



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Lebor, Merv

War Stories; How Experienced Teachers Said They Responded To Disruptive Students In The Lifelong Learning Sector

Original Citation

Lebor, Merv (2014) War Stories; How Experienced Teachers Said They Responded To Disruptive Students In The Lifelong Learning Sector. *Teaching in lifelong learning: a journal to inform and improve practice*, 5 (2). pp. 12-21. ISSN 2040-0993

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/19785/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

War Stories; How Experienced Teachers Said They Responded To Disruptive Students In The Lifelong Learning Sector

Merv Lebor

Leeds City College

HUDCETT

Abstract

This small-scale qualitative research inquiry investigates how a small sample of experienced teachers dealt with disruptive students in their classes in the Lifelong Learning Sector (LLS) in West Yorkshire. I wanted to continue my earlier writing on these issues by listening to what teachers said about their challenging experiences on the front line of the classroom interfacing with negative student behaviour. I firstly discuss a research instrument for collecting this data from these teachers' experiences, and also explore their strategies for dealing with disruptive student behaviours. It seemed very important to hear from practitioners rather than relying on what textbooks advised. Previously I was interested in the experiences of trainee tutors facing these difficulties; in this piece I am more concerned with how experienced tutors deal with these unpleasant circumstances. I outline the findings that this questionnaire elicited in terms of key negative incidents that these teachers had experienced in class and the strategies they had deployed to overcome the social and emotional challenges of disruptive student behaviour. I briefly summarise these tutors' perspectives on the support they felt they did or did not receive on these issues. I conclude with an analysis of the findings and question the problematics of this research, its meaning, validity and possible application in other teaching contexts.

Key words

Disruptive Behaviour; Strategies For Teachers; Experienced Teachers; Data Collection Of Experience.

Introduction

This research is a further investigation into how teachers respond to disruptive, challenging students (Anderson et al, 2004; DfE, 2012) particularly in Lifelong Learning contexts. I previously asked questions about how trainees dealt with disruptive students in the initial stages of a lesson, how that impacted on student learning, and particularly what options were available to trainees in especially fraught situations (Lebor, 2013a). I then formulated a strategy for supporting trainees and helping them reflect on difficult conflicts in trainee education classes and how a Humanist approach (Rogers, 1961; Maslow, 1954; Gatongi, 2007) was possible even under the most challenging circumstances (Lebor, 2013b). Both of my earlier pieces of research were based on findings and analysis of case studies, observing the '*effects of real situations*' (Cohen et al, 2011: p. 289) involving teacher trainees entering difficult classrooms. I now want to widen this exploration and question a sample of more experienced teachers on their strategies for dealing with difficult students. How did more experienced teachers in the LLS respond to aggressive, challenging behaviour? I particularly wanted to formulate a data collection tool which would gather qualitative research into how individual tutors not only identified examples of negative student behaviour in their careers, but also how they dealt with this and obtained support in facing these sometimes traumatic events.

I use a range of words to describe these situations, such as "disruptive", "challenging", "aggressive" and "negative" behaviours. It could be argued that challenging behaviour should be encouraged in order to provoke questioning, possibly promoting non-conformist

attitudes. However, the classroom behaviour described and analysed in this paper is more anti-social rather than either merely high-spirited or deeply questioning of the teacher's authority for any overriding ideological or intellectual agenda. The key characteristic of the disruptive behaviour described in this paper is that it is not conducive to learners' learning (Ofsted, 2012). It should be said that no teacher referred specifically to students with mental health problems, Asperger's or having Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLD) amongst the data sample, so the behaviour was characterised by the teachers as part of their 'normal' or typical teaching groups.

I am interested in these questions of disruption because the assumption is that learners wish to learn and that learners will conform to required classroom behaviours (Beere, 2012). The question that underlies this paper is what happens when learners refuse to cooperate or simply do not collude with the contractual/managerial expectations model of teaching (Kounin, 1977; Marzano, 2003; Dreikurs et al, 2005). As a result of this concern, I begin to question what has been done in the past and what might tutors do in these adverse circumstances in the future (Hannah, 2012; Paton, 2012).

I developed a series of open questions so as to '*capture the specificity of a particular situation*' (Cohen et al, 2011: p. 382). I wanted to know the answers to many questions, such as what were the worst behaviours these teachers had experienced in their careers? What strategies or tactics did they use when faced with these challenges? What sort of explanations did these teachers attribute to "bad behaviour"? Did the teachers manage to stop the disruptive behaviour? What strategies did they use to affect this? What support was available from managers, colleagues or the organisation within which they worked? What advice would they give to tutors just starting out in their careers? However, for the purposes of this research, my main focus is on the underlying questions of what students did in disrupted sessions and how teachers dealt with these problematic situations.

I then identified who would be my sample of teachers to respond to these questions and how I would approach them in order to achieve some level of authenticity, whilst staying within the limits of the British Educational Research Association's (BERA) ethical boundaries. In order to attach significance to this research, I scrutinised the data from the point of view of its validity (Cohen et al, 2011: pp. 179-195) and my own positionality (Cuncliffe, 2004; Agee, 2009) within this research project. Was it worth exploring these attitudes in local situations, itemising a list of negative behaviours that tutors had encountered? Could anything be learnt from exploring these circumstances? Would the tutors' strategies be helpful for application at a more general level of praxis? Had the entire sample of tutors selected all experienced some form of disruptive behaviour? How 'bad' was it?

These were all difficult questions to answer.

This was a small-scale piece of research, where the focus was qualitative, exploring attitudes, behaviours and '*states and processes*' (Flick, 2006: p. 109). I felt it was time to focus on this issue in short narrative-based localised contexts, looking at a range of behaviours that tutors had actually encountered rather than just believing the generalised statements made about student "bad" behaviour in textbooks. The fact that this study focused on a small sample meant that it might not achieve '*generalisability*' (Cohen, 2011: p. 242), but the opinions and strategies of experienced teachers might be of value in that this would open up a range of potential solutions (Iveson et al, 2012) to these problems for less experienced practitioners. I wanted to know whether experienced teachers could

provide useful advice that trainees could reflect on and use as a text for discussion and debate. The research was focused on the above set of interview questions.

The sample was made up of 30 teachers, all working within Lifelong Learning or 16+ education, whom I asked to participate and who knew me, or who I had met at conferences or courses. They all had worked in a variety of educational institutions in West Yorkshire. I was known to all respondents. Tutors worked or had worked in a range of different organisations. My first question was how many years had the respondent been in teaching. The majority had been teachers for over ten years, and many for 20 or 30 years. For the purposes of this research, I discarded respondents who had worked as teachers for less than ten years, because I wanted to focus on experienced teachers who could offer a wealth of helpful strategies to less experienced tutors just entering the profession. However, it could be said that because the timescale of the respondents being involved in teaching was longer, more incidents were likely to have occurred. I also did not make any distinction between different geographic or socio-economic backgrounds of teachers or their students. As the research progressed, I heard about disruptive student behaviour in classrooms that had taken place in Further Education colleges, training centres and Pupil Referral Units (PRUs).

Everyone whom I asked agreed to participate. There were greater numbers of women (60%) than men, but also a range of black or ethnic minorities (over 10%) and due to the ten year experience criteria used, all respondents were aged over 30. It should be noted that whoever I asked was passionate about contributing to this discussion, primarily because they said they felt it was an aspect of teaching that was institutionally unacknowledged. Generally, they wanted to express their views on a topic which for too long they felt had been taboo in many staffrooms or not spoken about in any depth during Teacher Education (TE) sessions or training days.

In fact, there are sections in the general key TE text books on Further Education that are devoted to issues of disruptive students (Curzon, 2004: pp. 245-247; Petty, 2009: pp. 98-129; Armitage et al, 2007: pp. 88-98). Coverage of this topic represents a relatively small portion of each book, and indeed nothing is said on this topic in others, for example, Reece and Walker's book (2003). Admittedly, there are whole books devoted to disruptive or disaffected students, such as Vizard (2009) and Cowley (2010), but these tend to be prescriptive rather than being focused on the experience and strategies of individual teachers. Susan Wallace originally wrote about the differences between trainee expectations and the challenging realities of student behaviour in Further Education contexts (2002) and has updated her book, offering strategies for removing '*barriers to learning*' (2007: p. 181) and dealing with the issues of un-cooperative learners. Generally, the focus in the literature does not link individual experiences with strategies adopted. My approach is centred on the notion of learning from the experiences of others.

The rationale for carrying out this research was partly a response to a large number of emails from writers and academics about my previous research. In particular, one writer wrote to me saying that my articles were "like war-stories from the front-line in World War One." He felt that many academics at his university were like generals discussing theories of behaviour, but the situations I was outlining were the real battlefields where education and training were being systematically resisted. My own view is that behaviour theories are the critique of practical situations and the empirical knowledge gained from practical situations works as a critique of theory. It is an ongoing dialectic between theory and praxis (hooks, 1994; Prasad and Caproni, 1997; Agee, 2009: p. 437).

The context of our investigation is Ofsted's intolerance for observations where there is any disruptive behaviour in class (Ofsted, 2012; Beere, 2012: p. 109). However, disruptive behaviour is seen as a considerable threat to teachers and is arguably getting worse (Rushton, 2010; Spiers, 2011; Mulholland, 2012; Sellgren, 2013; Townend, 2013). This work is a timely reminder that it is the responsibility of Teacher Educators to engage with the problematic aspects of practice as to how our trainees can be advised, supported and their resilience developed in a world that often depends strongly on teachers' professionalism despite the cost to their emotional and psychological sense of self (Kennet, 2010). The reality is that this area is a major cause for concern for tutors and trainees alike.

In order to conform to ethical considerations I anonymised all responses and asked all contributors to fill in a participation ethics form (Cohen et al, 2011: pp. 91-93).

Findings

I questioned what teachers considered to be 'disruptive behaviour' in their lessons and asked them to list some of the worst behaviour they had witnessed. These simple questions elicited an extraordinary and extensive list of aggressive behaviours. At the more palatable or normative end of the spectrum all these teachers spoke about students talking in class, verbal interruptions, refusals to cooperate, confrontational encounters, disrespectful remarks or attitudes, disruptive mobile phone activities, students walking round the room, persistent lateness or students merely not carrying out tasks. Learners were reported to have sworn and walked out of the classroom. One student refused to remove his balaclava and reveal his face.

Asked about more extreme behaviours, nearly all teachers had stories at the next stage of intensity, whereby students rejected the classroom norms of learning behaviours and started throwing objects such as, in one case, a stapler. One student threw their hat in the air whilst the tutor was being observed; another threw a cheesecake. They swore aggressively, were involved in chaotic shouting, tables were knocked over, some students verbally bullied others in the class, some carried out acts of violence and fighting; sometimes this was boys, sometimes girls. There was aggression against other students in class, but also on the way in or out of the room. One tutor was physically attacked as a student aimed a blow at another student. Tutors spoke of a "gang cultures" where students threatened others with weapons. One tutor mentioned a set of class notes being set on fire; another tutor spoke about a pen being burnt on a table in the classroom. A student threw a chair at a tutor and later stole and hid the tutor's car keys. In a PRU, one tutor was goaded with threats of violence, whilst another student filmed the results. One of the female tutors said there had been a constant stream of inappropriate remarks. A teenage pregnancy group had drunk alcohol before the lesson and during sessions defiantly spoke about having unprotected sex earlier and having similar intentions for the future.

I had asked several questions about how long these behaviours continued. Was it every lesson or large sections in the session? Some of the above behaviours were frequent and had to be continually battled; others were single incidents. A multiplicity of complex reasons were attributed as to why students acted in these ways, ranging from poverty, an anti-education culture and parents' break-ups to large groups, long-term unemployment, frustration, prison background or the natural ebullience of teenagers. For the purposes of this paper, the focus is going to be on a range of strategies and responses which these tutors adopted as ways of countering these difficult or challenging scenarios.

Some tutors admitted that they had failed to stop the disruptive behaviour. Other tutors felt at times quite ineffectual and just could not control the class behaviour in certain contexts. One tutor had to rely on prison guards; another contacted the parents. In one case the tutor had to position himself purposefully between learners to prevent physical aggression.

Suggested solutions

In most cases respondents indicated that they had set up their classrooms so there was no possibility that the situation could deteriorate to these levels. Prevention, though not always possible, was the cure. In other words, the best way was obviously to engage the class with work and keep order from the beginning. Thus, successful strategies mentioned were standard approaches, namely establishing ground rules, maintaining rules and regulations and discussing issues with students outside the situation. This was also phrased as “one-to-one tutorials”. Other perspectives were: “reinforcing mutual respect and empathy” and offering “unconditional positive regard for all students”. Also suggested were persistence and establishing and maintaining authenticity through teaching the subject effectively. This translated into managing the classroom by always keeping the students occupied. One tutor stated:

“Start early at the first session, take control, be consistent, never threaten what you won’t or can’t accomplish and always follow through with all sanctions and threats. Don’t show weakness! Ground rules, consistency and respect are the key!!”

Other tutors emphasised class rules, goals and rewards. One tutor argued that the key was actually relationships; building up connections with individuals, finding out about their lives, communicating the curriculum effectively and supporting students with their problems. One tutor in particular intercepted the challenge from disruptive students who had multiple social problems by:

“Getting the students to share how they felt about education, school and their difficulties, by spending time with them individually...In session one, get students to write an autobiographical piece about what their school or previous education experience was like, what helped or hindered their learning; how they felt about now being in college and hopes for the future. If they trust you, students tend to be more open about their experiences and you, as a teacher, can gain a lot of insights into their problems and help them with resolving, or at least being aware of, what is happening to these individuals. This can help guide your approach in understanding and supporting individual students.”

Management responses

In this sample of 30 teachers, over half said they had no support on these issues from managers within the institution where they worked. The attitude that emerged was that if teachers had prepared their classes more effectively, the events mentioned above would not have happened. Others said that they had had varying amounts of support from managers, depending on the specific team and institution; for example, managers offered help with the removal of disruptive individuals, but also suggested the possibility of staff development and training. Colleagues, peers and friends often offered emotional support. In one institution, teachers processed all incidents of student disruption in staff meetings. This team approach was seen as a very productive approach by all staff involved.

The analysis of data

My research revealed that all teachers interviewed had encountered difficult and disruptive students at some point in Lifelong Learning; the behaviour was more extreme in certain contexts, such as classes for ex-prisoners, PRUs and those just emerging from the

category of Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) (Simmons and Thompson, 2011). Was this atypical? If the sample was expanded, would it show that these problems were worse or not as bad? Was this a DNA of what was happening in the LLS as a whole? Was the sample merely a sample? Did it only represent those particular teachers and students or if other variables had been introduced would less extreme behaviour be evidenced (Cohen et al, 2011: pp. 186-187)? What would have happened if I had purposively selected tutors who worked in more leafy suburbs, or focused only on teachers working with students at Level 3 and above rather than elements of entry, Level 1 or Level 2 which emerged?

The sample was random in the sense that I had no idea beforehand what the teaching experience or student levels were of the respondents. In fact, all teachers in the sample worked in urban environments; a variety of city colleges or training units. Nevertheless, the experiences of these particular tutors might be a useful trigger point for discussion, exploration of other strategies and the possible deployment of a more systematic research tool.

The limitations of this research might be perceived that it focused on the negative side of teaching. Thirty teachers is a small sample, but their accumulated experience of at least ten years each represented a minimum of 300 years' potential teaching time as such. This meant that there were likely to be more examples of disruptive incidents during this lengthy timescale. The questions focused on the more negative sides of these teachers' careers and therefore emphasised what went wrong rather than what went well. However, the data could also be interpreted that for most teachers in this sample these stories represented one or two dramatic events that were particularly memorable. In some cases where tutors were working with NEETS or in PRUs, the timescale of disruptive behaviours was more relentless and formed a more normative part of their everyday experience.

There was also the possibility that only teachers with very negative experiences would want to articulate 'war stories' they had gone through as some kind of self-validation, justification or therapy for coming to terms with fraught situations. My questions allowed some anonymised relief, occasional humour or acknowledgement of the difficult and challenging times they had gone through. When I asked teachers to contribute to this research, I had little idea of the specific disruptive situations that these teachers had faced during their careers. As a result of the ten-year teaching experience criteria, it was likely that everyone would have had some experience of disruptive classes.

This turned out to be the case. Everyone in the sample had experienced some element of disruption, and most had had to deal with situations which were more dramatic and confrontational at some point in their career. The time element of how many hours, weeks or years this had continued depended on the level of teaching they were involved in. Was this element of the research valid? Was I asking questions to which I already knew the answers or influencing the answers because the respondents knew me? The fact that the participants knew me meant that there was trust. If I had gone into a college where I was unknown and asked these questions purely anonymously, there may well have been suspicion as to what was going to happen with the results. On having the opportunity to speak on this subject to teachers at a college where I was unknown, I was told that lecturers had to log all incidents and these were seen as performance-related events to be discussed at appraisal.

Was anyone in my sample likely to say that they had never had any disruption in their classes? It must be repeated that I was known to all respondents, either as students on

courses, professional colleagues in my own or other institutions, or teachers whom I knew through meetings at conferences. They knew my positionality, that I was involved in TE and they had, in some cases, read my previous articles and knew that they could trust me to anonymise their responses. Of course, the question “Have you had disruptive classes and how did you deal with them?” might have a very different resonance and answer if deployed at a job interview or again at an appraisal meeting than in the context of educational research which had the aim of supporting teacher and trainee development.

To answer the point about knowing the answers before asking the questions, I suspected that teachers would have their stories, but was not expecting the extraordinary level of intensity or dramatic nature of what many teachers actually experience in their daily jobs.

Was the research valid? It could be questioned on the grounds that there was not sufficient random sampling. However, there are several problems with respect to random anonymous sampling on this sensitive issue. Firstly, these questions provoke such a strong reaction that they go to the centre of all teachers’ professional identity so that asking people with whom I had no prior relationship or connection might well not have brought up any significant data. Respondents might well question what the information was being used for. Why would teachers trust a stranger asking about their competencies? Would Ofsted, management, other institutions, funding or governmental bodies have access to the answers? Was this just more surveillance (Ball, 2003)? The teachers I asked had to trust me that this information was purely going to be used for an academic paper that might be of benefit to other teachers and trainees.

Why was it significant that I briefly outlined the strategies that teachers suggested? Surely a more systematic approach to these questions is offered by Petty (2009), Curzon (2004), Cowley (2010) and Vizard (2009) etc? The point is that in this paper we are hearing the authentic voices of teachers recounting their experiences, strategies and students’ actions, defining their own individual approaches to difficult situations they personally encountered rather than the formalised and general approach of textbooks. The strategies could be used in the future by other tutors or trainees, knowing that they had actually been used in the past.

Finally, I have to say that this research has confirmed in me the belief that teachers are the unsung heroes of our society, not only battling constant government changes and bureaucracy (Simmons, 2009), but also the day-to-day fight with many unwilling, disruptive students.

Conclusion

The question as to what happened and happens in classrooms where there is challenging behaviour is worth knowing. This paper has begun to open an investigation into the disorder problems and challenges that a sample population of teachers have faced during their careers. It turned out that all respondents had experienced disruptive behaviour. However, there were some key strategies suggested for trying to overcome these problems; namely the application of consistency, ground rules, communicating the curriculum effectively and making connections with, and supporting learners through, oral and written activities.

Although support for teachers was generally not in evidence in any formal way for dealing with these challenging situations in most respondents’ accounts, an excellent strategy did exist of talking through problematic classes in staff meetings, which was used in one institution as a way of sharing difficulties, and discussing approaches to individuals and

classes. These are all possible ways forward to help teachers and trainees improve their practice. Future research might explore the issues of management response, but possibly future research might well focus on speaking directly to students who have disrupted lessons and getting a sense of their perspective on these processes.

References

- Agee, J. (2009) 'Developing Qualitative Research Questions: A Reflective Process', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 431-447.
- Anderson, A., Hamilton, R.J., Hattie, J. (2004) 'Classroom Climate And Motivated Behaviour In Secondary Schools', *Learning Environments Research* Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 211-225.
- Armitage, A., Bryant, R., Dunhill, R., Flanagan, K., Hayes, D., Hudson, A., Kent, J., Lawes, S., Renwick, M. (2007) *Teaching and Training in Post-Compulsory Education* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.
- Ball, S. (2003) 'The Teacher's Soul And The Terrors Of Performativity', *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 215-228.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods In Education*. London and New York: Routledge and Falmer.
- Cowley, S. (2010) *Getting The Buggers To Behave* (4th ed.). London and New York: Continuum.
- Cuncliffe, A. (2004) 'On Becoming A Critically Reflexive Practitioner', *Journal of Management Education* Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 407-426.
- Curzon, L.B. (2004) *Teaching In Further Education: An Outline Of Principles And Practice* (6th ed.). London: Continuum.
- DFE (2012) 'Pupil Behaviour In Schools In England' *DFE-RR218*.
<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/> [accessed 6 Nov 2012].
- Dreikurs, R. with Cassel, P., Dreikurs, E. (2005) *Discipline Without Tears: How To Reduce Conflict And Establish Co-Operation In The Classroom*. N.J.: Wiley.
- Flick, U. (2006) *An Introduction To Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gatongi, F. (2007) 'Person-Centred Approach In Schools: Is It The Answer To Disruptive Behaviour In Our Classrooms?', *Counselling Psychology Quarterly* Vol. 20, No. 2 (June), pp. 205-211.
- Hannah, V. (2012) 'How To Teach Behaviour Management'
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/aug/27/pupil-behaviour-management-teaching-resources> [accessed 20 September 2012].
- hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching To Transgress: Education As The Practice Of Freedom*. NY, London: Routledge.
- Iveson, C., George, E., Ratner, H. (2012) *Brief Coaching: A Solution Focussed Approach*. Hove, New York: Routledge.
- Kennet, K. (2010) 'Professionalism And Reflective Practice', in Wallace, S. (ed.) *The Lifelong Learning Sector Reflective Reader*, pp. 66-79. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Kounin, J. (1977) *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

- Lebor, M. (2013a) 'Class Wars: Initial Steps Into The Fray', *Teaching In Lifelong Learning* Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 14-23.
- Lebor, M. (2013b) 'War And Peace In The Classroom: Moments Of Reprieve; A Strategy For Reflecting On And Improving Students' Classroom Behaviour', *Teaching In Lifelong Learning* Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 21-31.
- Marzano, R.J. with Marzano, S., Pickering, D.J. (2003) *Classroom Management That Works: Research-Based Strategy For Every Teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. (1954) *Motivation And Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Mulholland, H. (2012) 'Millions Paid Out To Teachers For Classroom Assaults And Accidents' <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/apr/05/teachers-classroom-assaults-accidents> [accessed 12 Sept 2012].
- Ofsted (2012) *The Framework For School Inspection From September 2012. Doc* <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk> [accessed 6 Nov 2012].
- Paton, G. (2012) 'Bad Behaviour In Schools Fuelled By Over-Indulgent Parents' <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/9173533/Bad-behaviour-in-schools-fuelled-by-over-indulgent-parents.html> [accessed 4 April 2013].
- Petty, G. (2009) *Teaching Today: A Practical Guide* (4th ed.). London: Nelson Thornes.
- Prasad, P., Caproni, P.J. (1997) 'Critical Theory In The Management Classroom; Engaging Power, Ideology And Praxis', *Journal of Management Education* Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 284-291.
- Reece, I., Walker, S. (2003) *Teaching, Training And Learning: A Practical Guide Incorporating FENTO Standards* (5th ed.). Sunderland: Business Education Publishers Ltd.
- Rogers, C. (1961) *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. London: Constable.
- Rushton, I. (2010) 'Managing Meat One: Perceptions And Anxieties Of Trainee Teachers As They Enter The Learning And Skills Sector For The First Time', *Teaching in Lifelong Learning* Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 15-22.
- Sellgren, K. (2013) 'Disruptive Behaviour Rising, Teachers Say' <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-21895705> [accessed 28 March 2013].
- Simmons, R. (2009) 'An Overview Of The Lifelong Learning Sector And Its "Condition"', in Avis, J., Fisher, R., Simmons, R. (eds.) *Issues in Post-Compulsory Education and Training: Critical Perspectives*, pp. 6-10. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield Press.
- Simmons, R., Thompson, R. (2011) *Education And Training For Young People At Risk Of Becoming NEET: Findings From An Ethnographic Study Of Work-Based Learning Programmes*. London: Routledge.
- Spiers, E. (2011) 'Bad Behaviour In The Classroom Is Not The Problem' <http://www.guardian.co.uk/teacher-network/2011/nov/03/bad-behaviour-classroom> [accessed 12 September 2012].
- Townend, M. (2013) 'Massive Rise In Disruptive Behaviour Warn Teachers' <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2013/mar/24/schools-disruptive-behaviour>

[accessed 28 March 2013].

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

Wallace, S. (2002) 'No Good Surprises: Intending Lecturers' Preconceptions And Initial Experiences Of Further Education', *British Educational Research Journal* Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 79-93.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5920/till.2014.5212>

For lifelong learners the focus is outward. At Osher, classes are not specifically skill-based, like learning a language or weaving. Instead, students generally delve into subjects they may have been interested in for years but simply didn't have time to study. Bill Lewis, 69, and Paula Ramsey Lewis, 67, both had intense careers. Mr. Lewis was a senior executive in the federal government; she held numerous positions, among them director of development for the World Affairs Council of Northern California. "I'm learning a lot of things I didn't know," Mr. Lewis said. Among their favorite classes are those taught by the journalist Eleanor Clift, including *On the Road to the White House*. "I think it's very important that you plan what you are going to do before you retire," Mr. Lewis said.