature review and avoid any bias towards the data and its interpretations.

3.4 Participants

The participants were selected from a primary school where I worked as a TEP and had experience in teaching EL using PATHS and a personalised approach. Two class teachers from years 3/4 (Years 3 and 4 are grouped together) and two class teachers from year 5/6 (year 5 and 6 are grouped together) were selected by the Head Teacher and Deputy Head of the school on the basis of providing the most information. Participants were also sampled on the basis of having had experience of teaching PATHS at the primary school. A total of 4 teachers were used as the school felt that they were not able to accommodate for the release of any more teachers.

To maintain confidentiality, the teachers are given pseudonyms. The year 3/4 teachers will be referred to as and Ms. Grey and Ms. Blue. The year 5/6 teachers will be referred to as Ms. White and Mr. Brown.

3.5 Research Instrument

Face-to face semi-structured interviews were chosen because they allow the researcher to understand multiple social constructions as people construct their own understanding of concepts through their own experiences. They were also selected because of their flexibility
and ability to elicit in-depth information by following interesting responses on an area that little is known about. As the research relies on the participants views the questions asked by the researcher are open-ended in order for them to construct meaning of their experiences.

A semi-structured interview schedule was developed by the researcher as the research instrument (See Appendix 5 for the interview schedule). The questions were tailored around the teachers’ experience of PATHS and NA.

The questions were arranged in the following order to sustain the teachers’ interest in order to focus them onto their specific experiences and retrieving rich information before shifting their focus onto the next set of questions:

1. Questions about their understanding of EL
2. Questions focused on their experience of PATHS
3. Questions focused on their new approach to teaching EL.

Pre-determined prompts were added to the interview schedule in anticipation of the interviewees’ short replies as well as to get them to be more specific. The interview schedule was not followed rigidly as it was possible that the interviewee may enter an area that was not anticipated for.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

Consent was gained for the research after negotiations with the Head Teacher and the Deputy Head for the primary school in which the research took place, with a senior member of the EPS of the borough and myself. Unfortunately, the school decided to discontinue implementing the PATHS curriculum in the summer term of 2009, the initial aims of evaluating the curriculum were ceased.
Consent forms (See Appendix 15) were completed for all four participants prior to the semi-structured interviews indicating the nature of the study and that they interviews were to be recorded for transcription.

The interviews were conducted individually in a meeting room at the primary school on the 23rd and 27th of November 2009. Each interview started with a brief description of the researcher’s role and nature of the study and lasted between 45 minutes to an hour.

All the audio recordings were then transcribed by an external transcription agency in order for them to be analysed (See Section four for analysis and Appendix 14 for an example transcript). This decision was made due to the time limitations of the doctoral course where by a lot of time was lost because of the abandonment of the initial research. Look at Appendix 4 for an overall time line of data collection for both papers.

3.7 Ethics

The British Psychological Society’s code of Conduct, Ethical Principles and Guidelines (2005) for conducting research was adhered to and ethical consent was approved by the University of Exeter (see Appendix 17). Consent forms were used to record the participant teachers’ informed consent of taking part in this research and for the interviews to be digitally recorded (See Appendix 15). Verbal consent was also recorded at the start of each interview. Respect and confidentiality for all participants was maintained throughout the research and all written records have remained anonymous.

I am the sole researcher in this study; I have the ethical responsibility to avoid any bias in my interpretation of the data. I recognise that I am of Arab origin and that my primary and secondary education was in Oman where the concept of emotional literacy is not present or
practiced in the educational system. As the methodology is social in nature it is important to take account of the social context in which the teachers’ experiences have taken place.

**Section Four: Analysis and Discussion**

A description and presentation of the data analysis is illustrated using six thematic maps. Each map is presented individually and is discussed in reference to the literature review and research questions. Below, details of the thematic analysis are presented using examples to illustrate the process.

**4.1 Thematic Analysis**

Thematic analysis (TA) was selected as a method for analysing the data as it is in line with the methodology, design and purpose of this research project. The analysis was directed by the six phase step-by-step guide taken from Braun and Clarke (2006), a summary of the steps is found in Appendix 6.

The transcripts were read and re-read in order to familiarise the researcher with the data then the data was coded inductively for as many potential codes possible. The codes were identified within the data as no researcher-generated category system or a check list was used to direct the researcher. The codes ‘NA’ and ‘PATHS’ were used in conjunction with the generation of codes in accordance to the specific research questions and as a means to deal with the large amount of data. However, the analysis was not limited to such identification of codes or themes in order to gain further insight into an area where little in known and further coding was employed. The coding process was carried out on all four data sets and tentative codes were re-named, refined, rejected or even split into two codes.
As the coding was conducted manually, the extracts were highlighted and coded for. To retain the context in which the data was coded. All the same codes and their extracts were then put into Word (Look at Table 1). This allowed the researcher to determine more carefully whether the associated meaning for the code matched the extract.

Table 1: An example of retaining the context in which the data is coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot of adapting, 80% needed to be adapted just age pictures a bit more relevant to 10/11 year old.</td>
<td>adaption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean even there’s images of children like walking across monkey bars and my class was like, what are those? You know they haven’t played on those and things like that. Well a couple of kids were saying I don’t know what that is. It’s just that lesson was just lost on that child now because they were too busy trying to figure out what that was or thinking about, oh that would be so much fun, that they weren’t really focused on this is what we’re supposed to be talking about.</td>
<td>Adaption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the data were coded for and saturated, themes were identified by sorting the codes using a semantic approach. The approach focuses on explicit or surface meaning for data that is used to show emerging patterns by organising the data. For example, the codes ‘to adapt’, ‘length of lesson’, ‘time of day of lesson’, ‘to familiarise’ and ‘to prepare’ showed an emerging pattern as they all represented ‘time constraints’ and thus were grouped together. The initial candidate themes were revised and refined by re-reading the coded extracts and reorganising codes under other themes or creating new themes for the codes in order to determine whether a coherent theme has been identified. Below is an example of the steps described above. The first column lists the initial codes given to the extracts. The codes were then revised and refined, for example, ‘Time of day’ was re-named ‘Actual time of day’. Some codes were rejected, for example ‘to familiarise’
was rejected as it held the same meaning as ‘to prepare’ during the coding process. The final column shows how the revised codes were grouped together to form the theme.

‘Time constraint’. The code ‘Adaption’ was not grouped under the theme ‘Time constraint’ as it did not fall into this theme.

Table 2: An example of the process of the initial codes being grouped into themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial codes</th>
<th>Revised codes</th>
<th>Codes grouped into a theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To adapt</td>
<td>1. Adaption</td>
<td>Time constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Length of lesson</td>
<td>2. Length of lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time of day</td>
<td>3. Actual time of day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To familiarise</td>
<td>4. Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To prepare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patterns between the themes were identified and organised to generate super-ordinate themes. The analysis was a recursive process where earlier steps were repeated and there was a lot of movement within and between each data set. The super-ordinate themes were then placed under global themes which were specific to the research questions and were selected in order to visually present each network which is composed of codes, sub-ordinate themes, super-ordinate themes for discussion. A diagram of the thematic maps for all the data are presented individually with in-depth descriptions and discussion of the themes in reference to the research questions can be found in Appendix 7.
4.2 Research Question One

What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing PATHS?

The types of strengths of PATHS according to the teachers interviewed fell into two categories; they reported that it had benefits for children and for themselves as teachers. The teachers reported a marked development in the children’s emotional language.

They were using the correct language and could tell the difference with what they were feeling. (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)

It did make an impact so they weren’t saying I’m upset or I’m mad or I’m sad anymore. They were able to say things like I’m frustrated or I’m very depressed and it did change their vocabulary and how they talked about themselves. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

I thought good things came out of it ....strategies to deal with uncomfortable behaviours, giving them a clear and explicit forum to talk about different emotions. (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

The teachers also reported that the children benefited from strategies such as the ‘turtle’ as it got them to think about their emotions and how best to respond. (The Turtle is a strategy that makes children stop and think about an emotional situation by ‘going within themselves’ like a turtle before they respond as a means to express their feelings).
I’ve thought that to myself often, you know, that’s really good. That child spoke to that other one, you know, whereas in the past they perhaps sort of sulked or have been angry for an hour. Now they’re laughing and giggling and everything’s alright. (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

The little kids (Year 3/4) are happy to turtle themselves up and they quite liked that comfort. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

The first turtle story worked well when we were just introducing it, and, yes, the children really liked reminding themselves not to get angry and do the turtle. (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)

Such benefits are in line with the proposed outcomes of the ABCD model and the eco-behavioural systems model on which PATHS was developed. The ABCD model states that proficient emotional language allows children to identify their emotional state, thus a child who can label her feeling of jealousy is less likely to behave in an angry manner; allowing the child to achieve effective self-control and enhances their problem resolution skills. Furthermore, PATHS produced opportunities for children to share compliment letters with their parents thus creating meaningful real-life opportunities to reinforce EL skills.

There was evidence that the teachers benefited in terms of their professional development more broadly.

You think about the whole person, how ... not just their cognitive development, but their relationship to other children, how they deal with situations, solving problems, just about their total self, emotional, spiritual thing, cognitive. (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)
I gained a better understanding of what the children need to know as far as emotional... their emotional intelligence. I think for some teachers it sort of a scary topic because it’s so broad. I think PATHS really narrowed down things that are really helpful for the children to know and to understand which now, even though we’re not teaching PATHS, helps me... helps to guide my PSHCE lessons. I know what to look for now, what to model, what I want to teach the children. I think it was really helpful in getting me to understand what is needed to be taught to primary level as far as emotional intelligence. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

It’s made me think more explicitly about how social skills, emotional literacy are taught in the room and how they’re talked about. So to pin it down, principles that can be remembered, they’re unchanging, vocabulary that’s consistent and always used, and just making sure I’m doing that. That’s what I’ve gotten out of PATHS. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

These findings is important as they suggest that PATHS has had a role in the development of the teachers’ understating of EL and their EL teaching skills which is discussed as part of research question three.

Other benefits were found at the implementation level. Teachers reported that PATHS being taught as a discrete lesson meant that dedicated time was allocated for teaching EL.

There’s so much we have to do that sometimes it’s hard to fit things in, so that’s why having a timeslot is good. (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)
This teacher felt that giving a timeslot to PATHS gave EL equal importance as other lessons and reinforces the notion and policies surrounding EL that deem it important for learning and managing behaviour.

Although the teachers were able to identify strengths of teaching PATHS, they said that the year 5/6 children found doing the turtle babyish and ‘they didn’t want to be seen standing there doing the turtle’.

*I didn’t really like it and it was mainly because I decided was a little bit too young for the 5/6’s. And they thought it was a little bit too young. So, you know, we all kicked off PATHS with the turtle session and every classroom taught the turtle session and straightaway my class was just kind of... ‘this seems really childish, we would never do this’. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)*

*Doing the turtle to calm down and to kind of come within yourself and think and be introspective for a second. And that's worked better for them than it has for us. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)*

Similar comments were made about the PATHS material.

*The Year 6’s ...saw a cartoon and were just all silly and thinking that it was a bit childish and, you know, a couple of them would be very outspoken saying that it was a bit childish. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)*
It was quite repetitive, but, again, if you were to just follow it and do it then perhaps the children might get bored because I think they had issue in 5/6, but we tried to mix it up. (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

What I found is that I had to sort of change a lot of the lessons to make them suit the older children. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

Teachers found the context in which the scripts were presented problematic specifically for the older children who were emotionally immature but had mature interests.

It seems really trivial but I just think honestly seeing a cartoon picture for some of the Year 6’s, they just shut off straightaway which is a bit sad, because they are still children but unfortunately this is some of the kids at our school that are only ten but think they’re 15. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

The example texts, the suggestive kind of role plays, the kind of lesson plans that were ready were really young, in the sense they weren’t young because those skills were absolutely relevant to the children we’ve got. But the actual topics, I just found them babyish. And there is the problem with the sort of age group that we have ... on the one hand they can be very mature in that in terms of their interests and their ability to engage with each other when actually they’re more like 7 or 8 year olds. So having PATHS meet both of those needs was difficult and didn’t meet both, you couldn’t marry them up. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)
The teachers also explained that some material presented foreign situations to the children causing a barrier for them to draw parallels with their own repertoire of emotions which the children may already have scripts for.

*I mean even there are images of children like walking across monkey bars and my class was like, what are those? You know they haven’t played on those and things like that. Well a couple of kids were saying, “I don’t know what that is”. It’s just that the lesson was just lost on that child now because they were too busy trying to figure out what that was or thinking about, “oh that would be so much fun”, that they weren’t really focused.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

Furthermore, the teachers expressed that the material remained hypothetical and demanded the children to engage in higher order thinking. This means that children require higher level cognitive processing such as skills involving analysis, evaluation of information or stimuli and synthesis of new knowledge. It can also involve holding several pieces of information in order to problem solve, therefore making the emotional learning process difficult for some children.

*It’s really hard for them to think hypothetically so it’s really hard to give them a problem from the book if they’ve never been in that situation before.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

*I mean in the PATHS it may be real world but it isn’t really, those are hypothetical situations.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

Teachers’ views of teaching PATHS has uncovered the limitation of the PATHS material as they have a better understanding of how PATHS works and are able to criticise it and
highlight its limitations which is not possible when research focuses on EL outcomes for children.

The implication of these findings for schools that are considering PATHS is that it allows educators to make informed decisions regarding the extent to which they must adapt the PATHS syllabus.

_I found it quite time consuming, which I wasn’t really expecting because, you know, when they handed us PATHS it was like, oh, this is going to be great, just its scripted for you...I mean I was looking at it going I can’t really use half of this stuff... for every PATHS lesson and thinking about, okay how can I change this to suit our class? And I think at the end of the day it’s a bit hard for teachers to have to spend more time in changing lessons.’ (Ms. White, Year 5/6)_

Teachers felt that the extent and quantity of adaption was not anticipated for and one teacher stated that ‘80% (of the material) needed to be adapted’.

Interestingly, the other limitations of the PATHS curriculum are not necessarily attributed to PATHS per se, but to the teachers’ experience. For example, the actual time of day PATHS was delivered seemed to be a hindrance to the children who needed it the most when they were the least engaged.

_PATHS can often be the 20 minutes that happens before play and they’re thinking about playing and they’re just like I’m going to be quiet now so that we get to play, you know.....if it’s quiet work we’re doing, how much focus is there coming through_
really learning? Are they just going along with this because they want to get outside on time? (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

It’s actually no fault of PATHS, but, I mean PATHS has been slotted into a 20 minute timeframe in between an assembly, math class and playtime. Well, I mean when they burst out of math class, I mean their focus is play. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

Similarly, the teachers reported that a lot of teaching time was taken up with rewards and feedback raised in assembly and that there was a lack of team teaching.

When they handed us PATHS it was like, oh, this is going to be great, just it’s scripted for you, it’s all this and all that, and then go and do the lessons and reading it, I mean I was looking at it going I can’t really use half of this stuff, because, you know, in the emotion lessons half of the script was about repeating a word and saying a word and spelling the word which just was not necessary for the older children, because they... most of those words they recognised already and all that. So I did find myself having to spend some time... for every PATHS lesson and thinking about, okay how can I change this to suit our class? And I think at the end of the day it’s a bit hard for teachers to have to spend more time in changing lessons. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

I didn’t have anyone coming in with me to model a PATHS lesson or to help me teach one. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)
Some of these limitations are not a direct limitation of PATHS and can be rectified on a management level. For instance, having the PATHS lesson at a time when the children are more receptive or having more than three PATHS sessions a week.

In summary, previous research on the PATHS EL curriculum, by predominantly focusing on children’s outcomes, failed to identify aspects of the PATHS programme such as its benefits for the teachers and the limitations of its material as perceived by the teachers. The present research has filled this important gap. The above evidence suggests that PATHS can be also be presented as a teaching tool for inexperienced teachers. The implications for the developers of EL curricula is that with further research they are potentially able to market PATHS as a curriculum with benefits for both children and teachers. This may encourage other schools with little experience of PATHS to consider the programme as it would add value that other EL programmes have not offered or declared. Further research on PATHS may deem it an effective teaching tool for teachers with little EL experience. It is this function that sets it apart from other EL programmes that merely seek to improve children’s behaviour.

One of the main limitations of PATHS, however, that emerged in this study is the content or subject matter of its materials. The evidence suggests a discrepancy between the children’s actual emotional development and their interests. By this I mean that whilst some older children have interests in keeping with their age, their emotional literacy age may lag behind their chronological age. The reported limitations of the material identified above challenge the universal status of PATHS. In other words its materials need to be adapted to local conditions and cultures.
The materials also need to be adapted to match the interests of the chronological ages of its target audience. Although this research was not able to determine the effects of PATHS on its students as the school ceased its implementation before this evaluation was conducted, it does not detract from their decision to apply another approach to teaching EL which they judged would be better matched to the ages and experiences of the pupils they teach. A critical look at their decision suggests that even though PATHS may have produced positive outcomes for the children as perceived and reported by the teachers, the limitations of the material that resulted in extensive adaptation by those teaching the programme was the main reason why this school favoured moving to a more personalised approach that was more suited to the children in their care.

4.3 Research Question Two

*What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing the new personalised approach?*

One of the most salient aspects of the NA is that it is a PSHCE objective driven approach. For the teachers this has meant there is explicit thought given to how EL can be incorporated into an existing framework. This was done through group planning.

> *It (NA) underlines everything. So we discuss emotions and things throughout the entire curriculum, and it’s across the entire school which I think is very good because it’s a common language throughout the school. So, you know, when children interact with each other, it’s not just within the classroom.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)
The 5/6 teachers plan ... [in] the afternoons.... So in terms of medium term planning, we do that together and then we go away to do session planning. So I think it’s much better than it was last year in terms of the links we need where we’re meeting twice a week, that is. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

It’s throughout the day, yeah. It’s explicit in the sense that it’s written with planning. But it’s also more informal and it pervades more what we’re doing. So it will work into lessons... more likely to work into lessons now but it wasn’t then. Because it’s link into thinking skills, which is quite good, explicit and everything. So I guess that’s how it differs really in that... whereas last year our focus was how do we incorporate thinking skills into the bedrock of our planning? This year it’s right, we’re keeping that focus. How’s emotional literacy going to be incorporated as a bedrock of our planning, along with thinking skills, and all with subject specific objectives? (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

The NA used by the school has been described as ‘PSHCE form(ing) the backbone of the new curriculum’. Subsequently, this has meant there is no discrete EL lesson as it occurs in tandem with topic and subject learning. Subjects like History are not taught discretely and instead are used as vehicles to facilitate EL learning.

We’ve kind of been given the freedom to not teach History as a discrete subject, we don’t have to teach Geography as a discrete subject. And kind of now use those as vehicles towards emotional literacy learning. So it means that the PSHCE goals will always come first. And any activities that or kind of outcomes that we apply will always come out of those goals rather than vice versa. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)
More evidence from the teachers is given as part of research question three as it has led to their suggestions of how they would assess the NA.

Teachers said that the children benefited from this as they were able to see the objectives as part of all areas of their learning rather than being confined to a particular part of a day. One teacher made this point and said ‘Children see it as part of their learning and not something new that they need to add to what they are going to do in the day’. The objectives are presented throughout their school day through different subjects, topics or themes. In addition, this approach meant that the PSHCE objectives pervaded everything the teachers did and they were able to offer immediate responses to EL related matters. This supports the ‘infusion approach’ (Claxton, 2008) whereby positive learning dispositions are cultivated through a holistic whole-school approach to teaching EL, which is based on the assumption that EI or EL is not fixed and can be developed. However, the teachers reported that the lack of discrete EL lessons meant that they were not able to go into depth and discuss at length the emotional concerns of the children which also presented time related difficulties. These findings conflict with the teachers’ views of PATHS where they described the discrete lessons as a limitation.

*I mean I think it would be good to recommend having a bit of both, you know, always having PSHCE embedded somehow in your topic, but it would always be good ... I recommend as well to have those little sessions where you can do something like PATHS, where it can be explicit. So if you can do both then I think that would be the ideal world.* (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

Only one example is given here, as it feeds into the possible suggestions of improving the NA which is discussed as part of research question three.
Teachers reported that support in the initial planning received from management was a clear strength as the Deputy Head set the objectives and what they were going to develop in the interim plan. It was expressed that support received by the deputy was important as she was able to ‘foresee a lot of difficulties and look ahead’.

*From management ...the Deputy who kind of oversees the curriculum as a whole.*

*From the outset planned with us so that we were establish good... what objectives are we going to pull out of the national curriculum and how... what are we going to develop in the interim plan. She’s been with us all along.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

*We had like an inset at the beginning of the year, where we were like given the objectives (from senior management) that we have to include throughout the year.* (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4, )

These perceived strengths addressed some of the limitations experienced when teaching PATHS. This could also explain why the teachers preferred this approach over PATHS.

Although the teachers expressed that at the start of the academic year, a lot of work was done to teach EL and to set the standard and principles of their NA, time conflicts arose between conventional academic requirements and teaching EL. It was also felt that more time was needed to explicitly deal with emotions and that assembly time was not enough time to do so. This suggests that perhaps discrete EL lessons, such as PATHS, are in fact valuable as it reassures that EL is not taken over by the demands of the NC.

*As the year goes on and the focus now is more with the subjects, I’ve seen especially in 5/6 as we get closer to SATs and things really start to pick up... you find yourself*
having less time to pick up those key issues when they arise and really have that great discussion about it. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

I wish I had more time. I think we do a lot at the very beginning of the year, you know, trying to set up this really connected emotional literate class that, you know, that has those wonderful discussions and knows how to speak to each other all the time and knows how to read the emotions and all these things, we do a lot at the beginning of the year to sort of set the standard. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

I would like to change having more time to actually deal with the emotions, because, even though we do, it’s not enough because sometimes when issues come up, because there are certain things that you have to finish for the end of the day, you do not have time to really go into them in depth and have children talk more about them. Because even though we have ... class assembly, where sometimes we deal with these issues, but there’s still not enough time in the day to deal with emotions as they come up. So in an ideal world, in an ideal class, I think having more time to talk about issues would be quite good. (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)

It has been suggested that targets have been essentially academic in the past but that the NA is creating a movement towards more socially orientated targets.

I think the balance is coming back, we’re coming back to the social because the achievement ones are up and running. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

They have been more academic but now we’re seeing the targets come back to more social targets. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)
Also, the teachers did express some difficulty in including the PSHCE objectives in to lessons.

*I think sometimes people find it hard to just get given a lot of objectives and to say, now you have to make sure you include some of these in your lessons, it’s kind of like we have to reinvent the wheel sometimes.* (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

*It’s really hard and really time consuming again to get these lessons really, really specific.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

They felt that ‘*some of the links are tenuous and then you can also try to create links where maybe it’s a bit thin*’ (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

One teacher expressed that undesirable behaviour was arising in some of the children and could not be addressed within the scope of the existing PSHCE objectives and felt that new, relevant objectives need to be included based on the assessments of the children as they continue to teach. This presents NA as a developing approach rather than one that is static.

*There might be some times when you have to change or do something to bring out a skill that did not come out from the lesson, but I suppose it would happen based on your assessment as you teach, or as you see children interacting with each other, and something that keeps – that is happening consistently – do I need to have just a lesson on this behaviour? So I think at some point maybe things will change to include other things so that things that you pick up in your class that you need a whole lesson on.* (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)
The above evidence raises the question on whether using PSHCE objectives is sufficient as a means to teaching EL. Nonetheless the teachers expressed that the NA was the preferred approach although they were unable to definitively say the approach was working due to the lack of an assessment tool which they stated was needed.

_I think we are learning, the reason why I couldn’t answer your earlier question is just that we’re trying to figure out what the success criteria are and how quickly we can expect certain criteria to be met. So until we know what they are, it’s hard to really assess it, you know, is it working, other than on an intuitive level. I mean on an intuitive level, I’d say, yes. But against what success criteria I couldn’t say. Has objective 18 been met? Not yet. You know, it’s like that._ (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

_I like the freedom of planning it from scratch and knowing... deciding exactly what we want to do and creating what we want. I also like... I think it’s important because it’s hitting those national curriculum objectives, the PSHCE objectives and we’re able to make it more suited for the Year 6’s. I think the PATHS hit the surface on a lot of important issues but it didn’t really dive deep into some deeper thinking. It didn’t really give rise to any more serious situations that children might be facing as well._ (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

_It’s only the end of November now, so to say how well it works would be kind of too early to say if it is working._ (Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)

A critical reflection of the evidence presented in this section allows for the comparison between NA and PATHS, even although this is not the central aim of this research. One of the prominent features of NA is that EL is taught throughout the day as part of the ‘hidden
curriculum’ of the school using PSHCE objectives, whereas PATHS is taught through discrete timetabled lessons. In other words, the new approach to teaching EL, unlike PATHS, is through the everyday routines and occurrences of the school day rather than explicitly through a timetabled lesson. This key difference led the teachers to identify this as both a strength and a limitation of the respective approaches to teaching EL. This gives rise to an important question as to which is the ‘better’ approach when teaching EL. I return to critically discuss this issue in the final section of this paper.

4.4 Research Question Three

What are the implications of these understandings? How can they be used to inform other schools in their efforts to teach EL?

Research question three is answered by first reviewing the advice for other schools and teachers that are considering PATHS as a means of teaching EL and then considering possible improvements to the NA.

Advice for other schools and teachers that are considering PATHS as a means of teaching EL

Schools may be attracted to the ‘ready-made’ aspect of PATHS as all the lesson plans and materials are included. The teachers advise other schools and teachers to carefully consider the material to better anticipate the extent of adaption by considering its relevance to the children’s experiences, interests, age and their actual emotional development. This would require familiarisation of its contents and understanding the progression of all the volumes which make up the PATHS curriculum.
I think if the material were pitched more effectively to the age group that it’s really aiming at, at the upper end of the school, then it would be much more effective, because it wouldn’t need as much adaptation. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

I mean that’s time we’re talking about, so... it’s more likely to be left in favour of something else. It’s going to be less effective. You know if I have a choice between spending time on PATHS and math, I’m always going to choose math. You know there’s no longer a choice for me, it’s always going to be that choice, so the less adaptation, better pitch [so] it’s going to be used more and be more effective. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

Moreover, these findings put forward suggestions to the developers of the PATHS curriculum. The material does not offer alternatives that teach the same principles for specific age groups which would help combat the need for adapting the material due to the mismatch between the children's’ actual development and their life experiences and interests.

One explanation for the extent of adaptation experienced by the teachers may be due to the demographics of the school. The school is located in a poverty stricken area, where crime, violence and gang culture is a major concern. One teacher expressed the point that peer pressure is something the older children encounter more than the younger ones and felt that such topics would have been more beneficial if it were included in the PATHS material.

For 5 and 6 they start to get into peer pressure and things that are quite older and more mature, and PATHS doesn’t really touch too much on that. So I think, you know, we have to touch on these objectives anyway. It would be really great if PATHS had more of that for the older ones. (Ms. White, Year 5/6)
In addition, teachers felt there was a need to be aware of the different cultures and situations that the school finds itself in and cautioned against assuming that PATHS would suit every school.

*I think the images in the PATHS books really assume that children have had these experiences and they can relate and they can understand and I can tell how that child in the picture’s feeling when their castle’s been stepped on, those kind of things. So I think in schools where, you know, the children may have a better chance of having these experiences I think it would work better.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

*If you think about where our school is, now we’ve got, by key stage two, their interests are ensuring their emotional literacy isn’t necessarily so, the key stage two material might not be appropriate for them. If you look at it another way at a different school, that is further along in its development, the children might not really need to engage as much with the learning objectives in PATHS either. So I think it’s unlikely to be relevant to key stage two children. I think it will just be pitched badly for them.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

One teacher reported that ‘PATHS worked as part of a larger ethos and a larger effort’ and that for this particular school without PATHS, they ‘would have not been lost by now’. This challenges the ‘one size fits all’ notion and advocates that schools consider programmes such as PATHS in light of their children to determine whether a programme is suitable by using their knowledge of their children and not rely solely on its universal status. Teachers are in the position to know the children they teach especially in primary schools as the same teacher teaches most of the lessons throughout the day. Therefore, the knowledge teachers’ possess
about the children can be used to help direct senior management in selecting the best suited programme or approach for the school.

Furthermore, the teachers recommended that the experience of the teachers in teaching EL should be considered when determining whether PATHS is suited to the school.

*I would recommend it if teachers didn’t have much experience of teaching emotional literacy and they needed something to support them in quite a lot of depth and detail, I think PATHS does that.* (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

Its repetitive and prescriptive nature which was seen as a limitation of PATHS for these teachers may in fact hold value for schools that are having difficulties in teaching EL. The lessons and volumes are sequenced in increasing developmental difficulty. This means that teachers are teaching EL through a developmental approach and are therefore gaining an understanding of the stages in which children develop their emotions and regulate their behaviour as well as strategies to develop the children’s EL skills. The findings from this research show that PATHS may in fact have a function as a teaching tool for teachers with little experience in teaching EL and may have also served as a teaching tool for the teachers interviewed.

*Even though we’re not teaching PATHS, helps to guide my PSHCE lessons. I know what to look for now, what to model, what I want to teach the children. I think it was really helpful in getting me to understand what is needed to be taught to primary level as far as emotional intelligence.* (Ms. White, 5/6)
It (PATHS) has encouraged me to differentiate how I communicate the PSHCE objectives to the students. So whereas, you know, a few years ago I might have kind of talked to one child and another in the same way about the conflict. Well first children are at very different points in their learning. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

By understanding the schools’ needs and their perception of what EL is, EPs are in a position to help guide their decisions regarding methods of teaching EL that best meets teachers’ needs as well as the needs of the students. For instance, the teachers at this school felt that PATHS was not appropriate for them. It can be argued that for this school, PATHS had served its function as a teaching tool and allowed the teachers to be critical of it and confident enough to continue teaching EL through a more personalised approach. The Education and Children’s Bill, May 2010, was intended to give support to the range of programmes envisaged in the Coalition agreement. From the main elements of the bill: to provide schools with the freedom to deliver an excellent education in the way they see fit, to introduce a slimmer curriculum giving more space for teachers to decide how to teach and to give teachers and Head Teachers the powers to improve behaviour and tackle bullying. However, ‘in a way they see fit’ requires adequate experience, skills and knowledge. If we accept the notion that PATHS is a teaching tool, then it is extremely important for EPs to consider the teachers’ insights and not just the students’ needs. EPs are also de facto consultants to schools, thus they are in a privileged position as they hold knowledge of psychological theories and research. Through consultative measures they are able to seek information from teachers about the children and the school as well as again insight into their level of understanding and experience of teaching EL. With this knowledge they are then able to advise the school accordingly.
Another limitation identified by the teachers was the lack of team teaching as mentioned above. Schools that are considering PATHS may wish to incorporate team teaching as it is a mode of teaching that is familiar to teachers and was reported that it would have been helpful to have.

*I think in the very beginning it would have been nice to have seen exactly what this should look like. I know it’s scripted but it would have been nice to see how that would have looked. I’m not sure if it would’ve changed my mind on teaching it or not, but yeah I mean it’s always nice to see someone that’s really experienced at something do it first, just really gives you a better idea of how you can present it is all.* (Ms. White, Year 5/6)

As EPs have insight to the type of programmes that different schools in the same area are using they can help organise team teaching across schools. This means, using teachers from schools that are familiar with PATHS to model lessons for schools that are new to PATHS. Furthermore, Kam, Greenberg and Wall (2003) found that the quality of PATHS implementation and the support received by the head-teacher provides positive significant effects on the children’s outcome. This suggests that schools need to consider the quality of implementation of PATHS to increase the likelihood of producing effective outcomes.

Perhaps the quality of implementation can be increased with practical advice about PATHS. For instance, the time of day PATHS is implemented, which one teacher reported would have been helpful.
It’s actually no fault of PATHS, but, I mean PATHS has been slotted into a 20 minute timeframe in between an assembly, math class and playtime. Well, I mean when they burst out of math class, I mean they’re focus is play. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

**Possible Improvements to the New Approach**

The teachers identified the strength and limitations of having discrete EL lessons (PATHS) and having EL taught across all lessons throughout the day (NA) and suggested incorporating discrete EL lessons as part of the NA. They reported that this would allow for PSHCE objectives that come out of sex education and drug education to be taught explicitly, which otherwise would be difficult to thread through specific lessons.

I mean I think it would be good to recommend having a bit of both, you know, always having PSHC embedded somehow in your topic, but it would always be good ... I recommend as well to have those little sessions where you can do something like PATHS, where it can be explicit. So if you can do both then I think that would be the ideal world. (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)

Take those targets or take those objectives, take those kinds of problem solving steps and come back to them explicitly again. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

Last year was 60 minutes a week and this year we have 40 minutes a week because there’s an extra assembly, we do singing assembly now during one of those times. So we’ve sort of shortened that down because it’s through the curriculum now instead of sort of a separate issue. But I mean there are some PSHCE objectives that are going
to be hard to tie in to the curriculum, you know, the sex education and drug education, all those things that really need their own specific lessons. (Ms. White)

The strengths of the teachers’ experiences and views of PATHS and NA reflect the nature-nurture debate. Vygotsky’s theory (1978) states that implicit teaching that provides the opportunity to learn is sufficient, but the theory was aimed at the ‘typical’ child. Whereas the NA was primarily targeted at children with poor EL skills, but has benefits for all the children as they are all at different stages of their emotional development and are still developing. This would suggest that PATHS may be better tailored to children that are not able to learn through implicit teaching and need to be taught in an explicit manner. However, if the children have the disposition and opportunity to learn, it can be argued that there should not be a need for discrete lessons. The teachers’ suggestions for discrete lessons may be explained in terms of their difficulties in creating such opportunities through their topics. EPs’ can help the teachers acquire a deeper understanding of appropriate learning opportunities and help them consider the quality and frequency of the opportunities as well. The teachers stated that resources that cross referenced topics and activities with particular PSHCE objectives are more effective in relieving time constraints.

But some of the other objectives, it would be good to have, you know, PATHS could be a resource and then you could have other resources where you could maybe have a look and say “Oh, I want to do this lesson on … I’m doing this topic on the Iron Man, which is our topic. I want to do a lesson on this PSHCE objective” and just maybe seeing how it’s done or what sort of resources might be for teaching that PSHCE objective, and then trying to adapt it or incorporate it into your topic... (Ms. Blue, Year 3/4)
One teacher expressed the feeling of isolation; not knowing what other schools have done in teaching EL and whether they were alone in writing their own curriculum in their borough.

*Finding out what other people had done, what kinds of other effective things that people had done in my own age group. And kind of having a forum for that. So for instance, right, week number three looks really dull, has anyone done anything good for it for your, you know, for Year 5/6’s? Having a forum and time to do that would have been handy.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

EPs are in a position to help set up these forums as they work with a cluster of schools in the same area. For example, EPs could help set up a ‘buddy’ type system, where schools that have more experience in teaching EL could support a school that has less experience by sharing their own experiences and advice on their method of teaching EL.

Another suggestion of an improvement to the NA is to create a success criteria. The teachers expressed that although they felt the NA is successful ‘on an intuitive level’ they were not able to definitively declare it so.

*We’re trying to figure out what the success criteria are and how quickly we can expect certain criteria to be met. So until we know what they are, it’s hard to really assess it’* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

*The teachers suggested that using more concrete outcomes would be a great way to assess the school’s new approach. For example; if the PSHCE objective was linked to*
conflict resolution, problem solving, respecting other and having them attached to produce outcomes for the kids means that all the children are engaged as there is a clear expectation of them in terms of the end product. (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

These outcomes relate to concrete work produced by the students. The example given was that if ‘respect’ was the lesson objective, which is needed for group work, it could be assumed to be achieved through a task such as organising a photography exhibition. The task would create opportunities for differences in opinions that would need to be negotiated amongst the children and thus developing the children’s’ EL skills. According to the findings the teachers perceive that hosting a successful photography exhibition; which would be the physical outcome, means that ‘respect’ or cooperative learning was achieved. However, it was difficult to determine whether all the children had participated in the negotiations in a respectable manner. Though the rationale for a success criteria is valid, the question remains, can physical outcomes determine the children’s inter/intra-personal development?

This question resonates with the earlier discussions on a critical issue within the field of EL; the lack of a single universal definition, consequently raising issues of assessment. As mentioned in the literature review, the different theoretical models of EI result in different assessment, each presenting unique limitations.

A teacher’s suggestion of physical outcomes as a success criteria should reflect their understanding of EL and their teaching objectives which includes recording and monitoring the children’s EL development. Therefore it can be argued that their suggestion meets their requirements and objectives, however, like all assessments there are strengths and limitations.
The teachers viewed the strengths of their suggested assessment as a way of meeting the needs of every child.

*We like to have objectives but we don’t have enough outcomes for it. Developing more concrete physical outcomes that we want, to produce projects that we could work on. Moving away from discussion and reflection and input, and more on output now. About 1/3 of the class don’t engage in class where the rest love discussions and are becoming more articulate and their vocabulary is developing. By having more concrete outcomes we’re incorporating everyone, so that the discussions that occur can occur within the context just as easily.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

*We have, you know, a large proportion of our classes that love discussion, they’re becoming much more articulate, their vocabulary is developing but then a large... portion, about 1/3 aren’t going to engage with it, aren’t capable of engaging with it. And by having those more concrete outcomes we’re incorporating everyone. And then discussion that we have can occur within that context just as easily. So that’s been our big kind of... we looked at it again.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

Although their suggestion of assessment is consistent with the way in which they teach EL, some children may produce an observable physical outcome such as the photography exhibition, but did not necessarily do so by meeting the objective (e.g. respect). A possible refinement of the teachers’ suggestion would be to take on a developmental approach to assessment. For this school, this would mean using their suggested success criteria alongside an emotional literacy developmental tool whereby children are assessed by identifying where they are developmentally and measures are then taken to bring them on to the next
developmental point or milestone. The main advantage of this would be that it allows EL to be taught in a way that it meets the individual child’s needs and is in line with the “Every Child Matters: Change for Children” policy (DfES, 2003).

A critical analysis of the evidence presented above suggests that PATH’s ‘universal status’ is not necessarily enough to determine its suitability for schools. To put this another way, PATHS is a generic curriculum or intervention programme that needs to be tailored or customised to the specific needs of targeted children’s local conditions, cultures and chronological ages. The evidence in this paper suggests that the limitations of PATHS gave reason for the school to adopt a more personalised or customised approach. This limitation explains the school’s preference for NA over PATHS. Yet whilst at a superficial level it may appear that the school’s new approach to teaching EL eliminated this limitation of PATHS.

It is possible that the children may have internalised the PATHS lessons that took place prior to the introduction of the NA. Thus, the children’s positive outcomes, after switching to the NA, could be attributed to the residual effects of the previous PATHS program. This would mean that the children outcomes may have been attributed to PATHS and were not a direct outcome of the NA making it difficult to identify which curriculum has led to the positive outcomes.

Furthermore, by critically reflecting on the teachers’ views of how to improve the EL curriculum using the new approach which did not incorporate discreet lessons into their existing framework, one must ask why they chose not to do this. This is especially important given that the discrete lesson platform is largely derived from PATHS (a curriculum originally deemed suitable and later unsuitable for the school). Based on this, it would seem
that there is something to be gained from both discrete and integrated approaches to curriculum development particularly in the area of the curriculum under discussion since EL penetrates every areas of one’s life. This is an issue which is reflected in many debates about school curricula. This is not to suggest that either extreme end of a spectrum is the right way forward or that they are mutually exclusive. A common solution is usually to amalgamate both perspectives such as in the nature-nurture debates. In short, it is usually not one or the other, but one and the other. This issue is considered further in the discussion below.

Section Five: Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this final section is to critically reflect on the key findings that emerged from Section Four above and to consider the contribution to knowledge (theory and practice) that the research has made focusing particularly on the implications for schools and EPs.

Significance, Contribution and Implications

The PATHS material was reported as ‘babyish’ for children in years 5/6 and some of the material presented foreign situations. Whilst it is possible that these findings may be specific to the school studied given its geographical location in a deprived area of London, it is highly likely that they are not. Although the school studied was located in a poverty-stricken area of London, which means that the children have very different life experiences and interests than children in other areas of England, the lack of match between interest and chronological age is likely to be a common experience.

The PATHS material mismatch is not only limited to schools that find themselves on the lower end of the socio-economic strata. The PATHS material mismatch may also be
attributed to the culture of the intended audience. PATHS was developed for American children and thus used materials that resonates more with their experiences than UK children.

These findings have direct implications for schools as they draw attention to the need for teachers to consider the PATHS programme in light of their children’s chronological ages, cultural experiences and conditions, with particular focus on the relevance of the materials used. When teachers have great insight into the children they teach, their views should be used as an informative measure when deciding whether a programme will suit their children. Furthermore, these findings have implications for the developers of PATHS to create (or provide a framework to help teachers in local areas to create) alternative materials that are better suited to children they teach who will inevitably be from different cultures, experience different conditions and have interests which vary according to experience, community, economic circumstances and age.

Perhaps the most important finding was the key difference between the two approaches to curriculum development used by the teachers to teach EL. PATHS was taught explicitly through discrete timetabled lessons whereas the NA teaches EL implicitly through all lessons and as such pervaded everything the teachers and the children did during the school day. Whilst the teachers reported incorporating explicit EL lessons to their NA as a possible improvement to teaching EL, this may not go far enough as there are strengths and limitations to using the covert (‘hidden’) curriculum to teaching EL. For example EL is viewed as a way of life then it is clear that emotions cannot be compartmentalised into lessons and need to be incorporated within the fabric of the school’s ethos, policies and customs. Parallels can be drawn here with faith schools which teach religion in discrete lessons yet the principles and beliefs are deeply interwoven into all areas of school life.
From the evidence presented in this paper, it would seem highly plausible that PATHS has had an effect on the NA. This is manifested in much of the evidence. Notably there may have been a residual effect from PATHS on the children as teachers witness improvement in their emotional language. This would therefore challenge whether using the PSHCE objectives alone are enough to teach EL effectively, especially given the reports that undesirable behaviour which some of the children displayed could not be addressed by the PSHCE objectives.

The findings presented in this paper also raise an important issue with regards to the new approach to the curriculum taken by the teachers. NA was designed by inferring that EL falls under the definition and remit of emotional well-being. This assumption was apparent in the way in which the NA was based on PSHCE objectives. However careful scrutiny of the PSHCE objectives reveals that the objectives are not limited to EL skills as they also include aspects of health, personal and social elements which do not lie within the remit of EL. On the other hand, it is possible to argue that PATHS falls totally under the EL umbrella. This critical reflection on both these approaches considering the extent to which they fall within the EL remit highlights the lack of consensus of definition within the EL field (Burton & Shotton, 2004; Haddon et al., 2005).

A further problem implied in the lack of consensus concerning what falls within the EL remit is the issue of how teachers should assess EL and what knowledge and skills are involved. As reviewed above, EI assessments reflected their theoretical models (Mayer & Salovey, 1990; Goleman, 1995). Therefore, it can be argued that the teachers’ suggested assessments based on actual outcomes reflect their understanding of EL and what they intended their approach to teaching EL to achieve. This is an issue that has direct implications for EPs and
strengthens the need for them to use their consultative role in understanding the teachers’
views to help develop an appropriate assessment by using their (EPs’) knowledge of strengths
and limitations of the psychological theories. Traditionally, a top down approach had been
used where theory informs practice and even policies; however, the implications of this study
present EPs as facilitators of a feedback system from practice into theory.

**Strengths, Limitations and Implications for Future Research**

Whilst the grounded theory approach I took in this paper cannot offer reliability and validity
in their purely scientific terms (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), here I discuss the extent of validity
and rigour that may be claimed as well as considering the generalisability of the grounded
theory accomplished in this paper. The interpretivists approach taken offered alternatives to
generalisation as is commonly found in studies using scientific methodologies. This study
explored the existence of a phenomenon (Van Maanen, 1988) and generalised to theoretical
propositions, thus speaking to analytical rather than statistical generalisability (Yin, 2003).

Although the study was carried out in one London school, and some of the findings may be
specific to that school, one of the main strengths of the study is the generality of its
contribution to the knowledge and the implications of that knowledge for schools, teachers
and EPs. In this way, the findings presented in this paper can serve as a guide to inform
decisions concerning the teaching of EL as well as raise issues that may not necessarily be
anticipated by teachers and others involved in the teaching of EL.
As I write this final section of my paper in early August 2011 many London districts and some other cities and towns in England suffered widespread rioting, looting, arson and serious unrest. Many of those arrested over the days that followed were young people, some of whom were of primary school age or barely out of primary school. In the aftermath of these riots there has been much focus and commentaries in the media on how education may be to blame and its role in preventing such incidents occurring again in the future. Notably in the context of this study there has been a focus on how pro social behaviour can be engendered amongst the young. Pro social behaviour is strongly aligned with issues such as social responsibility and empathy which all come within the EL remit. The riots and their fall out have served to highlight the importance of the subject matter of this thesis and put the focus on the need for further research that will inform those charged with the responsibility of teaching EL in UK schools.

A major problem I faced, and one which offered both strengths and limitations to my study, was the school’s decision to cease the implementation of PATHS. Whilst this presented me with the opportunity to study the new approach to EL it also presented me with several dilemmas. Not least amongst these was the limitations put on my study by the time constraint I was under in the conduct of this research. For example, this prevented me from using of a cluster of schools in the borough using different approaches to teaching EL. Although this would have been desirable it was not feasible. Thus, a recommendation for future research would be to use a larger number of teachers drawn from a range of schools that have been identified through the variety of programmes and approaches they use to teach EL. This would give a more comprehensive picture of the issues, problems and strengths of teaching EL to young people attending schools in the UK in the wake of the August 2011 riots and how things might be improved for young people, their families and the communities in which they live.
Paper Two: An Evaluation Of A Personalised Approach To Teaching EL Devised By The Teachers Themselves.
Abstract

Social and emotional literacy has become an educational agenda on a national and international level. Schools universally are addressing deviant behaviour through a social learning perspective.

Emotional literacy (EL) reflects three of the five outcomes for “Every Child Matters: Change for Children” (DfES, 2003): to be healthy, to enjoy and achieve and to make a positive contribution. EI is also embedded in the legal framework for the associated reform that is set out in the Children Act (2004). The five outcomes for Every Child Matters are statutory demands on educational institutions and welfare services. Since EL is reflected in the outcomes, it suggests that it too needs to be addressed. However, schools have the flexibility in how they chose to address it.

This study aims to evaluate a personalised approach in promoting EL in Key Stage Two (KS2) children in one primary school. A pre and post design was used to evaluate the school’s new approach (NA). Class teachers completed Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQs) for 75 children pre-NA and post-NA.

Statistical tests were used to: 1) Compare the pre SDQ scores to the post SDQ scores to determine whether the NA produced a significant change. 2) Determine where there was a significant difference between the research sample scores and the expected value scores according to the classification of the SDQ scores. 3) Compare the research sample SDQ scores to the SDQ scores from the norm data of the British population.

Results of the statistical analysis suggest that the NA was effective as there was a significant improvement in the overall general behaviour according to the total difficulties scores. The statistical analysis revealed mixed results for the five scale scores. The hyperactivity scale, the peer problems scale and the emotional symptoms scale showed significant improvements.
However, the pro social scale showed a significant decline and the conduct problems scale was the only scale that showed no significant difference between pre-NA and post-NA. Further tests conducted to strengthen the quality of the sample showed the pro social scale was in line with the British norms even with the significant decline. Similarly, the conduct problems scale was in line with the British norm post-NA.

The research has produced encouraging statistics for the effectiveness of NA on the children’s behaviour, however, it calls for a re-evaluation of the NA in order to improve the pro social behaviour and lessen conduct problems.

Section One Introduction

1.1 Purpose

Personal, social and emotional development is as much a concern as academic development in children. Research suggests that social and emotional skills are needed to succeed in school (Thompson, 2002) to establish and sustain relationships, reduce aggressive behaviour (Nagin & Tremblay, 1999) and create an ideal learning and teaching environment.

The objective of this research is to determine whether the school’s personalised EL programme (NA) produces favourable behavioural outcomes in children.

1.2 Context

The research sits within the context of a political climate. International and national policies as well as national initiatives have been addressed in the Context Section of Paper One.
1.3 Rationale

The primary rationale for this research is that it addresses EL, a relatively new and under-researched field. It also addresses the interest of the EPS and my personal interests as a trainee educational psychologist. Moreover, it is a response to change that occurred in the initial research mentioned in Paper One. This has been elaborated in the research rationale in Paper One.

The direct implications of this research is that it provides the research school with evidence to support the teachers’ perceptions that the NA was beneficial to the students in terms of improving their behaviour. The findings can be used as evidence-based planning strategies for the research school and to help other schools that teach EL to make informed decisions.

By evaluating the NA, its components can be identified and assessed, thereby determining possible variables that may have affected the outcomes. This has implications for EPs to guide and support schools that wish to develop their own personalised approach for teaching EL.

Section Two: Literature Review

This literature review looks at the theoretical relationship between emotion and behaviour as a direct causal relationship and as a feedback system as well as associated research to justify behaviour as a measure of assessment for an EL programme.
2.1 Method for Searching

Refer to Section 3.1 in Paper One.

2.2 Emotional Intelligence

This research sits within the field of emotional intelligence (EI), which more recently prefers the term emotional literacy (EL). This section presents a historical summary of the development of the concept of EI and its varied terms. Most take the view that EI/EL is an area that can be developed and this explains its place in education which is considered in Section 2.3.

Gardner (1983) proposed the theory of multiple intelligences and identified eight distinct intelligences. Among these are inter-personal (understanding the emotions of others) and intra-personal intelligence (understanding the emotions of oneself) which is more commonly known as emotional intelligence (EI). Mayer and Salovey (1990) introduced the concept EI and conceptualised it as an ability and defined it as:

‘The ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth’ (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p.5)

The popularisation of the EI concept can be attributed to Goleman’s claims that EI ‘matters twice as much as IQ’ in predicting outcomes in the work place (Goleman, 1998, p. 31). Such claims have filtered their way into education much to the credit of the media and are easily rationalised by the average person thus maintaining the construct in the public domain. More
recently, the educational field prefers to use the term ‘emotional literacy’ as opposed to ‘emotional intelligence’ as the word ‘literacy’ implies an intelligence that is not fixed (Burton & Shotton, 2004).

There are varied views on the terminology, Haddon et al., (2005) views EL as one’s emotional abilities; the internal process and the social process as well as the interaction between both. This implies that EL holds a more social constructivist connotation than EI, which is more individualistic as it is focused solely on the internal process. Morris and Scott (2002) define EL as the practice of: recognising emotions, paying attention to them, giving them significance, thinking about and understanding them and taking them into account when deciding how to act. Humphrey et al., (2008) view EL as referring to schools, cultures and students within schools. Although there are slight differences in the definition of EL they are in line with the definition of EI by Mayer and Salovey (1990).

An advantage of the term ‘literacy’ is that it moves away from the static connotations associated with intelligence (IQ) and provides common language to teachers who promote the development of emotions in schools. Like reading, EL starts with strategies to identify the emotions and then learning decode them. This justifies the term ‘emotional literacy’ which is used throughout the research project. Other terms are used in conjunction with EL, such as, ‘social and emotional well-being’. It can be argued that ‘social and emotional well-being’ are presented together in order to demonstrate the relationship between emotions and social interactions. It has been suggested that the better emotions are regulated the better the social interactions (Lopes, Salovey, Côté & Beers, 2005). However, this causal relationship has not been evidenced, thus it has been argued that the opposite can also be true; that better social interactions result in better regulation of emotions (Lopes et al., 2005). The term ‘well-being’
evokes the adaptive nature of emotions and social interactions whereby the view is that together they can achieve a standard of good health which can help maintain social order and create an ideal learning environment.

A critical reflection of the above historical outline of EI illustrates the lack of consensus over a single universal definition and theoretical model. Yet, it seems that all the definitions and theoretical models allude to the notion that EI/EL can be developed, thus rationalising its place within the educational context.

2.3 Recognising the Role of Social and Emotional Development in Education

The implication of the section above that presents EI and its various terms to be in line with the Mayor and Salovey’s ability model of EI is that emotional literacy skills can be developed and taught. This section seeks to present the role of EL in education in terms of raising academic achievement and addressing behavioural difficulties and consequently further justifying research in this area.

The change in perception to education currently encompasses the ‘whole’ child. This means that education is no longer purely focused on academic achievements, but aspects such as emotional development are also considered for learning. This is evident in educational settings where schools are actively teaching EL as discussed in Paper One.

*Our learning objectives are moving away from purely academic ones to thinking skills and emotional intelligence, emotional literacy objectives...* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)
This further supports the existence of a multi-faceted perspective to education; in that there is a focus on the development of social and emotional skills in conjunction with conventional academic achievement.

McCombs (2004) and Payton, Wardlaw, Graczyk, Bloodworth, Tompsett, and Weissberg (2000) state that schools need to provide learning experiences that prepare learners to become knowledge users and producers as well as socially responsible citizens. EL programmes are in line with these objectives and have also been shown to raise academic outcomes. For example, EL programmes such as the teaching alternative thinking strategies (PATHS) curriculum, was developed by Greenberg and Kusché (1994) in the US in response to the criminal violence epidemic in the 1990’s (Blueprints for violence prevention, 1998, 2002). The programme is supported by research that demonstrates its positive effects on academic achievement and behaviour difficulties (Greenberg & Kusché 1993, 1996, 1998). A critical reflection of the research outcomes of PATHS would suggest a relationship between behaviour and academic achievement. For example, improving behaviours such as reducing aggression creates an environment that is more conducive to learning thus raising academic achievement and therefore justifying research in this area.

2.4 Theoretical Relationship between Emotion and Behaviour

There are two dominating theories that attempt to explain the relationship between emotion and behaviour with the aim of justifying the measure of behaviour when evaluating an EL programme. The first theory views emotion and behaviour as having a direct causal relationship. The second views the relationship where emotion serves a feedback function. The theories are not presented as equals, instead they can be thought of as a progression in
thought and conceptualisation from the initial widely accepted notion of direct causation that when challenged led to the feedback system theory.

2.4.1 Emotion Causes Behaviour

That emotion directly causes behaviour is a widely assumed and accepted notion as it has an intuitive appeal and thus has not faced much critical challenge. For example, Loewenstein, Weber, Hsee and Welch (2001) not only state that emotions directly influence behaviour but go on to state that this theory is supported by ample psychological literature on emotions, yet what was cited was not extensive or convincing. A commonly used and accepted example is that fear (emotion) causes flight (behaviour). The example receives little scrutiny as it resonates with personal experience and receives support from the evolutionary argument. However, it is also intuitively accepted that fear can cause one to ‘freeze’ thus challenging the idea that fear causes one to flee. This point lends itself to further challenge the notion of direct causation of emotion on behaviour. There are more behaviours than there are emotions, thus implying that emotions are not specific enough to predict a specific behaviour (Schwarz & Clore, 2007). Therefore, there must be other factors that affect behaviour.

In addition, if emotions produced maladaptive behaviour, according to evolution, people with fewer emotions would be more likely to survive. Similarly, it can be disputed that if the same emotion does not consistently cause the same behaviour then the influence on behaviour cannot be direct. However, this is not to say that there is no evidence to support the theoretical claims, but the evidence is scarce and unconvincing.

The direct causation theory has met considerable objection on both empirical and conceptual levels. Twenge and Campbell (2001) used mediation analysis to test the theory that social
rejection or exclusion would cause emotional distress which in turn causes aggressive behaviour. An extensive analysis was completed using four hundred tests for mediation by emotion from journal articles. It was found that only 17% were significant at 0.05 level. Thus, it could be argued that emotional distress is not the only emotion that causes aggressive behaviour, consequently challenging the direct causation theory.

2.4.2 Emotion as Feedback

Isen (1987) was critical of the notion that emotional distress causes a behavioural response and suggested that the behavioural response to emotion (distress) functions as a mood regulator. This means that the function of the behavioural response is to alleviate the emotional distress and improve the emotional state. Manucia, Baumann and Cialdini (1984) tested this by means of a mood freeze experiment. They gave participants in one condition a placebo pill that would make them immune to change of mood. Sad moods were thought to directly induce altruistic behaviour; however, in the placebo condition the participants were the least helpful in comparison to the changeable mood condition. The implications of these results suggest that emotions do not directly cause behaviour because otherwise a behavioural response for helping would have occurred regardless of the placebo.

The theory of emotion as a feedback views emotion as a mechanism to provide feedback on the behaviour and its effect on changing one’s emotional state. Gollwitzer (1999) proposed that people do not always deliberate all their behavioural options when in situations that requires a rapid response. This would suggest that our actions are governed by if-then rules; if I come back from work early then I will eat dinner with the family. As humans live in a social constructive world, the if-then rules need to be continuously updated and refined. Emotions
as a feedback system serve to influence behaviour by contributing to the updating process by
providing feedback to the actions on the adequacy of that behaviour. If the resulting emotion
is a positive emotion, the existing if-then rule is validated and can then even become
automatic. If the resulting emotion is negative, the if-then rule is subject to revision and the
other rule with a positive effect will take preference. The anticipation of emotional outcomes
is an important aspect of the feedback system as it may alter one’s choice of behaviour. This
would explain the above notion of emotion causing behaviour, as that is what is observed.
However, the feedback theory would explain the relationship as the emotional state precedes
behaviour. Moreover, the feedback system acts as a self-regulator. The emotions serve as an
inner mechanism that rewards or punishes behaviour. Baumeister, Vohs, DeWall and Zhang
(2007) argue that if we are able to have control over our emotions, for example, stop the
feeling of guilt simply by act of will, then there will be little or no reason to behave in a way
that avoids guilt-producing actions. Therefore emotions would lose their function of being
able to influence behaviour. A critical reflection would suggest that the feedback system is
more plausible than the direct causation theory as it is able to modify behaviour. Furthermore,
the feedback system is supported by the lack of clear research evidence of the direct
causation theory on behaviour.

A critical consideration of the implications of this model within the education context would
suggest that emotions serve as internal regulators, whereby the emotion will produce a
behaviour which produces feedback to the emotional state. In the same token, behaviour is
observable and can be externally regulated by teachers using a reward and punishment
system that could also feedback to into the emotions and reinforce positive behaviour.
2.5 Research Based Evidence of the Emotion-Behaviour Relationship

The above sections present the theoretical perspectives of the emotion-behaviour relationship in order to justify the use of behaviour as a measure when evaluating an EL programme as part of this research project. This section further argues this point by presenting research-based evidence where behavioural measures have been used in evaluative EL studies.

Mayer and Salovey (1990) introduced the concept of emotional intelligence. They conceptualised emotional intelligence as an ability and defined it as ‘The ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth’ (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p.5)

This definition implies that there is an intrinsic relationship between cognition and emotion. In order to regulate emotions one needs to understand emotions and to do so one must have the cognitive ability to perceive them. Lazarus (1991) asserts that understanding the situation or event (cognition) is a precondition for emotion to exist i.e. emotion succeeds cognition. However, Zajonc (1984) argues that cognition and emotion are independent and that emotion can actually precede cognition. Although, there remains a debate on the exact relationship, there is mutual consensus of the existence of a relationship between emotion and behaviour.

This relationship is demonstrated in cognitive behavioural therapy which is based on the notion that behaviour is dependent on cognition and that cognition is adaptive. Therefore, changing the way one thinks will change behaviour (Goldfried & Davidson 1994). Since cognition can influence behaviour and there is a relationship between emotion and cognition,
it can therefore be deduced that there is a relationship between emotion and behaviour. This may explain the reason that programmes based on the concept of EI have been evaluated in terms of behaviour and/or cognition.

Cognitive evaluations are twofold; academic achievement and social-cognition (understanding emotions). A good example that demonstrates this can be taken from Greenber and Kusché’s (1998) evaluation of the promoting alternative thinking strategies (PATHS) programme on a group of 57 deaf children using assessments for cognitive and academic skills:

1) The Performance Scale of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R; Wechsler, 1974).

2) The Matching Familiar Figures Test (MFFT; Kagan, Rosman, Day, Albert, & Phillips, 1964) which was used to assess cognitive style in problem solving.

3) Reading Comprehension section of the Special Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students (SAT; Madden, Gardner, Rumania, Karlsen, & Merwin, 1972) to measure reading skills.

The evaluation also included assessments for social and emotional understanding; these included:


2) The Kusché Emotional Inventory (KEI; Kusché, 1984) which was used to evaluate emotional recognition and reading of emotion labels for a wide range of affects.

3) Teacher reports of children's behavioural and emotional functioning and parents’ reports of children’s behavioural and emotional functioning and their associated tests were also used.
Results from the pre- and post-measures, compared to the control group, the intervention
group showed improved scores on the Mazes subset of the WISC-R test \( (p<0.1) \), few errors
on the MFFT at post-test \( (p=0.7) \) and a significant improvement on both measures of grade
level \( (p=0.05) \) and scale scores \( (p<0.05) \) from the Reading Comprehension section of the
Special Edition of the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students. The social-
cognition and behavioural findings showed significant improvements in the students’
emotional recognition skills, social problem solving skills, and the teacher ratings showed
significant improvements in behaviour.

These findings lend support for the theoretical Affective-Behavioural-Cognitive-Dynamic
(ABCD) Model which is one of the four conceptual models that PATHS is based on. It is a
hybrid model which takes account of developmental integration of affect, behaviour and
cognition in terms of social and emotional competence. It is understood from the ABCD
model that emotional development precedes cognition due to the maturational process and it
is the affective development that acts as a precursor to the other forms of thinking that
become integrated with cognitive and linguistic functions. The ability to label the emotional
states is key in the ABCD model and children are encouraged to express emotions, as it is
believed that it will facilitate effective self-control and act as a precursor to optimal problem
resolution. Implicit in the model is the notion that through emotional awareness, affective-
cognitive control and social-cognitive understanding, behaviour regulation and internal
regulation can be achieved.

By critically reflecting on the literature reviewed in this section it would seem that there is an
integrated relationship between cognition, behaviour and emotion as a feedback system in the
context of teaching EL to children. The literature indicates that emotion cannot be controlled directly but must be altered through cognition and behaviour. Thus, suggesting that in order to gauge EL one must assess behaviour and or cognition.

2.6 Focus of this Research

The purpose of this paper is to evaluate a personalised EL approach by assessing behaviour. The literature review establishes a case for studying the relationship between emotion and behaviour, which suggest that emotion can be measured by assessing cognition and or behaviour. The research will findings will also be able to comment on a causal relationship between emotion and behaviour and emotion as feedback system in the context of teaching EL to children.

Section Three: Methodology and Methods

Section three presents the aim and operationalised hypotheses. The methodology and design are stated and justified as well as the measures and the choice of test. The participants, procedures, data collection and ethical considerations are also included.

3.1 Aim

Section two has established the relationship between emotion and behaviour thus justifying the evaluation of a personalised approach to teaching EL by assessing behaviour. As Paper One aims to expand the evaluative EL studies by focusing on teachers, Paper Two aims to provide evidence to support the teachers’ perceptions that the personalised approach (or the
‘new approach’ (NA) as referred to by the research school) was beneficial to the students in terms of improving their behaviour.

The aim of the research is to find out if the NA works using the following hypotheses:

H1: The pro social behavior of the children will improve.
H2: Their hyperactivity will lessen.
H3: The bad conduct problems will lessen.
H4: The emotional symptoms will lessen (this refers to a child who is often worried or complains about having a headache or tummy ache, often due to being unhappy and nervous in new situations).
H5: The peer relationship problems will lessen.
H6: There will be a general improvement in behavior.

3.2 Methodology

In order to measure behavioural change over time (i.e. between pre and post intervention) I have to produce quantitative numerical descriptions (statistics) about the aspects of the children’s behavioural change I am interested in studying. I am therefore using a methodology that is set firmly within the ambit and rules of science of which measurement is a fundamental part. To answer my research questions, it is necessary for me to begin from a point where the key aspects of behaviour I am interested in measuring (pro social behaviour, hyperactivity, conduct problems etc.) are theorised, conceptualised and precisely defined so that they can be operationalised and made quantifiable (i.e. made into phenomena that are measurable).

Inevitably this quantification of my key concepts involves a process of reification whereby statistics (in this case numerical descriptors of the concepts listed in the above hypotheses)
become measures of a conceptualisation of these aspects of behaviour that purport to have an objective reality. That is ‘an existence as real’ to the extent that science is about providing ‘true’ descriptions of a real world or, at the very least, descriptions that appear to work in practice.

Quantification of the behaviours I am interested in is possible because they, in common with other complex concepts, have potentially a whole range of directly observable characteristics or manifestations in the ‘real’ word, which are taken to be indicative of a single underlying hypothetical (or ‘latent’) variable. This means that although these aspects of behaviour do not necessarily have a clear physical or reified identity in the world, it can be argued that at least some of each of their characteristics can be observed directly and quantified. These are the ‘factual’ material, which may safely be collected by an instrument designed to measure these aspect of children’s behaviour. It is to the operationalisation of my key concepts that I now turn my attention.

3.3 Hypotheses and their Operationalisation

I have divided this section into three sub-sections.

3.3.1 Measures

Only one instrument was used for Paper Two. The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) measure was selected because it meets the purpose of this research and has been used in past evaluative EL studies.

As the SDQ was administered and evaluated against the Rutter Parent and Teacher questionnaires (Goodman, 1997). The scores showed high correlations between the two questionnaires. SDQs were also selected because they are quick and easy to administer, thus serving as an ideal instrument to minimise disruption at the school, given the prior history of
this research project there. In addition, they provided information on the children’s strengths, as opposed to just the difficulties, making it a unique instrument of choice.

The SDQ is designed for children between the ages of 4 to 16, and is completed by teachers and parents. A self-report version, where the children complete the questionnaire themselves, is available for children over the age of 11. As the children at Time One were under the age of 11 no self-report versions of the SDQs were completed, instead they were completed by the children’s class teacher.

The SDQ is composed of 25 items which are divided between five scales of five items each. The five scales are:

1. Emotional Symptoms Scale (five items)
2. Conduct Problems Scale (five items)
3. Hyperactivity Scale (five items)
4. Peer Problems Scale (five items)
5. Pro-social Behaviour Scale (five items)

The teachers complete each SDQ by choosing ‘Not True’, ‘Somewhat True’ or ‘Certainly Not True’ for each item. The ‘Somewhat True’ is always scored as 1 but the Not True and Certainly Not True varies with each item. See Appendix 9 for the scores for each item. For each scale scores can range from 0-10 given that all items were completed and for the total difficulties scores can range from 0-40 by adding all the scale scores excluding the pro social scores.
3.3.2 Justification for Choice of Test

Different tests are used in different settings depending on age and intentions or purpose of the assessment. There are various types of assessments: interviews, questionnaires, check lists, and observations which are completed by teachers, parents and/or the children, some of which are individual assessments where others are whole class assessments.

Of the most accepted assessments are the following: Mayer, Salovey and Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002), the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) (Goleman, 1997), which was developed to assess emotional competencies, based on the mixed model of EI that accounts for personality as well as abilities. There are also assessments that are more commonly used to assess EL within the educational context, due to their simplicity, efficiency and valued attributes particularly when dealing with young school children. For example, the strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman, 1997) and the Kusché Affective Interview (Kusché, Greenberg & Beikle, 1988) which assesses emotional understanding in a range of affective states and situations. The Taxonomy of Problematic Situations (Dodge, McClasky & Feldman, 1985) is a whole class assessment, which is a context specific assessment of social and emotional competence in children using a check list that is completed by teachers.

For the purpose of practicality two assessments are short listed for discussion as they represent two distinct streams of assessment; The MSCEIT and the SDQ. The MSCEIT is based on the concept of EI as an ability, whereas the SDQ is a measure of behaviour. This reflects the arguments above of the relationship between emotion and behaviour.
The MSCEIT is consistent with the ability model and tests the four branches of EI and generates a score for each as well as a total score. The MSCEIT evaluates EI through numerous questions and objectives. It tests one’s ability to perceive, comprehend, act upon and manage internal and external emotions. The MSCEIT is a performance-based measure where a correct answer is identified when deciding on which emotion ‘best’ describes how an individual feels in a hypothetical situation. This approach means that a ‘correct’ answer can be identified, thus making the performance-based measure a more valid and reliable test in comparison to the self-report measures, as they are more likely to assess the EI construct that is distinct from personality. The self-report measures are reliant on the mixed ability model (Goleman, 1995), which defines EI as a mixture of abilities and personality traits that encompass a broader definition than the ability model. A weakness of the mixed model is that it labels a variety of attributes under EI which is misleading as it assumes that all EI components come in a package and can be taught, developed and can be a predictor of personal success when they are to some extent independent entities.

The MSCEIT is not without its critics, Roberts, Zeidner & Matthews (2001) argues that the MSCEIT is in fact a measure of conformity and not ability, where the “correct” answer is based on whatever the majority answers. Fiori (2008) argues that the scores from a performance-based test do not differentiate between declarative and procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1985). Thus, an individual may score high on the test as he/she has high declarative knowledge, knowledge of ‘what to do’ in a hypothetical situation but lacks in procedural knowledge, knowing ‘how to do’ in an actual situation. The opposite is equally true, the individual may be able to perform in an actual situation but is not able to articulate how they perform (Sun, Merrill & Peterson, 2001).
Other assessment tools such as the SDQ may be favoured over the MSCEIT due to practical considerations. The average estimated administration time for the MSCEIT test is 35-40 minutes whereas the SDQ is estimated to take 10 minutes. Although the SDQ may be more favourable particularly for schools, due to its shortened administration time, it is a very different measure to the MSCEIT as it is a behavioural screening questionnaire.

The SDQ is designed for children between the ages of 4 to 16, and is completed by teachers and parents. A self-report version completed by the children is available for children over the age of 11. The SDQ is composed of five scales as outlined in Section 3.3.1

The main difference between the MSCEIT and SDQs is that for children under the age of 11 the SDQ is completed by the teachers or parents. Though this removes limitations of self-report measures it is subject to respondent bias. In addition, unlike the MSCEIT which is based on hypothetical situations, the SDQs are based on observable behaviours which can be argued to be a more direct measure of emotions. As with all assessment tools there will be associated strengths and limitations, however, this has to be considered in lieu of the research purpose. For example, MSCEIT is concerned with the understanding of emotions, where the SDQs may be chosen to evaluate change in behaviour. For these reasons, in addition to changes in the initial research plans, the SDQs were selected as the appropriate measure for this research.

3.3.3 The Operationalised Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are based on NA improving the children’s behaviour. The hypotheses are based on the five scales of the SDQ including the total difficulties score.
**H1:** The pro social behaviour scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time Two than at Time One.

**H01:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the pro social behaviour scale at Time One and Time Two.

**H2:** The hyperactivity scale score will be significantly amongst the children tested higher at Time One than at Time Two.

**H02:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the hyperactivity scale at Time One and Time Two.

**H3:** The conduct problems scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H03:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the conduct problems scale at Time One and Time Two.

**H4:** The emotional symptoms scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H04:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the emotional symptoms scale at Time One and Time Two.

**H5:** The peer problems scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H05:** There will be no difference between the scores on the peer problems scale at Time One and Time Two.

**H6:** The total difficulties score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.
**H06:** *There will be no difference between the scores on the total difficulties score at Time One and Time Two.*

### 3.4 Design

A quantitative pre-and-post single group design was employed to evaluate the school’s personalised EL program that is referred to as the New Approach (NA). Data are collected from the same group of children at two points in time: Time One (pre-NA) and Time Two (post-NA). See Appendix 13 for raw data.

A control group was not used due to time limitation factors that arose after the initial plans for the research had to be dismissed due to the school’s decision to cease the implementation of the PATHS programme. A difficulty in finding a control group was that most schools teach EL to a certain extent regardless of whether they are not following a prescribed programme or doing so explicitly. Thus, using a control group may have introduced confounding factors to the research that would have been difficult to control for.

Due to time limitations on this study as a consequence of a change in the initial research, the quality of my sample is weakened due to the lack of a control group. My awareness of this limitation has made me take efforts in strengthening the study. I do this by using a proxy for a control, i.e. by comparing the research sample with British norm data provided in the test manuals.

### 3.5 Participants

The participants were drawn from the same school as Paper One. 85 SDQs were completed for the children by their class teachers but ten of these students were not included in the data analysis due to the following two reasons: a request by parents for their child not to be
included in the research, or an incomplete SDQ whereby an item was not answered or a
definitive selection made. Therefore, the total number of SDQs analysed for the research was
75; 30 females (40% of total number of children) and 45 male (60% of the total number of
children).

As previously stated, the children at Time One were from years 3, 4 and 5, and from years 4,
5 and 6 at Time Two.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

Consent was gained for the research with the Head Teacher and the Deputy Head for the
primary school in which the research took place. Consent forms were then sent out via the
school to all the parents of the children in which the SDQs were to be filled out.

The SDQs were then completed by the class teachers for the same group of Key Stage Two
(KS2) children pre-NA (Time One) and post-NA (Time Two); therefore each student
provided two sets of SDQ scores. At Time One the children were from years 3, 4 and 5 and at
Time Two, the same group of children were in years 4, 5 and 6. All the children were
exposed to the NA. The year 6 children at Time One were not included as part of the sample
as at Time Two they would have moved on to secondary school. The SDQs were then scored
by hand to provide a total difficulties score as well as a score for each of the 5 scales (See
Section 3.5) for each child at Time One and Time Two.
3.7 Ethics

The British Psychological Society’s code of Conduct, Ethical Principles and Guidelines (2005) for conducting research was adhered to and ethical consent was approved by the University of Exeter (see Appendix 17). Details about the research, confidentiality issues and withdrawal were addressed in the consent letters provided to the parents of the children that the SDQs were to be completed (see Appendix 16). Respect and confidentiality for all participants was maintained throughout the research and all written records have remained anonymous.

Section Four: Data Analysis and Results

Section four is divided into five sub-sections as outlined below.

The descriptive statistics are located in Appendix 10. The table in Appendix 10 describe the characteristics of the data and include the mean, median, range and standard deviation for the five SDQ scale scores and the total difficulties score for Time One and Time Two.

4.1 Checking the Normality of each of the SDQ scales

A test of normality was carried out on each of the scales to confirm whether the distribution of the scores on the dependent variable is normal in order to determine whether the assumption for the use of parametric tests is met. See Appendix 11 for a table for a test of Normality.

The test of Normality showed a significant result was found for all the scales at Time One and Time Two, for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, except for the hyperactivity scale at Time
One, D (75) = 0.96, p= 0.82. The significant results for all the scales (except for the hyperactivity scale at Time One) suggest the violation of the assumption of normality.

Though the hyperactivity scale at Time One was found to be non-significant for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test suggesting that the scores are normally distributed the Shapiro-Wilk test was found to be significant. Since all but one of the scales showed a non-normal distribution (hyperactivity score at Time One), a decision was made to use non-parametric tests for the data set.

As the assumption of normality was non-tenable the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was carried out to compare the Time One scores to the Time Two scores on the five SDQ scales and the total difficulties scores to determine whether NA produced a significant change in the SDQ scores over time. See Appendix 12 for the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test.

However, as the hyperactivity scale at Time One was found to be normally distributed in the Shapiro Wilk test, a paired sample t-test was used to confirm that the use of non-parametric tests would still be appropriate as the remaining scales at Time One and Time Two violated the assumption of normality. This paired-sample t-test reflected the exact pattern of results found in the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. For this reason, it was decided the use of the one sample t-test could be permitted to further investigate the data, thus allowing for comparisons of the research sample and the national norms. See Section 4.3.

**4.2 Testing the Hypotheses**

A Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was carried to test the hypotheses. Each hypothesis and their null hypothesis are presented individually and their results are reported below.

*Note: The data for the scores appear to be of a different magnitude as the direction of the scale is reversed. This means the lower scores denote a higher/better scale result.*
**H1:** The pro social behaviour scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time Two than at Time One.

**H_{01}:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the pro social behaviour scale at Time One and Time Two.

There was a significant difference in the pro social behaviour scale scores for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -2.685$, $p = 0.07$, $r = -0.219$. The median score on the pro social behaviour scale has decreased from Time One ($Mdn = 8$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 9$) which means that their pro social behaviour scale scores were better at Time One than at Time Two. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

**H2:** The hyperactivity scale score will be significantly amongst the children tested higher at Time One than at Time Two.

**H_{02}:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the hyperactivity scale at Time One and Time Two.

There was a significant difference in the hyperactivity scale for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -5.755$, $p < 0.05$, $r = -0.470$. The median score on the hyperactivity scale has increased from Time One ($Mdn = 3$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 1$). These results suggest that NA produced a significant improvement in the hyperactivity scale scores at Time Two and therefore the hypothesis is supported.

**H3:** The conduct problems scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H_{03}:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the conduct problems scale at Time One and Time Two.
There was no significant difference in the conduct problems scale scores for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -1.735, p = 0.083, r = -0.142$, therefore the hypothesis is rejected. However, the median score on the conduct problems scale had decreased from Time One ($Mdn = 1$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 0$) suggesting there was a very small improvement though the results were not found to be significant.

**H4:** The emotional symptoms scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H_04:** There will be no difference amongst the children tested between the scores on the emotional symptoms scale at Time One and Time Two.

There was a significant difference in the emotional symptoms scale scores for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -3.615, p < 0.05, r = -0.295$. The median score on the emotional symptoms scale increased from Time One ($Mdn = 1$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 0$). These results suggest that NA produced a significant improvement in the emotional symptoms scale scores at Time Two therefore the hypothesis is supported.

**H5:** The peer problems scale score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H_05:** There will be no difference between the scores on the peer problems scale at Time One and Time Two.

There was a significant difference in the peer problems scale scores for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -3.467, p = 0.001, r = -0.464$. The median score on the peer problems scale decreased from Time One ($Mdn = 1$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 0$). These results suggest that NA produced a significant decrease in the peer problems scale scores from Time One to Time Two, suggesting an improvement in NA, thus supporting the hypothesis.
**H6:** The total difficulties score will be significantly higher amongst the children tested at Time One than at Time Two.

**H₀₆:** There will be no difference between the scores on the total difficulties score at Time One and Time Two.

There was a significant difference in the total difficulties scale scores for Time One and Time Two, $Z = -5.687$, $p < 0.05$. The median score on the total difficulties scale has increased from Time One ($Mdn = 7$) to Time Two ($Mdn = 4$). These results suggest that the NA that was implemented at the primary school has produced an overall improvement on the children’s outcomes as measured by the SDQs, therefore supporting the hypothesis.

**4.3 Comparing the Research Sample to the British Population**

The comparisons of each SDQ scale and the total SDQ score allows findings to be considered in term of the national norms (See Table 1 below). A samples t-test was used to compare the pre-test and post-test scores on the five constructs of the SDQ scales and the total scores taken at Time One and Time two (See Table 2 below).

**Table 1**

*British means and standard deviation for SDQs completed by teachers for a sample of children between 5-10 years old.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean Score (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Scale</td>
<td>1.5 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Scale</td>
<td>0.9 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Scale</td>
<td>3.0 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Scale</td>
<td>1.4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro social Behaviour Scale</td>
<td>7.3 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difficulties scale</td>
<td>6.7 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data was taken from [http://www.sdqinfo.org/norms/UKNorm3.pdf](http://www.sdqinfo.org/norms/UKNorm3.pdf).

The British sample included 10,438 individuals aged between 5 and 15. Complete SDQ information was obtained from 10,298 parents, 8,208 teachers and 4,228 from the 11-15 year olds. However, for the purpose of this research, the data used was for SDQs completed for the children between the ages of 5-10.

**Table 2**

*One-Sample T-test comparing the SDQ scales at Time One and Time Two to the population mean from the British Norm Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Social Scale at Time 1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Social Scale at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-4.623</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Scale at Time 1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.939</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Scale at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Scale at Time 1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Scale at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-1.997</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Scale at Time 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Scale at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-4.659</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Difficulties score at Time 1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Difficulties score at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-3.439</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-2.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics show that when comparing the sample means to the population means there was no significant difference for the pro social scale at Time One ($t(74) = 0.492, p = .624$), the emotional symptoms scale at Time One ($t(74) = 0.460, p = .647$), the conduct problems scale at Time One ($t(74) = 1.939, P > 0.05$), the peer problems scale at Time One ($t(74) = 1.530, p = .130$), the hyperactivity scale at Time One ($t(74) = 1.961, p < 0.05$) and the total difficulties score at Time One ($t(74) = 1.901, p = .061$) and the conduct problems scale at Time Two ($t(74) = 0.375, p = .001$). This suggests that the tested sample come from the British population as taken from the British norm data (See Table 2).

The statistics show that the means of the pro social scale at Time Two ($t(74) = 3.394, p = .001$), the hyperactivity scale at Time Two ($t(74) = -4.659, p < 0.05$), the peer problems scale at Time Two ($t(74) = -1.997, p = .050$) and the total difficulties score at Time Two ($t(74) = -3.439, p = 001$) are significantly different to the means taken from the British norm data. The means for the pro social scale at Time Two ($M = 8.13$), the hyperactivity scale at Time Two ($M = 1.84$), the peer problems scale at Time Two ($M = 1.07$) and the total difficulties score at Time Two ($M = 4.69$) were all higher than the means from the British population. This suggests the sample did not come from the British population as taken from the British norm data.

The statistics also showed that the means for the emotional symptoms scale at Time Two, ($t(74) = -4.623, p < 0.05$), was significantly different to the means taken from the British population norms. However, the sample mean for the emotional scale at Time One was found to have a lower mean ($M = 0.73$) than the population mean.

**4.4 Comparing the Research Sample to the Classification of the SDQ Scores**

The Chi-Square Goodness-of-Fit Test (See Table 3) was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the research sample compared to the expected values.
according to the classification of the SDQ scores by Goodman
(http://www.sdqinfo.com/ScoreSheets/e1.pdf) in order to identify likely cases of mental
health disorders. According to the classification it is expected that 10% of the research
sample scores fall into the abnormal band, 10% into the borderline band and 80% into the
normal band. See Appendix 9 for the scores for each band.

Accordingly, the expected number of children from the research sample for the norm band
was (N= 60), the abnormal band (N=7.5) and the borderline band (N=7.5). The observed
number in these three bands showed the actual number of children that fell into each band.
Comparisons were made between the observed value and the expected value for each scale at
Time One and Time Two.
**Table 3**

*Chi-Square Test statistics and frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales and Scores</th>
<th>Observed N for Normal band</th>
<th>Observed N for Borderline band</th>
<th>Observed N for Abnormal band</th>
<th>Expected N for Normal band</th>
<th>Expected N for Borderline band</th>
<th>Expected N for Abnormal band</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro social scale at T1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro social scale at T2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.483</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity scale at T1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity scale at T2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional symptoms scale at T1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional symptoms scale at T2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>No value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct problems scale at T1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct problems scale at T2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer problems scale at T1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer problems scale at T2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.267</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difficulties score at T1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difficulties score at T2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.933</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics indicate that there was no significant difference between the observed sample compared to the expected value for the pro social scale, the hyperactivity scale, the conduct problems scale, the peer problems scale and the total difficulties scores at Time One, as well as the conduct problems scale and pro social scale at Time Two. This means that these scales are in line with the expectations classified by Goodman.

However, the test showed that there was a significant difference between the observed sample compared to the expected values for the emotional symptoms scale at Time One, $\chi^2(2, n = 75) = 7.1017, p > 0.030$. The test showed that for the emotional symptoms scale at Time Two only normal and abnormal bands were observed.

A significant difference was also found the hyperactivity scale at Time Two, $\chi^2(2, n = 75) = 10.350, p > 0.006$; the peer problems at Time Two, $\chi^2(2, n = 75) = 6.267, p > 0.044$ and the total difficulties score at Time Two, $\chi^2(2, n = 75) = 8.933, p > 0.011$. This suggests that these scales are different to the expectations as classified by Goodman.

Section Five: Discussion and Strengths and Limitation of Study

The section below critically discusses the above results in light of the findings of Paper One and its implications for schools and EPs. The following section considers the strengths and limitations of the study.

5.1 Discussion

The results reveal mixed findings regarding the effectiveness of the NA. However, by focusing on the total difficulties scale alone, it is fair to conclude that the NA is an effective means of improving behaviour, in general terms. Yet, for schools that may have specific behavioural concerns, this evidence is insufficient to make a fully informed decision on
whether developing a personalised approach similar to the NA would meet the behavioural needs of their children. This is resolved when we consider the five scale scores.

The results of three of the five behaviour scales have revealed a significant improvement over the course of the study. The results show that the hyperactivity levels, emotional symptoms and peer problems have decreased. This evidence suggests that the NA was effective in improving the children’s behaviour in these three areas and that it may be ideal for schools that are experiencing these specific behaviour problems with their children. However, a critical reflection of the NA is that it is in its early stages of development and will evolve over time, and therefore it is difficult to apply this exact approach to another school. However, what can be applied is the underlying essence of the NA which uses the PSHCE objectives to teach EL. This raises the question as to whether certain PSHCE objectives are responsible for the improvement of certain behaviours which would require further research to determine. This would have direct implications for schools that chose to develop a personalised approach to teaching EL by guiding them as to which PSHCE objectives need to be included for effective EL teaching.

The result of the pro social behaviour was not anticipated and somewhat disappointing as it revealed a decline in the children’s pro social behaviour over the course of the study. However, subsequent analysis undertaken to strengthen the study due to the lack of a control group shed a positive light on the findings. These tests revealed that even with the decline in pro social behaviour they remained within the normal band. A critical analysis of these results would suggest that the evidence is insufficient to conclude that this decline is continuous and that a later assessment would help determine this and is advised.

In terms of the SDQs, the pro social behaviour scale tests children’s consideration of the feelings of others, their helpfulness if someone is hurt or upset, their kindness to younger
children, volunteering to help others and well as sharing readily with other children. As these 
pro social behaviours are important for children, the results suggest that schools should 
consider the choice of PSHCE objectives that are being used more carefully and perhaps 
include additional objectives that would directly address pro social behaviour. This is 
supported by a comment made by one teacher from Paper One.

There might be some times when you have to change or do something to bring out a 
skill that did not come out from the lesson, but I suppose it would happen based on 
your assessment as you teach, or as you see children interacting with each other, and 
something that keeps – that is happening consistently – do I need to have just a lesson 
on this behaviour? So I think at some point maybe things will change to include other 
things so that things that you pick up in your class that you need a whole lesson on.
(Ms. Grey, Year 3/4)

EPs are able to use their consultative roles and their psychological knowledge to help identify 
certain PSHCE objectives that may bring about improvement in particular behaviours.

Results of the conduct problem behaviours revealed that no significant improvement was 
made over the course of the study. However, a critical analysis of the results showed that 
although there was no significant change there was some change suggesting potential 
improvement. This is supported by subsequent tests that reveal that at the start of the study 
the conduct problem behaviour amongst the children in this research were significantly 
different to the British norms and were in fact higher (i.e. worse). However, by the end of the 
research they were in line with the British norms, thus suggesting that perhaps the time 
between both measurements was not long enough for a significant improvement to have 
occurred.
Although the findings have produced mixed results, these results can be seen as encouraging for this school in that their NA produced some positive change in the children’s behaviour. However, a major limitation of this study is the lack of a control group due to time limitations that resulted as the initial research plans were terminated and therefore a critical discussion of these results in terms of the school’s history of teaching EL is crucial when interpreting these findings.

Prior to the development of the NA, the school had used PATHS to teach EL. According to the findings from Paper One, teachers have reported benefits from teaching PATHS.

Even though we’re not teaching PATHS, helps me… helps to guide my PSHCE lessons. I know what to look for now, what to model, what I want to teach the children. I think it was really helpful in getting me to understand what is needed to be taught to primary level as far as emotional intelligence. (Ms. White)

Thus it can be argued that the PATHS curriculum has played a role in increasing the teachers’ knowledge of EL and that it had allowed them to experience the use of strategies and understand the progressive nature of EL development through the structured PATHS lessons. This would suggest that the effectiveness of their NA is a result of teaching PATHS. This is further supported by the interview findings in Paper One. The participants had recommended the PATHS curriculum to teachers and schools that do not have a lot of experience in teaching EL. They felt that PATHS would be ideal due to the depth and details of the PATHS curriculum.

The recognition of the role of the PATHS curriculum in the effectiveness of NA in terms of the knowledge and experience it has provided is supported by findings obtained from research in challenging behaviour. Male (2003) addressed a gap in the study of challenging
behaviour by researching teachers’ perspectives. His findings suggested a possible influence of teachers’ qualifications and experience on their beliefs and actions. It was found that experience and qualification together allowed teachers to ascribe reasons for the behaviour and select appropriate strategies. Additional qualification did not seem to make the teachers feel more effective nor did it appear to give them more knowledge and awareness of a range of strategies. This would suggest that the experience gained from PATHS was perhaps pertinent in the effectiveness of the NA. This implies that EPs need to consider the school’s experience of EL in determining the level and type of support they give and that support should focus on the teachers first. Programmes such as PATHS can be used to develop the understanding and build experience of the teaching of EL. This is particularly important if and when schools plan to develop their own personalised approach. The use of PATHS as a framework for the development of EL teaching skills also enables the EP to provide more focused support given their wide ranging mandate. This potential role of PATHS as a teaching tool needs further research.

Another explanation for the findings can also be linked to the school’s experience with PATHS but in terms of its effects on the children. It may be argued the effectiveness of the NA is due to the continuing effects of PATHS on the children. For example, the PATHS programme provided the children with self-regulating strategies. ‘The Turtle’ is a self-control strategy that encourages children to go into themselves on an interpersonal level giving them time to think through their emotions before they respond. From the interviews in Paper One teachers reported that some of the children were still using it even after the school had discontinued the implementation of the PATHS curriculum.
The experience of PATHS and the teachers’ perceptions of its practical limitations may have also had an effect on the findings of this study. For example, the class teachers commented on the extent of adaption of the PATHS material and the time constraints both in terms of allocated time and the time of day EL was taught. These issues were resolved in their current approach, as the PSHCE objectives were inter-woven into the day to day lesson plans. This lessened the teachers’ workload and the NA was a more effective use of time. This finding has direct implications for EPs and schools as it is important that the practicalities of any approach, readymade or personalised are considered in order to ensure effective implementation. This is supported by the view of one teacher.

*I mean that’s time we’re talking about, so... it’s more likely to be left in favour of something else. It’s going to be less effective. You know if I have a choice between spending time on PATHS and math, I’m always going to choose math. You know there’s no longer a choice for me, it’s always going to be that choice, so the less adaptation, better pitch [so] it’s going to be used more and be more effective.* (Mr. Brown, Year 5/6)

### 5.2 Strengths and Limitations of Study

The overall findings suggest that the new approach (NA) has produced a significant change in the outcome of children as measured by the SDQ scores. However, this does not mean that the null hypotheses is true as the significant test statistics are based on probabilistic reasoning, thus limiting what can be concluded. For this reason it is important to consider other plausible explanations for the improved outcome in terms of the methodological limitations and possible threats to the internal validity.
Maturation and history threats are limitations to this study. Maturation is a threat that suggests that change and development in the children which was unrelated to the NA may have contributed to the findings. The history threat for this research is that external factors have changed the children’s behaviour or the teachers’ responses rather than the NA itself. These threats could be reduced with the use of a control group or a randomised design. Time and practicality limitations precluded the use of either method for this study. Moreover, the use of control groups in social science research presents its own problems as discussed in Section 2.6 of Paper One. Other limitations stem from the selected measure. Firstly, it is important to note that because the initial research project was discarded, the baseline measures that were initially collected had to be utilised as advised by the University of Exeter. Unfortunately, negotiations with the school meant that the Emotional Literacy Inventory could not be used as it was felt it would be disruptive to the children during an important time of year. The SDQs was therefore the only measure that was used.

The advantages of using the SDQ is that its validity have been established, as the SDQ was administered then evaluated against the Rutter Parent and Teacher questionnaires (Goodman, 1997). Also, it is a quick and easy measure to administer. The SDQ has also been used to evaluate interventions using a before and after design in educational settings, for example, Curtis et al., 2007. In addition, the recorded change in the behaviours suggests that the SDQ was an appropriate measure and further strengthens and supports the emotion-behaviour relationship discussed in the literature review.

The instructions for the use of the SDQs for children under 11 requires that SDQs need to be completed by teachers, thereby eliminating the criticisms made of self-reports in that they assume that the children are aware of their own feelings. However, the use of teachers completed SDQs is open to criticism of participant bias, particularly as they expressed that the NA was better suited to them, which could explain the scores obtained. Using additional
assessments, completed by the children would produce a more comprehensive picture of the outcomes of the NA. However, time limitations due to changes in the initial research did not allow for this.

Despite the limitations mentioned above, the overall research is strengthened by triangulating the data from Paper One with Paper Two and tests were conducted to take account of the lack of a control group.

Section Six: Conclusion

It is evident from the results of this research that there was a statistically significant improvement in the general behaviour of the children in the study school. Due to the many factors involved it is not possible to conclude that this positive outcome was produced by the NA alone, however the interviews with the teachers support that introduction of the NA was a key contributor to the results. However, it is not possible to separate the part that NA itself from the potential on-going impact that the PATHS programme that preceded it.

This finding has an important implication for the implementation of an EL programme in that continuous assessment of the programme is necessary in order provide a feedback loop to identify areas for improvement and development irrespective of the approach taken.

A key finding of this research is that the proposed feedback process should include the views of teachers as well as the effects on the children. This is especially important to ensure that the practicalities of the selected approach to implement EL are fully considered to assure effective implementation. Indeed is likely that the decision to shift from PATHS to a more personalised approach (NA) in the study school was a direct result of the teacher’s unease
with PATHS in terms of the time constraints it imposed and that the material was not suited to their children.

The research has identified that the use of teachers as a source for data and assessment of EL programmes has largely been ignored and should be the subject for future research.

It is evident that although the teachers preferred the personalised approach they recognised the value of PATHS in that it provided a structured introduction to the aims of EL without which the subsequent development of the NA programme may have been more difficult. The implication of this is that the teaching of EL requires a multifaceted approach that utilises the full spectrum of techniques from explicit methods such as PATHS to more implicit programmes such as NA.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Overview of PATHS; the Conceptual Models and the Curriculum

The PATHS curriculum is a preventative intervention that was developed by Greenberg and Kusché (1994) in the US in response to the criminal violence epidemic in the 1990’s (Blueprints for violence prevention, 1998, 2002). It is a comprehensive, developmentally-based curriculum, aimed at promoting emotional and social competence as well as reducing aggression, behaviour and emotional difficulties and decreasing risk factors related to later maladjustment. It was designed to be taught by teachers in elementary schools (Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2). The programme is taught 3 times a week for a minimum of 20-30 minutes a day and is also meant to be integrated into the regular yearlong curriculum (e.g. the national curriculum) where aspects of PATHS can also be used outside the classroom.

Conceptual Models

The PATHS curriculum is based on four conceptual models as under:

a) The first is the affective-behavioural-cognitive-dynamic model of development (ABCD). This is a hybrid model which takes account of developmental integration of affect, behaviour and cognition in terms of social and emotional competence. It is understood from the ABCD model that emotional development precedes cognition due to the maturational process and it is the affective development that acts as a precursor to the other forms of thinking that become integrated with cognitive and linguistic functions. The ability to label the emotional states is key in the ABCD model. Children are encouraged to express emotions, as it is believed that it will facilitate effective self-control and act as a precursor for optimal problem resolution.

b) The second is based on an eco-behavioural systems model where simultaneous focus on the child and the environment are deemed important to bring about positive change via teaching skills, creating meaningful real-life opportunities to use the skills and reinforcement for applying the skills effectively. PATHS focuses on promoting developmental skills and changing children’s behaviour as well as changing teachers’ behaviour, so that the teacher-child relationship and the classroom and school-level procedures support the children’s needs (Greenberg and Kusché, 1993).

c) The third model is based on the neurobiology and brain organization that incorporates vertical communication between the limbic system and the frontal lobes as well as horizontal communication between the left and right hemispheres. The vertical control refers to the higher order processing where emotional information is first perceived and processed in the limbic system before being transmitted to the frontal lobes for further processing. Information can then be transmitted back to the limbic system to modify emotional signals and actions. There are few interconnections between the limbic system and frontal lobes during early development which increase with maturation. The ability to regulate does not occur automatically since it needs to be learnt. This concept is reflected in PATHS as it teaches children to practice conscious strategies (e.g. self-talk) for self-control (e.g. using the Control Signals Poster, or the Turtle Technique) as well as labelling emotions to help manage
emotions and behaviour. The horizontal communication refers to information processing that occurs in the left (where the receptive and expressive language is processed) and right hemisphere (where comfortable and uncomfortable receptive and uncomfortable expressive affect) of the neocortex (Bryden and Ley, 1983). The corpus callosum is a bridge between the two hemispheres which allows for communication. For conscious awareness of emotional experiences, the emotions need to be verbally labelled and transmitted to the left hemisphere. Based on this concept, PATHS is able to theoretically rationalize the use of Feeling Face cards, the Turtle Technique etc. as a way to get children to verbalize and label their emotions in order to strengthen the neural interconnections and help manage their emotions and behaviour.

d) The fourth model is based on applied psychoanalysis, where the psychoanalytic theory is central to the development of PATHS, thus distinguishing it from other social learning curricula. It moves away from a teaching model to one that provides opportunities for internalization, personality maturation and cognitive growth. The problem here is that though there are many theoretical orientations of psychoanalysis, most stem from the Freudian psychoanalysis, the developers have not been explicit of the exact sources and theories they have used to derive their conceptual models. However, the rationale for the types of opportunities provided is logical and stems from the conceptual models.

Overview of the PATHS Curriculum

The PATHS curriculum was developed to address the need for a comprehensive developmentally based curriculum which considers the social and emotional aspects of learning for all children in a primary school setting. The main goals of the PATHS curriculum includes optimizing the developmental growth, the promotion and improvement of emotional literacy and social competence, alleviation and prevention of emotional stress, enhancing student-teacher relationships and creating a positive learning environment.

The PATHS curriculum covers four conceptual units (readiness and self-control, feelings and relationships, problem solving and supplementary lessons) which are contained over six volumes. Each volume contains lessons, teacher transcripts, photographs and pictures, activity sheets, home activities, and letters and information about each volume for parents.

Each unit covers 5 major conceptual domains and the learning is integrated with the preceding unit (self-control, emotional understanding, building self-esteem, relationships and interpersonal problem solving skills).

The lessons are sequenced in increasing developmental difficulty and include extensive generalization techniques for transferring skills to other aspects of the school day as well as transferring skills to the home.

The preventative intervention is based on 4 assumptions:
1) Children’s ability to understand their emotions may be related to their behaviour (Greenberg, Kuschè and Speltz, 1990)

2) Children’s ability to manage discuss and understand their emotions occur under developmental constraints (Saarni and Harris, 1989)

3) Children’s ability to understand their own emotions as well as the emotions of others is a central component of effective problem solving.

4) The school environment is a fundamental ecology and one that has the potential of being a central locus of change.

The curriculum has been developed to be user friendly for all involved. PATHS needs to sessions take place of minimum of 3 times a week by trained teachers, but it is not limited to these times and that the process and generalization of the program throughout the school day is equally crucial.
Appendix 2: The Turtle

PATHS contains “The Self Control Unit” (The Turtle)

This unit is aimed at helping children gain better self-control and is seen as necessary for being able to attend to the remainder of the curriculum. This Unit is used for children with significant language delays, cognitive delays and or behaviour problems.

The Turtle Technique teaches self-control on an interpersonal level rather than an academic level. The Turtle technique consists of a series of lessons where children are told a story about a young turtle that has interpersonal and academic difficulties because he/she does not stop to think before he/she acts. The young turtle acts aggressively and impulsively because he/she does not manage uncomfortable feelings. With the help of a wise old turtle the young turtle learns to develop better self-control. This involves the young turtle going into his/her shell to ‘stop and think’ about their problem and label their feelings. This is seen as important as it is needed for problem solving.

There is a script for the Turtle Story with drawings that help illustrate each section of the story that teachers can use.
Appendix 3: PSHCE Guidelines


It presents the objectives and what the children should be taught.

**Knowledge, skills and understanding**

**Developing confidence and responsibility and making the most of their abilities**

1. Pupils should be taught:
   a. to recognise what they like and dislike, what is fair and unfair, and what is right and wrong
   b. to share their opinions on things that matter to them and explain their views
   c. to recognise, name and deal with their feelings in a positive way
   d. to think about themselves, learn from their experiences and recognise what they are good at
   e. How to set simple goals.

**Preparing to play an active role as citizens**

2. Pupils should be taught:
   a. to take part in discussions with one other person and the whole class
   b. to take part in a simple debate about topical issues
   c. to recognise choices they can make, and recognise the difference between right and wrong
   d. to agree and follow rules for their group and classroom, and understand how rules help them
   e. to realise that people and other living things have needs, and that they have responsibilities to meet them
   f. that they belong to various groups and communities, such as family and school
   g. what improves and harms their local, natural and built environments and about some of the ways people look after them
   h. to contribute to the life of the class and school
   i. to realise that money comes from different sources and can be used for different purposes.

**Developing a healthy, safer lifestyle**

3. Pupils should be taught:
   a. how to make simple choices that improve their health and well-being
   b. to maintain personal hygiene
   c. how some diseases spread and can be controlled
   d. about the process of growing from young to old and how people’s needs change
   e. the names of the main parts of the body
   f. that all household products, including medicines, can be harmful if not used properly
   g. rules for, and ways of, keeping safe, including basic road safety, and about people who can help them to stay safe.
Developing good relationships and respecting the differences between people

4. Pupils should be taught:
   a. to recognise how their behaviour affects other people
   b. to listen to other people, and play and work cooperatively
   c. to identify and respect the differences and similarities between people
   d. that family and friends should care for each other
   e. That there are different types of teasing and bullying, that bullying is wrong, and how to get help to deal with bullying.

Explanatory text
Note for 2a, 2b

Cross reference to English

En1 Speaking and listening: Group discussion and interaction

3. To join in as members of a group, pupils should be taught to:
   a. take turns in speaking
   b. relate their contributions to what has gone on before
   c. take different views into account
   d. extend their ideas in the light of discussion
   e. give reasons for opinions and actions

Note for 2g

Cross reference to geography

Geographical enquiry and skills

1. In undertaking geographical enquiry, pupils should be taught to:
   c. express their own views about people, places and environments [for example, about litter in the school]

Knowledge and understanding of environmental change and sustainable development

5. Pupils should be taught to:
   a. recognise changes in the environment [for example, traffic pollution in a street]
   b. recognise how the environment may be improved and sustained [for example, by restricting the number of cars]

Cross reference to science

Sc2 Life processes and living things: Living things in their environment

5. Pupils should be taught to:
   c. care for the environment

Note for 3a

Cross reference to physical education

Knowledge and understanding of fitness and health
4. Pupils should be taught:
   a. how important it is to be active  
   b. to recognise and describe how their bodies feel during different activities

   *Note for 3d-3f*

   **Cross reference to science**

   **Sc2 Life processes and living things: Humans and other animals**

2. Pupils should be taught:
   a. to recognise and compare the main external parts of the bodies of humans and other animals  
   b. that humans and other animals need food and water to stay alive  
   c. that taking exercise and eating the right types and amounts of food help humans to keep healthy  
   d. about the role of drugs as medicines  
   e. how to treat animals with care and sensitivity  
   f. that humans and other animals can produce offspring and that these offspring grow into adults  
   g. about the senses that enable humans and other animals to be aware of the world around them

   *Note for 3g*

   **Cross reference to design and technology**

   **Working with tools, equipment, materials and components to make quality products**

2. Pupils should be taught to:
   f. follow safe procedures for food safety and hygiene

   **Breadth of opportunities**

5. During the key stage, pupils should be taught the Knowledge, skills and understanding through opportunities to:
   a. take and share responsibility [for example, for their own behaviour; by helping to make classroom rules and following them; by looking after pets well]  
   b. feel positive about themselves [for example, by having their achievements recognised and by being given positive feedback about themselves]  
   c. take part in discussions [for example, talking about topics of school, local, national, European, Commonwealth and global concern, such as 'where our food and raw materials for industry come from']  
   d. make real choices [for example, between healthy options in school meals, what to watch on television, what games to play, how to spend and save money sensibly]  
   e. meet and talk with people [for example, with outside visitors such as religious leaders, police officers, the school nurse]  
   f. develop relationships through work and play [for example, by sharing equipment with other pupils or their friends in a group task]  
   g. consider social and moral dilemmas that they come across in everyday life [for example, aggressive behaviour, questions of fairness, right and wrong, simple political issues, use of money, simple environmental issues]  
   h. Ask for help [for example, from family and friends, midday supervisors, older pupils, the police].
Appendix 4: An Overall Timeline for Paper One and Paper Two.

The time line for both papers is presented above. As the current research was a result of the school ceasing the implementation of PATHS it is included in the time line.
## Appendix 5: The Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions on teachers’ understanding of EL</th>
<th>Questions focused on PATHS</th>
<th>Questions focused on the new approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does EL mean to you?</td>
<td>What was your overall experience of PATHS?</td>
<td>What is your overall experience of the new approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: maybe focus on you as a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does it mean to be an EL teacher?</td>
<td>What worked well?</td>
<td>What works well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does it mean to be part of a school that addresses EL?</td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: maybe focus on a particular child, or PATHS lesson</td>
<td>Can you think of an example of it working well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Maybe focus on particular child/children, or a particular lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why do you think it worked well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Maybe focus on a particular element of the task, or the child/children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What part made it work well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you promote EL?</td>
<td>Is there anything that didn’t work well?</td>
<td>Is there anything that doesn’t work well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you give me an example of how you promote EL in your class?</td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Maybe focus on a particular element of the task, or the child/children</td>
<td>Could you give an example?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think promoting EL is important?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Maybe focus on a particular element of the task, or the child/children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Anything more</td>
<td></td>
<td>What would have worked better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: Maybe focus on what you would do differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt</strong>: What would you do to make it more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Prompt**: Any additional questions or probes to clarify or explore specific topics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you see EL fitting in to the school environment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prompt: maybe focus on the school ethos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this ideal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you see the EL fitting in to your class?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the way it fits in your class ideal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Maybe focus on why it may/may not be ideal, give an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you change/do differently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has PATHS worked for the children?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you know that it has/hasn’t worked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Give me an example that it has worked hasn’t worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspect(s) of PATHS do you think are responsible for it to work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> What parts of PATHS do you think makes it effective/non effective for the children?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why is PATHS no longer implemented?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about it no longer being implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> What is your personal views of it no longer being implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the new approach ideal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give an explanation of why you think it is or isn’t ideal. Please use examples to explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you improve this new approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think it needs to be changed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you recommend PATHS to a teacher at another school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why would you/wouldn’t you recommend it to another school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you recommend the new approach to a teacher at another school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why would you/wouldn’t you recommend it to another school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ideas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think it would have worked better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> why do you think such changes would work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> You can use and example to illustrate your ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a teacher, what type of support did you get in implementing PATHS?</th>
<th>As a teacher, what type of support did you get in implementing the new approach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Maybe focus on what you got within the school/ externally.</td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Maybe focus on what you got within the school/ externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this support helpful? Why? Why not?</td>
<td>Was this helpful? Why? Why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you have preferred?</td>
<td>What would you have preferred?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> What support would have been more helpful?</td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> What support would have been more helpful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think this would have worked better?</td>
<td>Why do you think this would have worked better?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PATHS is a very well researched program. There is a lot of evidence that points to it being a universally effective program. Why do you think it didn’t work? | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------| |
| **Prompt:** Maybe focus on the curriculum/the children/the teachers. | |

<p>| Is PATHS for every school? <strong>Prompt:</strong> Do you think it works for every school? | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------| |
| Is PATHS for every child? | Why do/don’t you think it |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is for every child?</td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Do you think it works for every child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of child do you see it not working for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you know now about PATHS that you wish you knew before the program was implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> what advice would you give other teachers who want to use PATHS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you gain from implementing PATHS as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Maybe focus on the way you teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How has PATHS changed you as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prompt:</strong> Has PATHS changed you in any other way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What part of PATHS do you see as being the most effective with the children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is it about (what’s mentioned above) that makes it effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What Part of PATHS do you not perceive as being effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What part of PATHS did the children most enjoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why do you think that might be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me an example of how you know they were enjoying it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What part of PATHS did the children not enjoy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think that might be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me an example of why that might be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Six Phase step-by-step Guide


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of thematic analysis</th>
<th>Phase Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Thematic Maps and Codes and their Associated Meanings.

There are six thematic maps that were developed as part of the data analysis from Paper One. The research questions are presented along with their thematic maps. Two thematic maps are presented for each research question. Below each thematic map, a table of the codes used and their associated meanings are presented. The research questions are placed in the same order as presented in paper one for ease of reference.

**Research Question One**

*What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing PATHS?*

**Diagram 1: A thematic map presenting the strengths of the PATHS curriculum.**
Table 1: codes and associated meaning for PATHS strengths theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Codes and associated meaning</th>
<th>Associated meaning/s of code expanded</th>
<th>Further expansion of associated meaning/s of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATHS strengths</strong></td>
<td>Outcome Positive effects of teaching PATHS.</td>
<td>Benefit of teaching PATHS All positive outcomes that have come out of teaching and being taught the PATHS curriculum.</td>
<td>For the children Benefits experienced by the children from being taught the PATHS curriculum For the teachers Benefits for the teachers gained by teaching the PATHS curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Positive outcome due to implementing PATHS.</td>
<td>Material This includes all material provided in the PATHS curriculum including the lesson plans.</td>
<td>Discrete lesson Set time designated to teach a PATHS lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 2: A thematic map presenting the limitation of the PATHS curriculum.
Table 2: codes and associated meaning for PATHS limitation theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme One</th>
<th>Codes and associated meaning</th>
<th>Associated meaning of code expanded</th>
<th>Further expansion of associated meaning/s of codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATHS Limitations</td>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>All time related difficulties this includes the actual delivery of PATHS and the time related constraints that happens in order for teachers to deliver PATHS</td>
<td>Actual time of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>This includes all material provided in the PATHS curriculum including the lesson plans.</td>
<td>Adapting</td>
<td>Quantity and extent of adaptation of material/activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support received</td>
<td>Support received by teachers in delivering the PATHS curriculum. This includes support from within the school and support from the EPS.</td>
<td>Lack of team teaching</td>
<td>Teaching is done by modelling a lesson and having a more experienced person observe and help a new teacher in delivering the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Strategies are the techniques used to help support the children regulate their own behaviour, e.g., the turtle.</td>
<td>No alternatives</td>
<td>The lack of alternative strategies that is better suited to certain children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two:  
*What are the teachers’ understanding of the strengths and limitations of implementing the new personalised approach?*

Diagram 3: A thematic map presenting the strengths of the new personalized approach.

Table 3: codes and associated meaning for Strength of NA theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme four</th>
<th>Codes and associated meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of New Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSHCE objective driven approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive outcomes due to the PSHCE objective driven approach. Explicit thought on how EL is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporated into the existing framework. EL teaching pervades all aspects of teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Lesson planning and sharing of ideas in a group of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No confined to an EL lesson</strong></td>
<td>No set time designated to teach and promote EL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram 4: A thematic map presenting the limitations of the new personalized approach.

Table 4: codes and associated meaning for the limitation of NA theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Three</th>
<th>Codes and associated meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limitation of New Approach</td>
<td>Time constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All time related difficulties experienced when teaching the NA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including PSHCE into lessons</td>
<td>Including PSHCE into lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties that have presented themselves due to including the PSHCE objectives into daily lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment tool</td>
<td>No assessment tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of assessment tool or means to assess the New approach used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question three:

What are the implications of these understandings? How can they be used to inform other schools in their efforts to teach EL?
Diagram 5: A thematic map presenting advice for teachers and schools considering the PATHS curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Codes and associated meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice for other teachers and schools who are considering the PATHS curriculum as a means of teaching EL.</td>
<td>Use Other Material Using material and resources that have not come from the PATHS curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand your School Being aware of the context of the school; the culture, the school ethos, the school’s policies and the teacher’s experience of teaching EL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Knowledge of the Children Being aware of the children’s abilities, interests, experiences and their actual EL development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the Curriculum This includes understanding the principles and objectives of PATHS and the familiarization of the material and lessons. Consider whether it is relevant for the children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of support This includes support teachers felt that would better prepare them to teach and implement PATHS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 6: A thematic map of the possible improvements to the NA.
### Theme five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible improvements of the New Approach</th>
<th>Codes and associated meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating an EL lesson</td>
<td>Creating a specific allocated time to teaching EL in order to teach EL explicitly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking knowledge from other schools</td>
<td>Getting information from other schools about how they promote EL, what they are using and doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a success criteria</td>
<td>Developing a way to assess the NA to determine whether the PSHCE objectives are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every child Matters</td>
<td>Including every child and considering every child when teaching EL and assessing the NA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 8: Overview of the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)**
The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) has been designed to meet the needs of researchers and educationalists. Concerns around its validity have been established as the SDQ was administered then evaluated against the Rutter Parent and Teacher questionnaires Goodman (1997). Scores showed high correlations between the two questionnaires.

The SDQ is designed for children between the ages of 4 to 16, and is completed by teachers and parents. The SDQ is composed of 25 items which are divided between 5 scales of 5 items each. The 5 scales are:

1. Emotional Symptoms (5 items)
2. Conduct Problems (5 items)
3. Hyperactivity/Inattention (5 items)
4. Peer Relationship Problems (5 items)
5. Pro-Social Behaviour (5 items)

Each item can be marked, not true, somewhat true or certainly true, and are scored with a mark of 0, 1, 2 respectively, except for 5 items which are scored in reverse. The score for each scale is the added up together to make up a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of 10.

Appendix 9: Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire
The SDQ is taken from [www.sdqinfo.org](http://www.sdqinfo.org). Below is an example of the SDQ, information on scoring and the classification of normal, abnormal and borderline bands.

### Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

For each item, please mark the box for Not True, Somewhat True or Certainly True. It would help us if you answered all items as best you can even if you are not absolutely certain of the item comes from. Please give your answers on the basis of the child’s behaviour over the last two months or this school year.

**Child’s Name**: 

**Date of Birth**: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers other people’s feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often complains of headaches, stomach aches or illnesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares readily with other children (toys, games, parties etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather solitary, tends to play alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally obedient, usually does what adults request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much quieter, often seems wounded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly fidgeting or squirming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has at least one good friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often fights with other children or bullies them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often unhappy, down hearted or tearful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally liked by other children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily distracted, can concentration wander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous or clumsy in new situations, easily loses confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind to younger children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often has or shares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulled or bullied by other children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks things out before acting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks from home, school or elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets on better with adults than with other children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many fears, easily scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does tasks through to the end, good attention span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature**: 

**Date**: 

Parent/Teacher/Other (please specify)

Thank you very much for your help.
Scoring the Informant-Rated Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

The 25 items in the SDQ comprise 5 scales of 5 items each. It is usually easiest to score all 5 scales first before working out the total difficulties score. Somewhat True is always scored as 1, but the scoring of Not True and Certainly True varies with the item, as shown below scale by scale. For each of the 5 scales the score can range from 0 to 10 if all 5 items were completed. Scale score can be prorated if at least 3 items were completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Symptoms Scale</th>
<th>Net True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often complains of headaches, stomach-aches ...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many worries, often seems worried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often unhappy, downhearted or fearful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous or clingy in new situations ...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many fears, easily scared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct Problems Scale</th>
<th>Net True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally obedient, usually does what ...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often fights with other children or bullies them</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often lies or cheats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks from home, school or elsewhere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperactivity Scale</th>
<th>Net True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly fidgeting or squirming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily distracted, concentration wanders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks things out before acting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Problems Scale</th>
<th>Net True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rather solitary, tends to play alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has at least one good friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally liked by other children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked on or bullied by other children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets on better with adults than with other children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosocial Scale</th>
<th>Net True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Certainly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerate of other people's feelings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares readily with other children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful if someone is hurt, upset of feeling ill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind to younger children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often volunteers to help others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Total Difficulties Score:

is generated by summing the scores from all the scales except the prosocial scale. The resultant score can range from 0 to 40 (and is counted as missing if one of the component scores is missing).
Interpreting Symptom Scores and Defining "Caseness" from Symptom Scores

Although SDQ scores can often be used as continuous variables, it is sometimes convenient to classify scores as normal, borderline and abnormal. Using the bandings shown below, an abnormal score on one or both of the total difficulties scores can be used to identify likely "cases" with mental health disorders. This is clearly only a rough and ready method for detecting disorders — combining information from SDQ symptom and impact scores from multiple informants is better, but still far from perfect. Approximately 10% of a community sample scores in the abnormal band on any given score, with a further 10% scoring in the borderline band. The exact proportions vary according to country, age and gender — normative SDQ data are available from the web site. You may want to adjust banding and caseness criteria for these characteristics, setting the threshold higher when avoiding false positives is of paramount importance, and setting the threshold lower when avoiding false negatives is more important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Completed</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Abnormal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Difficulties Score</td>
<td>0-13</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>17-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Score</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Score</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Score</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Score</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behaviour Score</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Completed</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Abnormal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Difficulties Score</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>16-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Score</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Score</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Score</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Score</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Behaviour Score</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generating and Interpreting Impact Scores

When using a version of the SDQ that includes an "Impact Supplement", the items on overall distress and social impairment can be summed to generate an impact score that ranges from 0 to 10 for the parent-completed version and from 0-6 for the teacher-completed version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent report</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only a little</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties upset or distress child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with HOME LIFE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with FRIENDS/PLAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with CLASSROOM LEARNING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with LEISURE ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher report</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only a little</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties upset or distress child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with PEER RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interferes with CLASSROOM LEARNING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to the questions on chronicity and burden to others are not included in the impact score. When respondents have answered "no" to the first question on the impact supplement (i.e. when they do not perceive the child as having any emotional or behavioural difficulties), they are not asked to complete the questions on resultant distress or impairment; the impact score is automatically scored zero in these circumstances.

Although the impact scores can be used as continuous variables, it is sometimes convenient to classify them as normal, borderline or abnormal: a total impact score of 2 or more is abnormal; a score of 1 is borderline; and a score of 0 is normal.
## Appendix 10: Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are presented in the table below to present the characteristics of the data.

**Descriptive statistics of the five SDQ scales and the total difficulties scores.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDQ Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SDQ Scales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro social scale at T1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Min 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity scale at T1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional symptoms scale at T1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct problems scale at T1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer problems scale at T1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total difficulties score at T1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Min 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: A Test of Normality

The table below presents the normality tests for each scale at Time One and Time Two.

_A Test of Normality_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov²</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic df Sig.</td>
<td>Statistic df Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Social Scale at Time One</td>
<td>.214 75 .000</td>
<td>.905 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Social Scale at Time Two</td>
<td>.210 75 .000</td>
<td>.823 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Scale at Time One</td>
<td>.096 75 .082</td>
<td>.945 75 .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactivity Scale at Time Two</td>
<td>.252 75 .000</td>
<td>.814 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Scale at Time One</td>
<td>.268 75 .000</td>
<td>.769 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Problems Scale at Time Two</td>
<td>.371 75 .000</td>
<td>.645 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time One</td>
<td>.256 75 .000</td>
<td>.816 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time Two</td>
<td>.362 75 .000</td>
<td>.578 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Scale at Time One</td>
<td>.262 75 .000</td>
<td>.859 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems Scale at Time Two</td>
<td>.316 75 .000</td>
<td>.744 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SDQ score at Time One</td>
<td>.157 75 .000</td>
<td>.913 75 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SDQ score at Time Two</td>
<td>.181 75 .000</td>
<td>.798 75 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction
Appendix 12: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

A Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was carried out to compare the T1 scores to the T2 scores on the five SDQ scales and the total difficulties scores.

**Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro Social Scale at Time 1 - Pro Social Scale at Time 2</th>
<th>Hyperactivity Scale at Time 1 - Hyperactivity Scale at Time 2</th>
<th>Conduct Problems Scale at Time 1 - Conduct Problems Scale at Time 2</th>
<th>Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time 1 - Emotional Symptoms Scale at Time 2</th>
<th>Peer Problems Scale at Time 1 - Peer Problems Scale at Time 2</th>
<th>Total Difficulties Score at Time 1 - Total Difficulties Score at Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.685&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-5.755&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.735&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-3.615&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-3.467&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-5.687&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Based on negative ranks

b. Based on positive ranks
Appendix 13: Raw Data

The following is the raw data obtained from the SDQs which were then analysed using SPSS. There was a total of 150 SDQs completed over the course of the research.

The extensions of the abbreviations are as follow:

ID: Is the numeral identity given to each student to maintain confidentiality.

Sex: is denoted as 1 for male and 2 for female.

PS1: Pro-social behaviour score at Time 1
CP1: Conduct Problems score at Time 1
ES1: Emotional Symptoms score at Time 1
H1: Hyperactivity score at Time 1
PP1: Peer Problems score at Time 1
Total 1: Total difficulties score at Time 1

PS2: Pro-social behaviour score at Time 2
CP2: Conduct Problems score at Time 2
ES2: Emotional Symptoms score at Time 2
H2: Hyperactivity score at Time 2
PP2: Peer Problems score at Time 2
Total 2: Total difficulties score at Time 2
The table below presents the raw data for paper two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>PS1</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>CP1</th>
<th>ES1</th>
<th>PP1</th>
<th>TOTAL 1</th>
<th>PS2</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>CP2</th>
<th>ES2</th>
<th>PP2</th>
<th>TOTAL 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>43</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14: Transcript

The following is an example transcript. All names have been removed to maintain confidentiality.

[Start of recorded material]

Interviewer: I’m Nuhaila and I’m the EP for this school. I’m carrying out research to gain further insight and understanding on the teacher’s view on promoting emotional literacy, from your experience with PATHS last term and your experience so far with the new approach and the new curriculum that’s being used currently. I’d also like you to know that all the names, including your own, will be kept confidential. As the main aim here is to hear the teachers’ views on promoting emotional literacy in schools. Before we start I need to make sure you’re happy to take part and that you know you can withdraw at any point. So yeah, are you happy with that?

Respondent: I am. I’m X( name removed to maintain confidentiality), year 5 teacher, happy to take part in this study

Interviewer: I’m not sure if Alison has actually told you beforehand but I will be recording the interview. Before I do I need to make sure this is OK with you.

Respondent: I wasn’t aware of the recording but it doesn’t matter. If it’s recording or written notes it’s the same.

Interviewer: And it just kind of allows me to go back and make sure I haven’t missed anything and analyse them and really pick up the points.

Respondent: Yeah, And you’re not writing furiously..

Interviewer: Let me just try my pen. And we shall start. Just to kind of give you an idea of how the questions are laid out, first I want to know how you view emotional literacy and then we’ll focus on PATHS and then we’ll focus on the new approach. But it’s
really hard to keep everything very separate because of everything’s really interlinked, but not to worry.

Respondent: I understand.

Interviewer: Okay, so we’ll start. What does emotional literacy mean to you?

Respondent: Well I guess I’d say it’s the ability of a person to be aware of their own feelings at a given time, the causes of those feelings and the likely results. The ability of a person to be aware in a general way of their motivations, so that might be a given time but also just generally, and how that actually impacts on your experience, you know, throughout the day. And an awareness as well of other peoples’ feelings at a given time, their motivations about opinions, generally speaking. Kind, I suppose an emotional intelligent or emotional literate person would recognise their own state of mind, their own motivation, their own goals, because if they’re emotionally literate then they’re thinking, well we’ll be objective... on some level be objective driven. And recognise how they can sort of reconcile other peoples’ wants needs objectives with their own without necessarily having everyone, you know, where one person gains and everyone loses and aware... nobody gains. They try to, you know, make it a win-win by being considerate and intelligent and aware. And I guess emotional literacy in education is an attempt to create an awareness of that and build in the skills that you need to recognise those feelings of yours, feelings of other peoples, your own goals and other peoples goals, and reconcile them, usually in some kind of, you know, in this type of situation, what do you need to do? And sort of... because it’s, you know, because it is education and it is in our curriculum, it’s going to be communicated through steps that are linked, but they are kind of communicated as discrete steps, and now we do this, we notice that, we notice that so we do this, kind of the cause and effect relationship.

Interviewer: Okay, good. Onto the next question, what does it mean to be an emotional literacy teacher?

Respondent: I suppose if you’re going to be an emotional literacy teacher first thing is you have to make some attempt to be emotionally literate yourself, at least for a time. So I mean... all that means is that in the same way that you would need subject knowledge in math or writing or whatever it is, you’re going to need to understand what it is that you’re talking about. So I suppose different PSHCE curricular or curriculum will have, or kind of communicate it differently. But the
kind of basic and the same principles there aren’t they? So, but to be a teacher
you need to be aware what the programme that you’re running, how it
communicates it and what vocabulary it is using and what steps its... how the
steps are being described in that curriculum, even though they may all be based
on the same principles. And it’s about modelling emotionally literate behaviour.
It’s about modelling those learning objectives of what is happening within that
lesson. And it’s about maintaining that whenever the children are around you,
and to modelling that and using that language and that vocabulary when you
really don’t feel emotionally literate or intelligent at the time.

Interviewer: So would that mean it’s important for a teacher to be emotionally literate... to be
an emotionally literate teacher?

Respondent: Yes. Because you could very easily fall into the trap of teaching emotional literacy
as a discrete subject and then not demonstrating it throughout your working day,
and then all that learning is lost in the same way that you need to apply
knowledge and they need to see it, need to be bombarded with it all the time, on
a conscious or an unconscious level or they’re not going to learn whatever it is you
want them to learn. So you need to be doing it all the time, not just teaching it.

Interviewer: What does it mean to be part of a school that addresses emotional literacy?

Respondent: Well it means kind of what I was getting back to is the staff and their interactions
between each other and with the kids. You need to be demonstrating it all the
time. That’s a kind of... that’s on a social level and then it’s from a purely
academic level that it needs to be woven into the curriculum. I mean I’d hesitate
to say at all levels, but at all levels, you know, obviously some of the links are
tenuous and then you can also try to then create links where maybe it’s a bit thin.
But you’re definitely trying to find ways to weave it in, even mathematics or
science. Because, I mean the area you’re talking about, cause and effect, so it
might not be about how to behave in the playground. But it actually is about how
to behave in the playground because its cause and effect. So I guess it just
pervades everything that we do. For our school, lately it’s meant... I mean with
this year’s curriculum, cos we’re writing, it means making the links explicit. So the
learning objectives come from the PSHCE objectives often. Or at least you can
have the success criteria of the lesson are coming out of there.

Interviewer: Coming out of?
Respondent: Coming out of learning national curriculum with... for PSHCE. So I think I links this year, I’m more explicit anyway last year, because it’s woven into topics, woven into writing and our learning objectives are moving away from purely academic ones to thinking skills and emotional intelligence, emotional literacy objectives.

Interviewer: Okay. How do you promote emotional literacy?

Respondent: Well in... I mean everyone says their classroom’s difficult. I have a particularly emotionally immature class this year, so we do it in... we try to do all of the little things right I guess because I’ve got some really frankly immature boys, really immature boys in my class, and that has an effect on the rest of the room. So they seem to focus really, really closely on doing little things right, little details. I guess because the payoff is so quick when they do something right, you know, they may get praise or something good might happen very, very quickly, so that’s working around that. So we try to do those thing right and then as we’re talking about it, we talk about the and reflect back, that and that we’re lining up well so that means everybody gets to go outside sooner so, you know, we’re doing this right, that means that the person next to you gets to learn as well as you. And just reflecting all that all the time. This is on top of how emotional literacy is worked into our curriculum. So I guess in terms of the classroom management perspective, it’s just reflecting and modelling the behaviour all the time, while we’re doing it. When we have a problem, getting, you know, people involved to stop and go back to what we need to think about at this moment and what we need to think about in the next few minutes and how it’s going to help us tomorrow, and so what are we going to do now and making it very objective driven. Like you have your seat back, so what do we need to do? You need to do this, right let’s do this and they get... they get a very kind of step by step process. But at the same time looking ahead to the next step, like how are we going to ready for the next step. Because that next step will always involve another classmate or how you’re about to speak to an adult or, or what they’re then going to do for you if you complete those steps properly. And I think especially the boys making it a... I use the word step a lot because that’s kind of what they respond to.

Interviewer: Okay.

Respondent: So in terms of classroom management, that breaking it down step by step, great, you’ve done well, let’s, you know, this is what we’re going to do next. And then of course meeting the learning objectives. There it’s about reflecting that explicit
learning through... that we’ve done in PATHS or that we’re doing now and applying that to real world. I mean in the PATHS it maybe real world but it isn’t really, those are hypothetical situations. But in topic these are real projects that we’re working on. And writing this is a real project we’re working on. So it gives us a sense of reality that might not exist in a 20 minute PATHS session or, you know, what used to be our PSHE time. And so through our curriculum we’re trying to make it more real and relevant.

Interviewer: Okay. And why do you feel this is important?

Respondent: Well I suppose, and this is a kind of linking of PATHS now, I mean it’s actually no fault of PATHS, but, I mean PATHS has been slotted into a 20 minute timeframe in between an assembly, math class and playtime. Well, I mean when they burst out of math class, I mean they’re focus is play. It’s so PATHS can often be the 20 mins that happens before play and they’re thinking about playing and they’re just like I’m going to be quiet now so that we get to play, you know, at 11:20. So after one... yeah, like... if it’s quiet work we’re doing, how much focus is there coming through really learning? Are they just going along with this cos they want to get outside on time? And of course in 20 minutes we can do both role play and drama but then that’s real, it’s still just role play and it’s still drama it’s not actually happening. Whereas with writing, with topic, there are actual real often physical outcomes that come out of it. It may be displayed, it may be written work, it maybe something we’re going to publish, it may be an exhibition that’s covering focus this term. These are real projects that we actually need to cooperate on or they will fail, they won’t learn, there won’t be anything on the wall, there won’t be anything in your book, there won’t be anything to show to take home.

Interviewer: And is that the difference between...?

Respondent: That is the difference. Whereas when you do kind of hot seating and role-playing in drama, it’s all wonderful, but at the end of it, it was... drama was something that no-one can take away. You take it away the learning, but there’s nothing kind of permanent to hang your hat on. And having that kind of permanent outcome of project, it gives everyone a focus but it also is something that we’re all working towards as much one other person, there’s 25 other people.

Interviewer: OK, so, are there any benefits for you and the children?
Respondent: yes.

Interviewer: what do you benefit and what do the children benefit?

Respondent: Aside from the physical fact of the completed work, but become clear at work, that whole process of, you know, weeks where, or months, is... that is where the learning’s taking place, so we’re trying to [move towards is...actually after this interview, when I go back it will like for our exhibition, what do you need? And the plan was going to be... and I have ideas about what’s going to happen, but the children have said what’s going to be on exhibition. I’m going to group them but when it comes to establishing what is actually going to happen for that exhibition, that’s going to be negotiated between them and myself. And it’s in that process of negotiation and agreeing, having them agree and having them reach consensus so that they’re happy with that they’re planning to do. And they explain to me and then deal with any kind of challenges to it or questions I have about it, it’s in that negotiation, in that kind of planning process that the learning is going to be taking place. And then of course you’ve got the .. if they’re doing a photography exhibition, how are they going to arrange the cameras? How are they going to share the cameras? How are they going to let each other have the shots they need? How are they going to help each other get the shots that they want or use the shots for the best effect? How are they going to talk about it? How are they going to agree on how it’s physically to be arranged on the wall? Or how the parents who come are going to engage with it? Or anything else that’s going to go on with the display. And it’s in all that kind of group work, that ongoing group work.

Interviewer: So where does the emotional bits come into the task?

Respondent: Because it’s they are going to disagree on everything. Sorry, need to be clear. They’re going disagree on everything. I mean we take that pretty much for granted. So moving past that disagreement into like how can we discover what, you know, how can Sharon discover what Kane wants to have happen? What kind of language is going to need to use to engage with Kane? Like Kane, when can you tell that someone’s asking for your opinion? How will you then offer? Okay, now both of you will have the information that they need, what are we going to do with it? Sharon, you have... you know what Kane wants but you still want what you want. You might not what he wants, so how are we going to come to some kind of compromise? Or are we going to compromise? Why would we compromise?
Interviewer: And when is it that they learn these skills that are needed for an activity?

Respondent: Ideally they would be learning kind of... the kind of... a lot of nuts and boltsy stuff in the past sessions. But like I say, those are short and...

Interviewer: Class sessions this year or last year?

Respondent: Last year and this year. But I mean those have always been very short and, you know, I've always kind of questioned just, you know, the time of day, it’s not the time of day where you expect learning and retention.

Interviewer: That’s interesting.

Respondent: So that’s ideal...but no I’d say that learning hasn’t really taken place. It’s happening now and it’s happening in our praise for the kind of interactions that take place

Interviewer: The learning that you’re speaking of specifically would be the language that they use or...?

Respondent: The language, the steps to kind of acquiring information, how do we ask someone what they want without... and use that information in our response to them.

Interviewer: So, just to be clear, what was it about PATHS that didn’t allow for what’s happening now?

Respondent: It’s... I don’t think it’s anything in PATHS per se. Just the fact that how it is... how we applied it. The 20 minute time slot and the wrong time of day. It will always be the wrong time of day cos we have so many other things. But at the wrong time of day makes it so that... I’m not sure how effective it’s been for our group.
Interviewer: Okay, so if you could change when it would all occur instead of after maths, before playtime, what would have been more ideal?

Respondent: Well that’s the problem isn’t it? Since there’s no solution to that, that’s why 11 o’clock, when would I do it? I suppose I would do it in between the afternoon session so it would break up the first session in the afternoon and the second, cos there’s period after lunch where that, you know, they just come in after lunch and they’re all very excited harness or they’re a zombie like. So I guess that first kind of half an hour often you’re really building them up towards learning. By 2 o’clock and a little bit after, they’re up there again, they’re kind of ready to go again. And then there’s a lull again towards the end of the day. That kind of peak in between those two sessions would be a great 10 minutes or a great 15 minutes to get some work in where they would remember the language of all this. If we’re going to do it. You could also argue that we don’t need to but we maybe working it into the curriculum and using the language then and really we don’t need to spend another 10 minutes learning words and learning steps to...

Interviewer: So how do you see emotion literacy fitting in to the school ethos?

Respondent: I suppose we have a Rye Oak code which is what does it really... it’s some behaviours that we... that are positive. And I mean because it’s a code, there’s no kind of explanation of it or elaboration on it. And I think emotional literacy is an elaboration on how... why those behaviours are useful to the individual and how we go about doing it ourselves and encouraging other people to do it.

Interviewer: Okay. And how do you see emotional literacy fitting into your classroom?

Respondent: I guess because my classroom changes throughout the day, so the answer to that would be different. I suppose in my kind of home form, that I only see in the afternoon, there it’s... I don’t really see them at all in the morning cos I don’t have them. It is through the topic, it is through a group... our group of regular projects. And how we cooperate to keep the classroom, you know, a nice place to be. But you wouldn’t need to keep it tidy, just to take care of all of these things. And then encouraging others to take responsibility without being aggressive. That’s something that my class is struggling with. They’re all about other people taking responsibility for actions but I think they’re at a stage now where they’re willing to do and they’re able to take responsibility quite often. They want others to do it and they’re still at the stage where they want it to happen but they’re very
aggressive about it. So we’re learning to encourage people through our own kind of modelling and our own behaviour, I’m talking about the children and not just adults.

Interviewer: Yeah. So how... what would you like to change or do differently in your classroom? I mean reflecting on your past experience?

Respondent: What would I like to change or do differently? Right now, you mean what would...?

Interviewer: In terms of promoting emotional literacy in the children.

Respondent: I don’t know if there’s anything I’d like to do differently because we’re... I mean I don’t know about the outcome, but we’re getting there, so I would say there’s nothing that I want to do differently but I would want a different outcome if you know what I mean.

Interviewer: What was the outcome? What are you talking about?

Respondent: I guess we’re trying to move to a class that will, you know, we are showing respect for each other where we’re not blaming other people for things that we’ve done, that we recognise that other people want different things than we do.

Interviewer: So the outcome meaning what’s happening and occurring currently.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. I’m going to move the focus to PATHS.

Respondent: Sure.
Interviewer: And we’ll start off with a general question. So what was your overall experience of PATHS last year?

Respondent: My overall experience last year… [pause] I thought that… I mean I was kind of disappointed with PATHS I suppose because again I think it was less about the programme and more about the time of day. So the children who needed PATHS the most were the least engaged in it. And the children who needed it the least were the most engaged. We have children, you know, producing work, producing outcomes, who… and it was great, but then the children who really needed it weren’t really involved in discussions or were just kind of laying off, you know, if I don’t do anything or if I just contribute a little bit and don’t actually think too much about what I’m doing, well after 10 minutes it’s over, it’s finished and we’ve moved onto something else. So they were kind of like just look for a chance to get away with it. Cos they wouldn’t necessarily be… they weren’t necessarily doing something they’d be interested in.

Interviewer: Can I just check, what year group were you teaching?

Respondent: Last year it was Year 5’s.

Interviewer: Oh you had Year 5’s.

Respondent: Year 5’s, these are the Year 6’s now.

Interviewer: So for you the main issue around PATHS last year wasn’t the programme, it was when it kind of took place for the children to be engaged with it.

Respondent: Yeah. The main thing is timetable. There are also some kind of problems I had with the programme as well, but that’s secondary to the timetable.

Interviewer: So what about the problems with the programme?
Respondent: The principles are great and the learning objectives are great. And absolutely relevant but I think the language that was used and the kind of the material as it was presented to the teacher, so like the example texts, the suggestive kind of role plays, the kind of lesson plans that were ready were really young, in the sense they weren’t young cos those skills were absolutely relevant to the children we’ve got. But the actual topics, I just found them babyish. And there is the problem with sort of age group that we have is that on the one hand they can be very mature in that in terms of their interests, well in their ability to engage with each other when actually they’re more like 7 or 8 year olds. So having PATHS meet both of those needs was difficult and didn’t meet both, you couldn’t marry them up.

Interviewer: Okay, so what is it that you needed to do for that to occur last year?

Respondent: Look at the learning objectives and think right, I’m not telling the story, I’m making up a different one. I will use this photo but I’m explaining it differently and the situations of role plays that we’re talking about will be the ones that we’re doing, cos they need to be like quotations older to appeal, to engage them.

Interviewer: So it sounds like you had to adapt quite a bit of the material?

Respondent: A lot. There was a lot of adapting.

Interviewer: Percentage wise roughly how much were you adapting?

Respondent: About 80. Often it would look at the [unintelligible 28.39] and go, oh never mind, I’m not using it, and keeping the learning objective and just do this completely different.

Interviewer: Okay, and does that mean you followed the sequence of the learning objectives week by week and adapted the way in which you delivered...?

Respondent: We follow week by week. But not necessarily following the plans.
Interviewer: Were there parts of PATHS that worked well?

Respondent: yes

Interviewer: Okay. what part of PATHS worked well?

Respondent: The problem solving. The conflict resolution. The language of conflict resolution. That sort of approach of, you know, stop and calm down, evaluate how you feel, what you want, consider what other people want or never engaging, and the next step is to engage the other person. Or not, maybe. You’re assessment earlier on. Other situation might say actually I’m not engaged, fine, recognising when... teaching to recognise when to engage with the other person or not. That kind of step by step take on it worked really well. Because they’re used to learning things in that way now.

Interviewer: So other than the step by step take on the problem solving, is there any other reasons why you think the problem solving topic or volume worked so well?

Respondent: I did like that the situations ... the role plays and the picture stimuli would, although babyish, were easy to read and they would ask... the kids kind of look and consider that person’s perspective from the evidence that they see in the picture, so using the evidence of what they see and, you know, from the teacher what they’re hearing, and their own commonsense and kind of easing that information to then put together a picture of the whole situation that’s outside of their own experience. And kind of integrating that into a picture of what’s going on and what their place is in that role play situation, and what they’re going to need to do in order to get what they want, but still allow someone else to have a good outcome too. So I like the idea that the stimuli provided that, but the pictures were... the kind of situations, you know, like things in things in the sand box , was a bit young but the principle was good.

Interviewer: Okay. So did you use the same principle and the same idea using pictures ?

Respondent: I did, yeah, I just age the pictures a bit more relevant to 10/11 year olds
Interviewer: Okay. Is there anything about the PATHS that didn’t work well?

Respondent: I’m not sure really cos the parts that I thought weren’t going to work well I just didn’t use. So I couldn’t say kind of bad science. Didn’t use it, so, you know, I was just predicting that...

Interviewer: So what kind of things didn’t you use?

Respondent: I’m trying to remember now cos I just focused on the things I thought they needed and ignored everything else. For like... cos it’s that 20 minute session everyday because that 20 minute daily sessions was also used for other things. For example, to choose people for rewards or do classroom business or feedback on something we’ve done in assembly. So it might only be three, two or three days a week that we’re doing PATHS. So a lot got left out. I’ll say the things we did worked well and most of the other things we did.

Interviewer: And could you give me a concrete example of how you know... or when something actually went well with a child? How do you know it was actually working?

Respondent: Right. We would use... we would actually use kind of real situations of things that were going on in the classroom. Kind of like with permission to sort of say Inka and, you know, Victor would be going at each or something. I’d ask them do you mind if we... they would say I don’t want it to happen anymore, great, so can we work it out in class, can we make it part of our discussion now and inevitably they would say, sure. And we would kind of use that and then we’d have real words and the other things that people had said to draw on. And use that for hot seating... and other people in the classroom would have an interest in seeing the best result. Because it annoys them what’s going on. And they’ll actually... you can use that to paraphrase what the children are saying so that... so Inka said something that Victor didn’t like it with regards to, you know, they’re arguing with people and everything. Victor would have to let Charlie paraphrase what Inka was saying and what Charlie would say, in paraphrase terms was always much more diplomatic cos he could... he’d be much more diplomatic and objective than what Inka would say, and Victor would have to respond to that rather than the kind of more emotional language that Inka would use.

Interviewer: And is this a strategy that’s come out of PATHS?
Respondent: No. Oh no, I don’t think so. It’s just what I was given to involve them.

Interviewer: The other question I have is using this example where there was a conflict between two children that PATHS I understand had those three sessions a week? No, was it three sessions?

Respondent: It would vary depending on what was happening but it was three.

Interviewer: So would you have to… you’d ask them can we discuss about… discuss this?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: In the lesson, and you’d wait until the next lesson would come up, or would you…?

Respondent: Oh no, I’d just, you know, ask them any time, you know, can we talk about this more in PATHS

Interviewer: Okay, so you’d ask them about it but it would be to discuss and then PATHS session or slot?

Respondent: Yeah. If it wasn't something that I needed to come and deal with immediately, you know, away from other kids, then we could do PATHS.

Interviewer: And how’s that different to this year?

Respondent: This year, I think we are busier at that time and...

Interviewer: I think my question is if same exact conflict occurred, would you still wait until you had... to discuss it with the class in a 20 minute slot or would you have... are you
able to discuss it there and then? Is there a difference between how it worked last year?

Respondent: Oh I see.

Interviewer: Yeah, in terms of, you know, kind of having a discussion around what has happened?

Respondent: If... I'd probably not discuss it there and then. And I would as much as possible move back, just straight back into whatever the learning objective is for that session. And then come back to it later, unless it was directly relevant to what we were doing. So I'd anticipate that, that there will be a lot of conflict between the students between now and Christmas and our exhibition. So because that's directly relevant to what... where objectives are, then after we'll deal with it in the session, because it's kind of part of our learning. But if it isn't, I'll leave it and come back to it.

Interviewer: Okay. Let me just have a look. Would you recommend PATHS to any teachers in another school?

Respondent: I would. I would recommend they look at it really carefully because I think it... from what I hear, teachers downstairs, key stage one, I think they've responded to it more positively than we have upstairs frankly.

Interviewer: Upstairs being key stage two?

Respondent: yes key stage two. I think they've gotten a lot out of using... making I- messages, you know, ubiquitous having an approach that has a name like doing the turtle to cam down and to kind of come within yourself and think and be introspective for a second. And that's worked better for them than it has for us. So I would recommend that they look at it, yeah.

Interviewer: And what about recommending it to teachers that are key stage two teachers?
Respondent: Probably not because if it... if you think about where our school is, now we’ve got, by key stage two, their interests are ensuring their emotional literacy isn’t necessarily so, the key stage two material might not be appropriate for them. If you look at it another way at a different school, that is further along in its development, the children might not really need to engage as much with the learning objectives in PATHS either. So I think it’s unlikely to be relevant to key stage two children. I think it will just be pitched badly for them.

Interviewer: Even though the contents and the principles behind them are...

Respondent: They’re there, yeah, but you know there’s so much adaptation that you might as well just not use it and go do it yourself.

Interviewer: Okay. So overall has PATHS worked for the children?

Respondent: It’s worked as a part of a larger ethos and a larger effort. But, you know, if PATHS didn’t happen I don’t think we would be lost right now. So it’s, you know, it’s worked as part of a larger programme.

my perspective again is key stage two so I think the benefit in key stage one has been more positive than key stage two. I’m not sure. I think the children we have now have benefited from PATHS. But if maybe the thing had started PATHS earlier, then maybe we would see that now. Yeah.

Interviewer: And in terms of the way in PATHS is structured and the way it’s set up and run, what aspects in particular do you think makes it effective in looking at the programme itself? Or it might be easier to look at it the other way round where which parts of specifically in PATHS that you could do without as a programme, you don’t think actually promotes emotional literacy?

Respondent: Again no, but the principles are there so I think if the material were pitched more effectively to the age group that it’s really aiming at, at the upper end of the school, then it would be much more effective, because it wouldn’t need as much adaptation. And as soon as something needs adaptation, then... I mean that’s time we’re talking about, so... it’s more likely to be left in favour of something else. It’s going to be less effective. You know if I have a choice between spending time on PATHS and math, I’m always going to choose math. You know there’s no longer a
choice for me, it’s always going to be that choice, so the less adaptation, better pitch mean that it’s going to be used more and more effective.

Interviewer: And why is PATHS no longer implemented then?

Respondent: I think... I don’t know that it’s no longer implemented, I think that it’s been kind of elbowed out by a kind of classroom business creep that’s happened over the months. You know we’ve got more classroom targets and more school based targets, more whole of key stage targets. There will always be some kind of incentive based programme that’s running and all of these things take time to communicate to the children, to let them know this or that... how we’re doing on handwriting or how we’re doing on maths structure, you know, who’s going to be star of the week this week, and just that all of these things together have really creeped in on that time and elbowed them out. And PATHS is, you know, lost a day, lost another day and then lost another day. So that now... whereas it was five days or, you know, it would’ve been five days, now it’s 2/3 days.

Interviewer: So the other things that have come into play are more classroom targets?

Respondent: Yeah, and mostly like achievement based targets which are just as important but often we talk about those things in PATHS time.

Interviewer: The achievements are... the achievement based targets, are they more academic or more social and emotionally...?

Respondent: They have been more academic but now we’re seeing the targets come back to more social targets. Like today in assembly we were... we’re developing behavioural targets for the entire school. So of course I know that my next PATHS sessions will be about those.

Interviewer: Okay, so there’s more of a balance, or is the social side taken?

Respondent: I think the balance is coming back, only very recently. Because there’s a real push on achievement allowed the kinds of discussions that we had or run achievement.
And now we’re coming back to the social, because the achievement ones are up and running.

Interviewer: Okay, so how do you feel about it... about PATHS no longer being implemented?

Respondent: I can’t say that I miss it because that time is being used well in other ways. I suppose something that it could do to kind of go back to PATHS is take some of those... you know, to take those targets or take those objectives, take those kinds of problem solving steps and come back to them explicitly again, not in PATHS but in our other sessions.

Interviewer: But use them to guide you?

Respondent: Yeah, and not even call it PATHS, just work them in. Because the children will bridge back, in terms of their learning, they will recognise it.

Interviewer: So where did the decision come from to no longer follow PATHS as a programme?

Respondent: I don’t know. I’m not sure when it happened exactly or...

My impression is that in the springtime or earlier maybe, the teachers started having reservations about its effectiveness. And then in meetings we’d kind of discuss it in a more formal setting and then that’s how it kind of got back to management. And then I’m not sure how the decision to kind of lay off of it... how that filtered down, I don’t remember.

Interviewer: Last year, did you receive support of any kind?

Respondent: yeah

Interviewer: what kind of support were you getting when implementing PATHS? What support was available?
Respondent: I remember we had an inset on what PATHS resources were available on our system, and how they might be used. And then we were pretty much left to it.

Interviewer: What did you think of the support?

Respondent: I think it was... it was probably enough, yeah. It’s not complicated or complex or anything.

Interviewer: Was there any additional support that you would have liked?

Respondent: Probably yeah in terms of adapting it. Finding out what other people had done, what kinds of other effective things that people had done in my own age group. And kind of having a forum for that. So for instance, right, week number three looks really dull, has anyone done anything good for it for your, you know, for Year 5/6’s? Having a forum and time to do that would have been handy.

Interviewer: So your planning last year was really separate?

Respondent: Oh yeah, yeah.

Interviewer: And how does that compare to this year?

Respondent: Planning for?

Interviewer: For...

Respondent: Or just like in general?

Interviewer: Yeah, for the emotional literacy parts of the day?
Respondent: Well it’s already linked so the 5/6 teachers plan the… the plan, the afternoons together and so in the afternoons that most of this will take place. So in terms of medium term planning, we do that together and then we go away to do session planning. So I think it’s much better than it was last year in terms of the links we need where we’re meeting twice a week, that is.

Interviewer: Which of the two types of planning did you prefer?

Respondent: Well for core subject planning I’d rather do that alone. But for afternoon planning I’d rather do it with the group.

Interviewer: And the afternoon planning is the emotional literacy...

Respondent: Exactly. Because it’s sharing that the ideas about it saves alot of time

Interviewer: I’m not sure if… I mean I’ve looked up studies on PATHS and it is very researched and evidence based. I struggle to find any research that kind of says it doesn’t work or anything particularly negative about it. And I mean so far from the interview you’ve suggested, you know, this works cos we were able to compare the two. You said, you know, the idea of the time, choosing the right time, type of planning that would go into PATHS is very different to what you’re doing now..

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Do you feel that PATHS would work for every school or for every child?

Respondent: Probably I wouldn’t say anything would ever work for every school and certainly not everything will work for every child. So no, but of course it can be… since the principles are sound, it could be adapted very well for any school or any child. Cos you would just… you would change your objectives and you’d change your lesson material. But if you need to adapt it so much then I wonder what the point of
Interviewer: What do you feel that you’ve gained from PATHS?

Respondent: Oh it’s made me think more explicitly about how social skills, emotional literacy are taught in the room and how they’re talked about. So to pin it down, principles that can be remembered, they’re unchanging, vocabulary that’s consistent and always used, and just making sure I’m doing that. That’s what I’ve gotten out of PATHS.

Interviewer: So to clarify, the principles on emotional literacy is what you’ve gained?

Respondent: Of communicating this consistently to the children using the same kind of language so that it doesn’t always seem like we’re... you know, if we talk about problem solving in eight different ways but never leave them, then the students don’t know when we’re talking about problem solving or not. But if we’re using kind of a consistent vocabulary then the children can recognise okay right now he’s having a conflict resolution, I know this cos I’m here and the language conflict resolution. So just as a teacher it’s made me be aware of love the fact that I need to that in the main... continue to do that.

Interviewer: So, okay, so you’re able to link and to make sure these links of language and consistent language is used, so that’s something that you gained?

Respondent: Oh definitely, yeah.

Interviewer: But in terms of the principles behind emotional literacy, is that something that you had before going into PATHS or is that something you got or gained from PATHS? I just want to double check ...

Respondent: I wouldn’t have gained it from PATHS. No. I think that that’s something that you learn in the course of being in school really and doing... dealing with your kind of
clients that, you know, that you need to be teaching them. Strategies to deal with each other and get what they need without being kind of left out, without being left behind. So they’re skills that I think everyone in the staff in the school would pick up regardless of whether or not you’re doing PATHS.

I am assuming...

That you wouldn’t be able to do your job I would assume. If you weren’t learning, if you weren’t striving to be emotional literate yourself, you just wouldn’t be effective.

Interviewer: Okay. So just to go over these points. how has PATHS changed you as a teacher? So you’re thinking more explicitly, you’re using the language consistently. Are there any other changes in you as a teacher, or you personally that you’ve gained from PATHS?

Respondent: I suppose it’s encouraged me… because I’m seeing it almost like a learning subject, well not almost, like a learning subject, it has encouraged me to differentiate how I communicate the PSHCE objectives to the students. So whereas, you know, a few years ago I might have kind of talked to one child and another in the same way about the conflict. Well first children are at very different points in their learning, I think not necessarily just PATHS but just having PSHCE being such an important part of the school has encouraged me to speak, even with… cos children about the same age and same year group, but I might speak to them completely differently as I might not have a few years ago. And then I wouldn’t have been as effective with those two children. I might’ve pitched well at one but not the other.

Interviewer: And this is something that you’ve kind of learned through your… the experience of last year?

Respondent: The experience, yeah, the experience… not the experience of last year per se, but the experience over the last four years.

Interviewer: Okay. But PATHS has been here for is it two years?

Respondent: Yeah. I don’t...
Interviewer: Well they said they were trying to assign some of... they’re trying to... the first year was a pilot one but it wasn’t kind of picked up by everyone and wasn’t used well or all the time. When last year I understand that everybody was on board.

Respondent: It was much more consistent last year. I wouldn’t link sort my/their learning necessarily to PATHS. So PATHS is part of it but I wouldn’t... if PATHS has not occurred that still would’ve... that learning still would’ve taken place.

Interviewer: And what possible class do you see this being most effective with the children?

Respondent: I think inferring other peoples’ emotional state?

Interviewer: Hmm.

Respondent: By drawing evidence that you see, either in pictures or through dialogue where it has been... so whatever is presented in the lesson... this question has said that, you know, XYZ about the situation, what is their emotional state? What do you think their next likely step is going to be, inferring or predicting? And conflict resolution and problem solving, those things have been most effective.

Interviewer: In comparison to the other volumes of PATHS?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: And the reason for that is... you said that it was more relevant to...?

Respondent: To their age, yeah.

Interviewer: To their age group.
Respondent: So the sections on knowing my... like knowing my feelings are irrelevant but there’s not as much as learning needed to take place in terms of knowing, you know, I know I’m angry and now I know three words for angry, but and if they know they’re angry, okay, so let’s push that forward now, what is that going to mean for us? And that’s really where the learning was.

Interviewer: And what part of PATHS did the children most enjoy?

Respondent: I think what they most enjoyed, pretending to be in different emotional states, so the role play. Possibly.

Interviewer: And why do you think that might be?

Respondent: Cos they get to step out of their... they get to step out of themselves for a minute, the get to pretend to be... pretend to be something for a few minutes. They get to be rude, you know, without getting in trouble. And not only do they not get in trouble but I’m saying that they need to be even ruder because it’s more realistic and, you know, in sound. You know, I think that they found most engaging.

Interviewer: If we move to looking at what’s being implemented now... So the new approach, what is your overall experience of the new approach? Sorry, I’m just looking at it just to make sure it hasn’t stopped. Sorry.

Respondent: If the red light’s on ...

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Respondent: New approach. So by new approach you mean having PSHCE form the backbone of the new curriculum at the school?

Interviewer: Yeah.
Respondent: Okay.

Interviewer: That’s… yeah, but how do you feel about… how’s it gone so far?

Respondent: Oh, sorry. How’s it gone so far? I think it’s been pretty mixed. I think we were really excited about having that form the new basis for topics, so that if our topic was visual … and then our topic was knowing ourselves and our place in our locality, that was kind of a new approach for us, so we were really excited about it. We still are actually. What we struggled with was how in actual sessions that incorporated enough concrete activities so that there was enough kind of… we did engage in art and we did engage in outcomes of products that we could be working on. Then a lot of discussion around reflection and so on and so forth which is all fine, but it doesn’t suit our kids and we like to have objectives, we still do. But we don’t have enough concrete outcomes quite for it. So our first few months really haven’t gone as well as we’d hoped. And now that we’ve kind of worked at it again, I think that it’s going to be much better in the springtime because we have more concrete physical outcomes that we want to produce projects that we could work on. And we’re moving away from discussion and reflection and input and more into output now.

Interviewer: And why do feel having the concrete outcomes ..

Respondent: Well I mean for engagement, for, okay. We have, you know, a large proportion of our classes that love discussion, they’re becoming much more articulate, their vocabulary is developing but then a large… portion – about1/3 aren’t going to engage with it, aren’t capable of engaging with it. And by having those more concrete outcomes we’re incorporating everyone. And then discussion that we have can occur within that context just as easily. So that’s been our big kind of… we looked at it again.

Interviewer: And last year did you have the concrete outcomes and activities, or is there something that was…?

Respondent: We hadn’t even… the thinking process hadn’t even gone that far. The final started in the intake of… in the September intake.

Interviewer: For this new…?
Respondent: For this year.. And everything that we’ve done in the last couple of months has come out of that. And now we’ve looked at it again, we’re in the process of planning and a new approach that suits our classes better. So it’s been a learning curve.

Interviewer: And I mean it looks like there’s been a bigger movement in your thinking about how it’s working for the children in the last three months in comparison to the last year.

Respondent: Definitely, oh yeah.

Interviewer: And why do you think it’s moved on faster this year than it has last year?

Respondent: Because, well for planning sessions we’re doing medium term planning. Rather than thinking about, how emotional literacy can be incorporated into an already existing framework, kind of as an afterthought. Where that is our starting point. So all our thinking are coming back to those emotional literacy goals. So just the very situation means that we’re getting thinking explicitly about it. The freedom as well to move away. We’ve kind of been given the freedom to not teach history as a discrete subject, we don’t have to teach geography as a discrete subject. And kind of now use those as vehicles towards emotional literacy learning. So it means that the PSHCE goals will always come first. And any activities that or kind of outcomes that we apply will always come out of those goals rather than vice versa. Because before it meant that the other way round, where someone might think, okay, this is actually great, what objectives does it achieve? Well, it’s the other way now. We’ve got these objectives, what are the activities then? If you’re used to achieving objectives. So it’s much more objective based than activity based.

Interviewer: So just to clarify cos I’m not a teacher. So say an objective would be around conflict resolution and you would use history and talking about war or...

Respondent: Exactly.
Interviewer: rather than just to

Respondent: Rather than starting with okay, we’re dealing with tudours this month so what things can I… what objectives can stick on to the Tudors, which is I think what happens a lot of the time. Not that we were doing that last year but, you know, quite often. It wasn’t the Tudors but basically that was happening. And it’s been a real about face this year. Much better I think. We can get deeper learning. We can get a more consistent thread through our, you know, term of topic work because everyone kind of understands what we’re doing even if, you know, last week we were learning about Tudors. We were doing the mountains and this week we’re learning about, you know, we’d be learning about some kind of technology which for both cases we are coming back to the PSHCE objectives. So it’s giving them a common thread foundation.

Interviewer: So this year the PSHCE objectives are the driving force?

Respondent: Much more. Absolutely.

Interviewer: Behind every other type of learning?

Respondent: Every other type of sort of foundation subject learning and a lot of the written and reading work.

Interviewer: Whereas last year?

Respondent: It was working but haphazardly. And it certainly wasn’t foundation.

Interviewer: Okay, but what was in the foundation you’re referring to the PSHCE objectives?

Respondent: Yeah, that’s right.
Interviewer: Okay. And so having them as the driving force, I mean why do you think it’s working better?

Respondent: Because those objectives are attached to produced outcomes by the kids. So for instance they produced work for display and the thinking the thinking that went into that art, it wasn’t actually linked to a history subject or a geography subject or anything, it linked back to them and their thinking about what they valued about themselves and what they valued about Peckham or about their area... mostly it was about themselves. The activities in the learning came out of an introspective reflection of what they like about themselves or what they think of themselves. So they were achieving kind of art based learning objectives and PSHCE in-tandem, properly in-tandem rather than having them dealt with separately.

Interviewer: Okay. Is there anything that’s happening this year that’s not... other than the fact that you were missing out on these concrete activities that you spoke about, is there anything else that you feel that’s lacking or could do with improvement from the experience of this approach so far?

Respondent: I don’t know yet. It’s so early on. And it’s my first year cross teaching. So I’m not... I honestly don’t know. Ask me that next year.

Interviewer: Okay, it’ll be quite interesting.

Respondent: Is there anything that’s not working? I’m not sure. I’ll think about it.

Interviewer: Would you recommend this new approach to another teacher at another school?

Respondent: Not necessarily. It would depend on the ethos of the other school. So, I mean at another primary school the... if say the ethos is more around subject learning and retention and acquiring knowledge in terms of like learning more history, learning more geography, well then it might not suit them. So I wouldn’t necessarily recommend it.

Interviewer: So what type of school would you recommend it to?
Respondent: Oh at a school like ours. That’s coming out of a difficult time where... a school where it is pretty obvious that the children are lacking in emotional literacy, that don’t necessarily have much of a self-awareness or an awareness others. Definitely that would absolutely suit them really well. But they would need to develop their own curriculum just... because, I mean they know their kids... What’s interesting and what’s relevant to them, that would need to be developed by the school, no-one could give it to them.

Interviewer: And do you feel the new approach is working for the children?

Respondent: I think it is. I think we are learning, the reason why I couldn’t answer your earlier question is just that we’re trying to figure out what the success criteria are and how quickly we can expect certain criteria to be met. So until we know what they are, it’s hard to really assess it, you know, is it working, other than on an intuitive level I mean on an intuitive level, I’d say, yes. But against what success criteria I couldn’t say. Has objective 18 been met? Not yet. You know, it’s like that.

Interviewer: And who will decide the success criteria?

Respondent: Well, Ofsted... Have you met our objectives? We won’t really know until more time’s passed.

Interviewer: That’s okay.

Respondent: Because they aren’t quick objectives. Objectives like, you know, understanding how our actions impact on others is not one that they’re going to know quickly. So they need lots of opportunities to see it and to apply it and to see the effects throughout the year, years. So we need to come back to it.

Interviewer: So as a teacher what type of support did you get in implementing this new approach?

Respondent: From management, X the Deputy who kind of oversees the curriculum as a whole. From the outset planned with us so that we were establish good... what objectives
are we going to pull out of the national curriculum and how... what are we going to develop in the interim plan. She’s been with us all along

Interviewer: Okay, so it’s a group of 5/6 teachers?

Respondent: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So we’ve been working together on the oversight of X who has been really supportive, just cos her experience has been great. She’s... cos I mean I’m a trainee teacher, Katherine’s an NQT, Kate is an experienced teacher but our [approach is new to her, so having someone who has... who can foresee a lot of difficulties and look ahead has been very handy. And that’s really where the support’s come from.

Interviewer: Is there any other type of support that you would have like or would have found helpful?

Respondent: Maybe knowing what other schools have done in the area, if other schools are writing their own curriculum based off, I’m not sure if they are. Kind of not really aware of them. So we have felt a bit blind that way.

Interviewer: Other schools have done it in the area, and the area in Pekham or the subject?

Respondent: Sorry, the subject. I’m sure there are schools around, up and down the country doing their own thing. But I don’t know what it is they’re doing. It would be helpful. Not to say well let’s do that, but to see the outcomes that come out of it. But then how would you find out about it? How would you know what outcomes come out of it? How would you assess them?

Interviewer: These are the questions that you’d like to...?

Respondent: These are questions that we’re not really able to answer.
Interviewer: So what you would like in addition would be say find out from another school who is in a similar position and not necessarily copy their curriculum but to find out more about how they’ve gone about it and...

Respondent: Yeah, and knowing what considerations did they have that they found useful. And what sorts of miss steps or what things started occurring that they, you know, didn’t foresee kind of like what we didn’t really foresee that, We would lose a third of the kids in our sessions, so it seems to us that actually which was engaging. Which it was for two-thirds and then a third not really. Knowing that three months ago we certainly would have done things differently. So just that kind of foresight would have been very, very useful.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you think that would be useful for me to know about your views on emotional literacy in the school? I mean it could be focused on PATHS or on the new programme that I may not have asked?

Respondent: Not necessarily. I think we’ve... cos we’ve addressed sort of academic and then on a more social side, I... beyond that I don’t really think about it to be honest. So...

Interviewer: Ok, Would you be able to give me a concrete example of what’s happening in a lesson this term?

Respondent: Sure. So say for instance since the children were meant to have an understanding of what... how other people perceive them and then how they would like other people to perceive them, and how they might go about getting other people to perceive them differently, towards that we’ve studied a lot of emotional literacy about communicating things through images, about developing our own images that represent different personality traits for different emotional states, that are more abstract so they don’t necessarily incorporate faces on body parts. And kind of over the course of a few weeks we’ve used that knowledge to have them develop abstract logos that represent themselves. And you know they’ve done quite a lot of thinking into it, the produced it and other... so that other people should be able to look at the logo, maybe not get it right away, but kind of pull things... this person’s someone who’s really... who thinks of themselves as being really active and being really energetic and being... but also being a this or that
way. That’s kind of the physical outcome and the thinking that goes into that, well what am I like? And getting out of that... looking at really superficial things, so for...

Interviewer: What sorry? What PSHCE objective would that be linked to?

Respondent: That would be linked to knowing... oh there’s more than one. Im trying to think which it was. This was a while ago now. Literally knowing how your actions affect the opinions of others. Taking risks in a familiar situation. And managing risk in a familiar situation because you’re kind of telling other people visually things that you might not have told them about. So quite a lot of the logos incorporated things that... like personality traits that the children might not be very proud of and it wouldn’t actually I think I’m really dumb. But their logo might actually say I, you know, I’m someone who doesn’t feel confident in, you know, in terms of my own ability to do this right. And you often saw that in the logos.

Interviewer: And then you would use them for discussions?

Respondent: No. Usually not so much. Just quick classroom discussion because they didn’t want to draw attention to it. But certainly one on one. That would be a talking point. That like, well if, you know, if our logo was of promoting ourselves in a positive way then other, you know, this aspect you’re doing is absolutely relevant because it affects you. Does that achieve kind of the affect you want? Is that what you want in your teacher, you know? Praise and ownership. No, okay, so what... maybe can we pull this out, can you develop something that shows you in a positive light? And it would get them to sort of consider what things about them are more valuable, which is also PSHCE objective. I don’t know which number, don’t remember what it’s called.

Interviewer: Can I just check, so last year did you have... how was the PSHCE delivered?

Respondent: Through PATHS and through... mostly through PATHS and through assembly.

Interviewer: Okay, so, and therefore it was timed slots for...?
Respondent: Time slots.

Interviewer: Okay, but this year it’s throughout the day and...?

Respondent: It’s throughout the day, yeah. It’s explicit in the sense that it’s written with planning. But it’s also more informal and it pervades more what we’re doing. So it will work into lessons... more likely to work into lessons now but it wasn’t then. Because it’s link into thinking skills, which is quite good, explicit and everything. So I guess that’s how it differs really in that... whereas last year our focus was how do we incorporate thinking skills into the bedrock of our planning? This year it’s right, we’re keeping that focus. How’s emotional literacy going to be incorporated as a bedrock of our planning, along with thinking skills, and all with subject specific objectives.

Interviewer: So last year it was almost like an additional layer to everything else that was going on at the school?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: Where now it’s part of the foundation and...

Respondent: Exactly, so... whereas, and if thinking skills and emotional literacy are a foundation but they would be parallel to each other. And which one's more important in terms of how it’s... you actually see it. I’m not sure. Probably even... which is... I suppose was the idea.

Interviewer: You can see it changing again, like the curriculum that you set up so far, do you think it will be...?


Interviewer: Could you foresee how it would change ...?
Respondent: Yes. I think what’s going to happen is again our objectives are solid. I think we are anticipating what they will find interesting and what they will find relevant. And we’re going to get some of that wrong and by the same time we’ll know what we’ve got wrong and be able to sort of adjust our heading again.

Interviewer: The last question is, last year if I spoke to a child about PATHS, they would know what I was talking about cos they are the PATHS child and...?

Respondent: Yes. Right.

Interviewer: I mean how... how aware are they of it this year and how is important?

Respondent: There’s... I don’t think that there’s... there’d be a depth of awareness and I’m not sure it’s important for us anymore. If you said PATHS, they would know what you mean that slot between 11 o’clock and 11:20. But if you press them on it and said well what does that mean? They might say oh it means... it’s when we, you know, talk about other people’s feelings or how we get along or what, you know, things that we need to do. I don’t think they’d be able to be as explicit about what PATHS is as they were last year, or there were names about specific activities that would have familiar. there really isn’t that now.

Interviewer: Cos it’s not called PATHS anymore, but do you have... is it called anything or is it just...?

Respondent: I still call it PATHS out of habit. But even though PATHS is only run in a nominal sense, we just haven’t named it anything else.

Interviewer: Cos it’s actively running throughout the day, is it not?

Respondent: Not as PATHS but it’s just running throughout the day.

Interviewer: Not as PATHS but as PSHCE and...
Respondent: Yeah, exactly.

Interviewer: And the principles are running throughout the day instead of time specific?

Respondent: That’s right.

[Interruption]

[End of recorded material]
Appendix 15: Consent Form for Participant Teachers

Dear Teacher,

I am conducting a research on emotional literacy where I am interested in your views of your experience in this area. You have experienced teaching PATHS and are now promoting emotional literacy through a more personalized approached. I hope to gain insight into your understanding of what is needed for the promotion of emotional literacy.

The research is supported by the ******** School, The University of Exeter and the Educational Psychology department in the Children’s Services in ********.

I will be directing and conducting the research project which will include an interview and completing some questionnaires about the children you teach.

With your consent, the interviews will be recorded and all the interview responses and questionnaire data will remain confidential. Any excerpts from the interviews may be used for the research paper, but no names or any identifying characteristics will be included in the final report.

I would like to remind you that your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time. Please contact me if you have any questions. My contact details are:
Phone number: ***********
Email: ***********

Please sign below if you are willing to take part in this research.

I (print name) _______________________________ agree to take part in this research. I am willing to provide questionnaire data and take part in an interview which will be recorded.

Signed _______________________________________
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Appendix 16: Consent Letter for the Parents

Dear Parent,

Your school has agreed to take part in a piece of research with the Educational Psychology Service. The aim of the research is to find out if the school’s approach for promoting emotional literacy is working for your school and for your child/children. The data will in turn be used by the school to inform their future planning or to celebrate your child’s/children’s success against non-academic criteria.

For this research we will be looking at the effects of the school’s approach in promoting emotional literacy on children in year 3, 4 and some in year 5.

The school will need to give data about your child. This will include your child’s age and gender as well as a questionnaire about your child’s behaviour which will be completed by their class teacher.

I would like to take the opportunity to state that all the information will remain confidential, and that all the collected data will be conducted and used in a respectful and responsible manner.

If you are NOT happy for your child’s anonymised details to be used in this research, please complete the slip below.

At any time during the research you have the right to request your child to be withdrawn from the research.

For any further information, please contact the school.

Yours sincerely

Nuhaila Al- Rawahi

Educational Psychology Service
*******Children’s Services

I DO NOT give permission for my child (NAME)................................. to take part in this piece of research.

Signed ..........................................................
Appendix 17: Certificate of Ethical Research Approval

Certificate of ethical research approval

Your student no: 570016396

Title of your project: Promoting Emotional Literacy: The Voice of the Teachers

Note: There has been a change in my research. Although the measures and methodology remain very similar as I'm still using semi structured interviews SDQs, I'm no longer using the Emotional Literacy inventory and I'm only interviewing the teachers. In addition, the focus and purpose of the study has shifted to focus on the perceptions of teachers as a result of the school no longer implementing PATHS.

Brief description of your research project:

I strongly believe that gaining insight on the views of teachers is beneficial in that there are not enough studies that focus on the content in which emotional literacy is promoted in. Moreover, teachers have influential roles and can be regarded as significant as children's parents (Wentzel, 2002) because children spend a large portion of their day in school. Thus, teachers' perceptions are invaluable in gaining insight on what they view is needed to promote emotional literacy effectively.

My research will take place in an inner city London primary school which has chosen to discontinue the implementation of PATHS and have decided to develop a personalized emotional literacy program of their own. This is a reflection of decisions that are made in schools in the UK which validates the urgency of this research and getting the teachers’ voices heard. In keeping with the recommendations given by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES, 2002) for the need to prioritize work on emotional and social well being which takes on a holistic and early developmental approach, schools are required to promote emotional literacy; however, there is no set program that is required to be followed. There are many structured and evidenced programs schools can choose from, such as SEAL, however, they can devise their own.

I propose to seek insight into what teachers feel is needed for an emotional literacy program to be effective. Teacher interviews around the opportunities and challenges presented in PATHS as well as from their experience in implementing a more personalized and self-structured program. I hope to categorize the themes to generate a theory/framework that could aid other schools in their decision of personalizing and developing their own emotional literacy program, or deciding on implementing a structured program such as PATHS or SEAL.

The SEAL programme that came out of the Primary behaviour and Attendance Pilot which took place between 2003–2005 was developed to promote positive behaviour and effective learning by focusing on five social and emotional aspects of learning which include self awareness, managing feelings, motivation, empathy and social skills. These skills are reflected in the PATHS program. My aim is not to discriminate between the two programs, as there are major themes and aspects of both programs that overlap thus demonstrating a consistency between the two.

My focus is on gaining insight from teachers of their experience of the context in which they promote emotional literacy and determining whether their new approach to promoting EL is effective.
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Literature Review

Effective Emotional Literacy Programmes: Teachers’ Perceptions.

Introduction

Process

The literature review examines other studies that are related to the area of emotional literacy (EL) by relating them to the ongoing dialogue in the literature with the aim of filling gaps in order to establish the importance of my research.

Information for the literature review was gained through access from online journals through both the University of Exeter portal and public access sites. Key words for searches included; emotional literacy, emotional intelligence, promoting alternative thinking strategies, social and emotional aspects of learning, model of emotional intelligence, emotional development, well-being and teacher perceptions. Articles that were relevant from the search were also used as references for a further search of primary references, and key words were then able to be more refined.

Outline

This literature will explore issues around EL in relation my research. The research aims to gain insight into the teachers’ perceptions of promoting EL.
I will rationalize my area of interest by discussing aspects prevalent to EL. Firstly, I will discuss national and international policies that consider EL and emotional well-being and how they influenced education in the UK and maintained interest in the social and emotional development of children. I also consider the role of educational psychologists (EP) in their promotion of attainment in children and their healthy emotional development.

I will then discuss the construct of emotional intelligence and its two theoretical models of in relation to their measures and limitations and the proposed considerations of future theoretical models.

The psychology that underpins the social and emotional development of children is then discussed in terms of the potential roles of teachers in their development and programmes targeted at schools as preventative measures. This provides a further rationale for the proposed research project.

Finally, I critique evaluative studies of the promoting alternative thinking strategies curriculum (PATHS) in the UK and I am critical of how its effectiveness has been determined and advocate and exploration of teachers’ perceptions of their role in promoting EL. This insight will allow for a more holistic understanding of promoting EL in schools and portray teachers as a valuable knowledge source of the challenges and facilitators of EL programmes which may direct future research of its application in schools.

1. Education and Emotional Literacy

The educational field prefers the term emotional literacy (EL) as opposed to emotional intelligence (EI) as the word ‘literacy’ insinuates an intelligence that is not fixed (Burton and Shotton, 2004, p 18) and therefore can be developed. This may explain a universal growth and interest in the development of emotionally literate schools.
On an international level, UNICEF (2007) calls for indicators of children’s well-being that they feel safe, respected and loved. Similarly, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development claim that well-being is a key outcome of learning in progressive societies (OECD, 2001). This demonstrates a multifaceted interest in well-being that goes beyond the educational realm; yet, the transition into political institutes in the UK has been very recent.

In the UK, EL has been incorporated in the education system in programmes such as social and emotional aspects of learning programmes (SEAL), a commissioned study by the DfES, (2002) into how children’s emotional and social competence and well-being could be best developed. It resulted in recommendations that included prioritizing work in this area; as well as emphasizing the importance of a holistic and developmental approach that starts early in a child’s life (Weare and Gray, 2002). This is further supported by the Ministerial speech at the Antidote Conference (2002; cited in Weare and Gray, 2003)

Other studies have also considered aspects that contribute to the development of social and emotional competence. Durlak and Wells (1997) reviewed 177 programmes aimed at preventing behavioural and social problem in children in the USA. Their results showed that positive effects could be gained from programmes that modify the school environment, focus on meeting the needs of individual children and help children with difficult transitions. Wells et al. (2003) found that programmes that promote emotional well-being were effective when a whole school approach is adopted and implemented for more than a year.

Other national examples include the DfEE’s Excellence for all children: Meeting special educational needs (DfEE, 1997) which cites nurture groups as an example of early identification and intervention for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. This exemplifies EL becoming better recognized in the UK.
EL has been embraced and has been strengthened by its links made to various national policies and initiatives. For instance, EL reflects three of the five outcomes for Every Child Matters: change for children (DfES 2004); to be healthy, to enjoy and achieve and to make a positive contribution, as well as the legal framework for the associated reform that is set out in the Children Act (2004). The 5 outcomes for Every Child Matters are statutory demands on educational institutions and welfare services. Since EL is reflected in the outcomes, it suggests that it too needs to be addressed. Similarly, the DfES (2005), now the DCSF (2008), have taken EL and emotional competence and emotional well-being as an integral part of SEAL, thus giving more importance to this area.

The concept that emotional and social skills can be taught has political relevance. The Education Act (1996) states that all children have a right to education, which has been more recently strengthened by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (2001). As EL has become an aspect of learning, this would warrant political and educational bodies’ interest and research in this field. For example, the government’s review of the role of the educational psychology service in England (DfEE, 2004) stated that EPs should apply psychology to promote the attainment of children and young people, as well as to promote their healthy emotional development. This makes emotional development an area of relevance and duty to the EPs which could explain the reason for increased interest and research in this area. Regardless of EPs’ freedom in the way they work, they are bound to the political context, as well as the social context where the public are aware of the benefits EL brings due to the media. Therefore, schools and professionals who work with schools, exist beyond merely an educational context and instead reside in a multi-faceted complex context that includes, the political, socio economic, educational and research contexts.

All considerations made, it remains the responsibility of the EP to be aware of the issues revolving around the EI/EL construct and its applications and to be involved in its research.
2. The Construct and theoretical models of Emotional Intelligence

In the past education was focused on academic achievement and IQ was a significant predictor of success, but with societal, political and financial changes. Catering for academic needs alone is no longer enough to support the emotional well-being of the children today. As children spend a large portion of their lives at school, schools have taken up the responsibility of nurturing emotional intelligent students through a more direct teaching approach.

The development of EI has been attributed to Gardner (1983), who identified eight distinct intelligences among these are interpersonal (understanding the emotions of others) and intrapersonal intelligence (understanding the emotions of oneself). Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligence (MI) has had a subsequent repercussion in the development of theories and application regardless of its inability to meet the standards for reliability and consistent measurement (McMahon, Rose and Park, 2004). The popularization of the EI concept can be attributed to Goleman’s claims that EI ‘matters twice as much as IQ’ in predicting outcomes in the work place (Goleman, 1998, p. 31). Such claims have filtered their way into education much to the credit of the media and are easily rationalized by the average person which plays a role in maintaining the construct in the public domain.

There are various theories pertaining to EI which offer different views. Though the ways in which the theories define EI differ they are very similar in that they consider the person’s ability/competency to understand their own emotions as well as the emotions of others.

In fact, it was Mayer and Salovey (1990) that introduced the concept EI. They conceptualized EI as an ability and defined it as ‘The ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth’ (Mayer and Salovey, 1997, p.5)
The most basic skill is the ability to perceive emotions. For example, an infant is aware of the adult’s response to its cries of joy and distress and learns to detect and decipher expressions and voices in itself. The second set of skills involves using emotion to facilitate cognitive activities like problem solving or achieving an intended goal. The third set of skills includes understanding emotions, emotional language and slight variations of similar emotions (e.g. anger and frustration). It also includes the understanding that emotions are rule- governed, for example, anger is usually experienced in response to an injustice. The final set of skills involves managing and regulating emotions within oneself and with others, for example, to know how to comfort a friend who has lost her job or to reduce her anxiety levels before an interview.

The ability model views EI as it does any other intelligence as it meets three empirical criteria; mental problems have right and wrong answers, the measured skills correlate with other mental abilities and absolute ability level rises with age. The model is also able to predict what an emotionally intelligent person is able to achieve and execute. Examples include being able to communicate and discuss feelings, develop expert knowledge in a particular emotional area as well as having had an emotionally sensitive upbringing (Mayer and Salovey, 1995).

The Mayer, Salovey and Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT, 2002) is consistent with the ability model and their proposal of the need for mental abilities to process information is reflected in their approach of assessment. It tests abilities of the four branches of EI and generates a score for each as well as a total score. The MSCEIT is a performance-based measure where a correct answer is identified when deciding on which emotion best describes how an individual feels in a hypothetical situation. This approach means that a correct answer can be identified, thus making the performance-based measure a more valid
and reliable test in comparison to the self-report measures that result from the mixed model view of EI (Goleman, 1995).

Goleman’s mixed model of EI is a model of competencies. He puts forward 5 competencies: knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others and handling relationships.

Mixed ability models define EI as a mixture of abilities and personality traits which encompass a broader definition than the ability model which only considers emotions and intelligence and the relationship between the two. The ability model exists and operates in the region defined by emotion and cognition. The strength of the ability model is that it allows for analysis of the extent to which EI independently can influence behaviour (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). A weakness of the mixed model is that it labels a variety of attributes under EI which is misleading as it assumes that all the components come in a package and that they can be taught and developed in that sense and can be a predictor of personal success when they are to some extent independent entities.

The self-report measure is an assessment tool used for the mixed model view of EI. It uses the Likert-type scale, so individuals can rate how well they identify a person’s feelings. This is criticized as it is based on the assumption that the individual is aware of their own emotions. Much criticism has been made of the mixed model approach in terms of its unclear and broad definition and measurement. Similarly, the performance-based measure is not without its criticism. Fiori (2008) argues that the scores from a performance based test do not differentiate between declarative and procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1985). Thus, an individual may score high on the test as he/she has high declarative knowledge, knowledge of ‘what to do’ in a hypothetical situation but lacks in procedural knowledge, knowing ‘how to do’ in an actual situation. The opposite is equally true, the individual maybe able to perform
in an actual situation, but is not able to articulate how they perform it (Sun, Merrill and Peterson, 2001).

Although both approaches of measurement are criticized, Fiori’s in depth consideration of Mayer and Salovey’s conceptualization of EI and the associated assessment leads her to critically extract that their underlying assumption of EI is based on a conscious processing. Their definition of EI as an ability assumes that people are aware of their emotional experience and can consciously regulate their emotions and use them to facilitate thought. Thus, Fiori suggests a reconsideration of the automatic processes involved and their implications of the associated assessments.

The much debated issues over the definition of EI, its measurement and the elements that should ascertain an EI model could be interpreted as the weakening of the its construct validity, or worse, the non existence of EI (Locke, 2005). However, the nature of its varied theoretical approaches can be seen as a healthy developmental process to obtain and refine EI as a construct, its theoretical approaches, assessment tools and application. I stand firmly with the view of the latter as I am able to appreciate the notion of EI to be a reality of the world we live in today.

3. The Psychology

There is a wealth of studies on the series of developmental stages in understanding emotions. Emotional development is rapid in the first 5 years of a person’s life. According to Malatesta and Izard (1984) the entire repertoire of affective signals develop during the first three years of life and remain available to the individual for the rest of his/her life. A core set of emotions and strategies for regulating emotions (e.g. self soothing) can be seen in infant behaviour and expression by the time they are one year old (Sroufe, 1997). At age two, feelings of guilt, shame, embarrassment and pride emerge (Lewis and Sullivan, 2005) and the
child’s ability to understand and interpret the emotional state of others and even attempt to alleviate their discomfort and influence behaviour (Zahn-Waxler and Radke-Yarrow, 1990, Lewis and Michalson, 1983 and Zabel, 1979). By the age of three, children learn to display culturally appropriate ways of expressing emotions (Ekman and Friesman, 1975). Affective responses become automatically incorporated into the child’s daily functioning by the time the child is beginning to utilize language fluently to regulate internal affective states through verbal self-regulation (Vygotsky, 1978). Children then develop skills to regulate emotions well enough to learn, make friends and cope with the classroom context (Calkins and Hill (2007).

Early difficult experiences can have long term effects on the child’s behaviour and physiology as their cognitive and social skills are not developed enough to deal with stress and conflict. Therefore, the caregiver has a critical role as an external regulator of the child’s emotion early in their development. In addition, there is a coherent agreement in research of an existence of a shift in children’s understanding of different aspects of emotion between the ages of 5 and 12 (Caroll and Steward, 1984) thus justifying primary schools as an ideal research setting.

Recognizing the importance of relationships as well as providing a context for learning is imperative. The relationship between the child and teacher is a significant one. It is important for children to experience a variety of emotions to construct social scripts with encouragement of positive emotions and the management of negative emotions in a socially acceptable manner (Denham, 1998). Regulating emotion is also crucial in the development of social interactions and relationships with others (Saarni, 1990). The ability to think through problem situations accurately regarding emotions can influence children’s behaviour (Dewey, 1933; Dodge, 1986). The cognitive process involved in such a situation will only be effective if the child can accurately process the emotional content as the child will only then be more
likely to generate useful solutions if he/she can identify their own feelings and the feelings of others. Lazarus (1991) sees this relationship where understanding the situation or event (cognition) needs to precede emotion, however, Zajonc (1984) argues that cognition and emotion are independent and that emotion can actually precede cognition. Although, there remains a debate on the exact relationship, there is a mutual consensus of the existence of a relationship between emotion and cognition. Furthermore, neuropsychological models of behaviour claim that the neuropsychological functioning affects emotion regulation and aspects of social, cognitive and behavioural performance (Greenberg et al., 2004).

In conclusion, understanding the emotional development of children is of great significance in its implications for teachers in that it allows them to identify children that are not developing the emotional skills to have healthy social interactions with their peers and promote their emotional development through modelling coaching and the way in which they respond to the children’s emotions (Denham, 1998).

4. Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies programme (PATHS)

4.1 Overview

The PATHS curriculum is a preventative intervention that was developed by Greenberg and Kusché (1994) in the US in response to the criminal violence epidemic in the 1990’s (Blueprints for violence prevention, 1998, 2002). It is a comprehensive, developmentally-based curriculum, aimed at promoting emotional and social competence as well as reducing aggression, behaviour and emotional difficulties and decreasing risk factors related to later maladjustment. It was designed to be taught by teachers in elementary schools (Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2). The programme is taught 3 times a week for a minimum of 20-30 minutes a day and is also meant to be integrated into the regular year long curriculum (e.g. the national curriculum) where aspects of PATHS can also be used outside the classroom.
4.2 Conceptual models

The PATHS curriculum is based on four conceptual models as under:

a) The first is the affective-behavioural-cognitive-dynamic model of development (ABCD). This is a hybrid model which takes account of developmental integration of affect, behaviour and cognition in terms of social and emotional competence. It is understood from the ABCD model that emotional development precedes cognition due to the maturational process and it is the affective development that acts as a precursor to the other forms of thinking that become integrated with cognitive and linguistic functions. The ability to label the emotional states is key in the ABCD model. Children are encouraged to express emotions, as it is believed that it will facilitate effective self control and act as a precursor for optimal problem resolution.

b) The second is based on an eco-behavioural systems model where simultaneous focus on the child and the environment are deemed important to bring about positive change via teaching skills, creating meaningful real-life opportunities to use the skills and reinforcement for applying the skills effectively. PATHS focuses on promoting developmental skills and changing children’s behaviour as well as changing teachers’ behaviour, so that the teacher-child relationship and the classroom and school-level procedures support the children’s needs (Greenberg and Kusché, 1993).

c) The third model is based on the neurobiology and brain organization that incorporates vertical communication between the limbic system and the frontal lobes as well as horizontal communication between the left and right hemispheres. The vertical control refers to the higher order processing where emotional information is first perceived and processed in the limbic system before being transmitted to the frontal lobes for further processing. Information can then be transmitted back to the limbic
system to modify emotional signals and actions. There are few interconnections between the limbic system and frontal lobes during early development which increase with maturation. The ability to regulate does not occur automatically since it needs to be learnt. This concept is reflected in PATHS as it teaches children to practice conscious strategies (e.g. self talk) for self control (e.g. using the Control Signals Poster, or the Turtle Technique) as well as labelling emotions to help manage emotions and behaviour. The horizontal communication refers to information processing that occurs in the left (where the receptive and expressive language is processed) and right hemisphere (where comfortable and uncomfortable receptive and uncomfortable expressive affect) of the neocortex (Bryden and Ley, 1983). The corpus callosum is a bridge between the two hemispheres which allows for communication. For conscious awareness of emotional experiences, the emotions need to be verbally labelled and transmitted to the left hemisphere. Based on this concept, PATHS is able to theoretically rationalize the use of Feeling Face cards, the Turtle Technique etc. as a way to get children to verbalize and label their emotions in order to strengthen the neural interconnections and help manage their emotions and behaviour.

d) The fourth model is based on applied psychoanalysis, where the psychoanalytic theory is central to the development of PATHS, thus distinguishing it from other social learning curricula. It moves away from a teaching model to one that provides opportunities for internalization, personality maturation and cognitive growth. The problem here is that though there are many theoretical orientations of psychoanalysis, most stem from the Freudian psychoanalysis, the developers have not been explicit of the exact sources and theories they have used to derive their conceptual models.
However, the rationale for the types of opportunities provided is logical and stems from the conceptual models.

The principles of the PATHS model are drawn on from the four above concepts and are evident in the PATHS curriculum. Though, the developers have integrated the conceptual models which cover vast subfields of psychology in the development of PATHS, they have left little room for critique of their theoretical rationale taken from the conceptual models. Therefore, one may question whether one clear conceptual model is more favourable over four integrated models, as the latter does not allow for identification of the exact conceptual model that deems it an effective programme, or if, in fact, it is the integration of all four concepts that are responsible.

4.3 Research on PATHS

Studies on PATHS have shown it to be an effective programme with SEN children, deaf children, children in regular education and of different ages. Furthermore, in 1996, the Centre for the Study and Prevention of violence at the University of Colorado identified violence prevention programmes that met a set of evaluation standards for the selection of Blueprint programmes. Their selection criteria included; an experimental design, evidence of a statistically significant deterrent effect, replication at multiple sites with demonstrated effects and evidence that the deterrent effect was sustained for at least one year (Blueprints for violence prevention, 1998, 2002, p. xv). Eleven programmes were identified, one of which is the PATHS programme. The programme prides itself as being universal, as it has been used and researched in Canada, Holland, Norway and the UK all yielding positive results. Due to PATHS being selected as a Blueprint programme, it has been able to market itself as an evidenced-based programme. Also, most evaluations of PATHS have concluded that it is an effective programme, however, a large proportion of these studies were conducted by the
developers themselves, which may also explain the lack of a critical literature review of PATHS and any conflicting evidence.

Research into the PATHS curriculum in the UK has been very limited. In 2004, Kelly et al., investigated the introduction of PATHS material with seven 9-10 year olds in a Scottish Primary school. Although results demonstrated that PATHS had a positive effect on their emotional understanding and problem solving, the sample used was extremely small and the absence of a control group meant that the natural course of emotional and social development cannot be ignored. However, the feedback from the teachers described the material as being ‘innovative, well designed, tightly structured and engaging for pupils’, thus suggesting that PATHS may have a place in the educational system in the UK.

Curtis et al., (2007) conducted an evaluation of the PATHS curriculum at Key Stage One in five Hampshire schools. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as part of the evaluation with 17 teachers from the PATHS schools. Pre and post measures were taken and compared to three control schools where the children were matched for age and catchments area. Results showed a significant improvement on all five emotional and behavioural constructs in the PATHS group. These results were echoed in the teacher interviews. Unfortunately, the results revealed that due to the matching criteria, the control group were of lower levels of behavioural and emotional difficulties at the pre test which was later acknowledged by the researchers as a possible explanation for the non-significant SDQ results for the control group. It was therefore suggested that future studies gather data from the school the year prior to the introduction of PATHS. This raises two main concerns of this study. Firstly, although the researches were not able to anticipate differences in the matching criteria for both groups, they did not account for the differences within the control group. It is not clear whether any of these schools addressed social and emotional needs, or if they did, what approach was taken. Therefore, it is not clear if PATHS is significantly more effective than other social and
emotional programmes or if it is merely more effective when no other social and emotional programme is implemented. The researchers’ definition of a control group was broad and has left them susceptible to confounding factors that they did not control for or acknowledge. However, this can be argued that such a difference was irrelevant for Hampshire as they were gathering evidence to support their intentions to incorporate PATHS into all their local primary schools, thus leading to the second concern. An element of observer bias can be argued to be present in the SDQs that were filled out by the teachers, more specifically in the control group, as their participation in the study was encouraged as a means to gain PATHS training the following year. Other concerns stem from the way in which the training was received by the schools. It was reported that the initial training was given to at least two school staff from each school in the intervention group by EPs. They then were given the responsibility to share and feedback the information to their school. The extent of comprehension, perceived value of the programme and the manner the staff were able to articulate and disseminate the knowledge would essentially differ for each school. Ideally, this could have been controlled where by all staff from all schools received the same training. This study, like other studies, some mentioned already, were not implemented at a whole school level, as intended by the programme, which implies that for PATHS to be effective a holistic approach is not necessary but favourable.

Further examinations of studies on PATHS reveal that academic functioning is regarded as a secondary function of PATHS (Riggs et al., 2006). Previous studies have reported mathematic and reading improvement in the PATHS intervention group (Greenberg and Kusché, 1993, 2003). The interest in the academic achievement of PATHS is presented in one of the earliest evaluation studies where the sample used were a group of deaf children (Greenberg and Kusché, 1993). This presents conflict with the main purpose of developing such a curriculum. The sample choice was not the most appropriate as it suggests that deaf
children are more at risk of behavioural and emotional difficulties. Moreover, if this assumption was true, then why has PATHS targeted all children, regardless of need, at the Elementary School age (Key Stage One and Key Stage Two). Having said that, I am not suggesting that such a sample should not have been considered, on the contrary, research has shown beneficial improvements for this sample. The decision to measure changes in the academic achievement reflects the conceptualization of the main goal of education of that time, and its absence in more recent studies such as the Curtis et al. study (2007) suggests a change in the way the academic achievement is being perceived. Since PATHS was developed to be implemented in schools with the view that schools can be a central locus of change and that their main role is to provide education and that education is provided with the intent of achieving academic success, it seems logical that such a measure was used, even though it goes against the primary purpose of the curriculum. Hence, I would argue that the consideration of the culture in which PATHS was developed is justified.

4.4 PATHS in context

Ecclestone and Hayes (2009) respond to the gap in the public and academic debate about the educational implications by exploring the current preoccupation with emotional well-being (EWB) and the changes it impinges on the subject; the human subject and the subject knowledge.

According to Ecclestone and Hayes (2009), the government’s preoccupation with EWB and their sponsorship of the diverse interventions derive from very varied concerns, with the main concern emanating from the government’s conceptualization of social justice, where social exclusion is the result of damage to self esteem and EWB. Thus, emotional deprivation is seen as an injustice. They argue that policy, practice and research in this area have emerged from incoherent concerns, interests, goals and even different constructs resulting in a rise of
intervention programmes, such as nurture groups and SEAL. It is not clear whether EWB is a progressive sign of social justice or whether it, in fact, merely undermines the capacity to cope with life without official support. However, this does not answer the question of the emergence of interest in EWB before its translation into legislation.

Ecclestone and Hayes consider the preoccupation and rise in intervention in relation to the therapeutic culture. Though therapeutic culture is a widely accepted notion, it is not definitively defined. However, they claim it can be recognized in our everyday lives, for example, in the large number of self help books and the expansion of therapeutic support through counselling, psychoanalysis and psychological interventions which are evident in health and educational services. Schools are now more commonly using specialist support to supplement mainstream activities. There is a belief that learning cannot occur until negative emotions are addressed and that all humans have self esteem issues and there is a need to be self aware in order for personal development. Ecclestone and Hayes challenge this obsession with the notion of a diminished self which reflect the ideas of human potential and go on to challenge therapeutic education. They believe that EL programmes that get children to reveal their more vulnerable side lowers their aspirations as it will lower their expectations of themselves. Such therapeutic interventions used in schools raise ethical concerns in that they generate emotionally literate children by coaching them to experience and respond to emotions appropriately. Such political sponsorship of therapeutic education is evident and Ecclestone and Hayes believe that it needs to be challenged and its causes and reason for its existence investigated and explored. However, it is impossible to investigate something that is not clearly defined. Perhaps all they have achieved is labelling an aspect of our social context that has always existed and have in instead caused some doubt in the actual existence of an emotional well-being construct. For example, most people would agree with Sir Jim Rose’s comment (Perks, 2008; cited in Spike) that ‘curriculum overload will lead to a
superficial treatment of essential content’ rather than teach ‘worthwhile knowledge, skills and understanding to sufficient depth and make sure that children value and enjoy their learning’.

However a more critical analysis of his comment presents his lack of understanding of the importance of knowledge of subjects as a discipline in order for children to structure their world. Instead there has been an emphasis on health and EWB which feeds from and into the therapeutic culture. Such issues are not educational but political and are forced into the curriculum to send a message. Parallels can be drawn from the current environmental issues where we are told that we are damaging the earth and that we need to save it. Recycling is being pushed upon us even though in reality its efforts are inadequate to save the world and that we need fuel to recycle. Perhaps, the main aim of recycling is not to recycle but the message that it sends, which is to become more aware of our wastefulness. Such attempt to focus on EWB and promoting programs in schools is perhaps to send the message on how we are expected to behave emotionally. Furthermore, it reinforces the notion of a diminished self which suggests that we need a greater force (e.g. the government) for support. Perhaps the hidden agenda is to maintain the governmental power and its influence under the guise of the need for well-being. Perhaps what Ecclestone and Hayes need to consider is not the influence of therapeutic culture on education but the implications of politics on education.

Ecclestone and Hayes argue that although it is possible to resist a dominant culture, the first step to change would be the awareness of what has changed. To me, the debate around the difference between therapy and therapeutic culture bears a reflection on past debate of the differences between inclusion and integration where concerns and interests are different and the assumptions that they share the same values are not necessarily true. This is not to say therapy has no place in our world today, it is just that the key principles of therapy were targeted at the minority and have now shifted its focus and extended its application to the majority which is supported by the belief of preventative measures, which would explain why
we can recognize a therapeutic culture in our everyday lives. Interestingly, preventative measures is a notion that is politically endorsed suggesting that the promotion of EWB and EL programmes are merely a means of maintaining social control. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the underlying psychology of interventions such as PATHS resonate powerfully with the popularized therapeutic ideas that are promoted through the media and the ever increasing self help books. It is only by placing PATHS into this context that I am able to critique the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks put forward by the programme developers. Are they merely responding to a culture that demands psychological explanations? This would explain their theoretical rationale. For example, the psychoanalytic model that makes up part of the conceptual framework and theoretical rational distinguishes this programme from others, which is a feature of the programme making it even more marketable in a therapeutic culture. The psychoanalytic model stems from Freudian theories where the aim is to make the subconscious conscious and this is featured in many aspects of the PATHS curriculum where children are taught to label emotions and use the ‘turtle’ as a means to express their feelings. Freud’s theory was meant for the minority; however, these strategies and theories are encompassing the majority, thus keeping in tune with the therapeutic culture.

This begs the question, is the problem that therapeutic culture is taken up by the public and responded to by the government with policies or is the issue here, the collapse of politics? I do not believe that we can attribute a large portion of the interest and the subsequent progressions in EWB to the therapeutic culture alone, if in fact it even exists. It can be argued that the government has a role in keeping this culture alive by having a diminished view of humans and that without its therapeutic interventions, humans will remain emotionally unhealthy. Yet, programmes such as PATHS and SEAL feed into this vicious cycle.
Nevertheless, is this enough to claim that PATHS is right for every child? And if not, understanding the reasons and perceptions of teachers could allow schools to be more selective of the social and emotional programmes they wish to implement. Moreover, even though PATHS has presented itself as an effective programme that addresses social, emotional and behavioural issues, there is no research that determines the exact components of the programme that deem it effective. This information would be valuable for schools selecting structured programmes to implement, or choosing to devise a more personalized programme for their school. Understanding teachers’ and students’ perception of what they view is important for an effective EL programme may help identify possible areas for further research. In addition, this information could support schools to develop a programme that is more suited to their needs and raise awareness of the areas of possible challenge and limitations as well as the facilitators of promoting EL.

The education and psychology domains have a vested interest in social and emotional development and EL programmes. This interest is evident and is endorsed in policies and encouraged through national initiatives. This makes it difficult to disregard the context in which schools find themselves in, regardless of conflicting research and debates on the construct of emotion and its measures. My aim is not to determine whether EI exists or defining or refining its construct and although I am aware of these debates I cannot deny that EL is the reality of schools today, which further justifies my interest in the area.

4.5 Shift of focus to the perception of teachers

Perry et al. (2008) critically reviewed research on EL in the primary classroom by drawing attention to the limitations of evaluations carried out on EL programmes. They claim that much research has centred its focus on the pupils themselves, which can be explained by the
alleged claims that EL can have positive effects on children’s academic performance as well as preventive factors and promoting EWB.

There is very little importance given to the views of teachers. I strongly believe that gaining insight on the views of teachers is beneficial in that there are not enough studies that focus on the context in which EL is promoted. Moreover, teachers have influential roles and can be regarded as significant as the children’s parents (Wentzel, 2002) because children spend a large portion of their day in school. Thus, teachers’ perceptions are invaluable in gaining insight on what they view is needed to promote EL effectively. This is not to say that an evaluation of an EL programme focused on the children should not be considered. The data gathered from the students provides evidence of the outcome of the EL programme implemented. However, I argue that such data should be considered in conjunction with the consideration of the context in which it is promoted.

5. Research Proposal

I propose to seek insight from teachers of their experience of the context in which they promote EL and triangulating this data with data gained from an evaluation of its direct effect on the children.

I believe that these findings may help enlighten other programmes as well as informing other schools’ approach to implementing or even selecting a suitable programme.
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