

Note. This is the original version of the paper submitted to the British Educational Research Journal. It is not the final, peer-reviewed version that appears in British Educational Research Journal, 35(5) pp. 661-686.

The effect of support staff on pupil engagement and individual attention.

Peter Blatchford, Paul Bassett, Penelope Brown and Rob Webster

*All at Dept of Psychology and Human Development,
Institute of Education,
University of London
25 Woburn Square,
London, WC1H 0AA
UK*

Corresponding author: Peter Blatchford (p.blatchford@ioe.ac.uk)

Note

The authors would like to thank Selma Babayigit for her valuable work on data collection in schools. They would also like to thank the staff and students of the participating schools for their cooperation and patience. The research was funded by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Welsh Assembly Government.

The effect of support staff on pupil engagement and individual attention.

Abstract

Despite an unprecedented increase in classroom based support staff there are confusing messages about their appropriate deployment and a lack of systematic evidence on their impact. This paper addresses the deployment and impact of classroom based support staff (TAs) in terms of: 1. a comparison between TAs and teachers; 2. differences between pupils with and without Special Educational Needs (SEN); and 3. differences between primary and secondary schools. Systematic observations of pupil behaviour in 49 primary and secondary schools showed that support staff presence resulted in increased individualisation of attention and overall teaching, easier classroom control, and pupils showed more engagement and a more active role in interaction with adults. This supports teacher's positive view of support staff but their presence also meant pupils' contact with teachers declined and at secondary level there was less individual and active interactions between teachers and pupils.

Background

A number of developments have affected the range and number of support staff in schools in England and Wales. A major context for policy and resourcing involving support staff in schools was the introduction in January 2003 of the National Agreement (NA): *'Raising Standards and Tackling Workload'* which set out a number of measures designed to raise pupil standards, tackle teacher workload, including a concerted attack on unnecessary paperwork and bureaucracy, and create new support staff roles (see Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, Russell, Webster and Heywood, 2006; Burgess, 2008)

Information from the DCSF, the Deployment and Impact of Support Staff (DISS) project (Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, Russell and Webster, 2007) and UNISON (2002, 2004) show that these developments have been accompanied by a huge increase in numbers of support staff in schools. Numbers increased from 60,600 in 1997 to 176,900 in 2008 (DCSF, 2008) and the DISS survey showed a particular increase in TA equivalent staff.

Despite evidence pointing to the ubiquitous presence of support staff in schools, there is little systematic data on how they are deployed and how much impact they have on teachers and pupils. The DISS project was set up to address this lack of data and provides a comprehensive assessment of TA deployment and impact in the wake of the NA. This paper is concerned with the deployment and impact of classroom based support (in the DISS project these are called 'TA Equivalent' and include Teaching Assistants, Learning Support Assistants, Classroom Assistants, Nursery Nurses, and Higher Level Teaching Assistants). Although the DISS project overall is concerned with impact across a range of outcomes, in this paper we concentrate on the deployment of TAs and effects of their presence on pupil engagement and interactions with teachers. Information on the characteristics, deployment and impact of other categories of support staff in schools is given in Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, Russell and Webster (2007).

This paper addresses the deployment and impact of TAs in three main ways: 1. in terms of a comparison between TAs and teachers; 2. in terms of differences between pupils with and without SEN; and 3. in terms of differences between primary and secondary schools. More details on these three features are given below.

Deployment of support staff in schools

A number of studies have identified uncertainties about just how TAs are deployed in classrooms. Studies have drawn attention to difficulties concerning the boundaries between

teaching and non-teaching roles, and the grey areas where uncertainty exists (Farrell, Balshaw, and Polat, 1999; Moran and Abbott, 2002; Beeson, Kerry and Kerry, 2003; Mistry, Burton and Brundrett, 2004). This uncertainty lies at the heart of controversy over the expansion of support staff in schools and is why some teacher organizations are concerned that TAs may take over roles and responsibilities that should be carried out by teachers. Mortimore, Mortimore, Thomas, Cairns and Taggart (1992) addressed a specific version of this issue in terms of when it is appropriate to consider TAs ‘substituting’ or ‘augmenting’ the teachers’ role. A Scottish study found that boundaries between the teacher’s role and the TA’s role were sometimes unclear and some TAs were judged to overstep a boundary into teaching (Schlapp, Wilson & Davidson, 2003).

There have been different messages from Government and other bodies about the appropriate deployment of support in classrooms. The recruitment and retention crisis in the teaching profession, fuelled by concerns about workload pressures (School Teachers’ Review Body, 2001), was one reason for government proposals that support staff could play a significant role in releasing teachers so they could focus on core teaching tasks (DfES, 2001a). In this sense, support staff were seen to have an *indirect* effect on pupil standards. Yet the DfES ‘*Time for Standards*’ consultation described support staff as an intrinsic part of “achieve[ing] ever higher standards”, via “more opportunities to take on wider and deeper roles in support of teaching and learning” (DfES, 2002). The documentation makes it clear that support staff have a *direct* impact on pupil attainment, through overtly pedagogical input. But with the advent of the NA the emphasis was back on an *indirect* effect by taking on routine and clerical tasks.

This lack of clarity suggests the value in having current and clear data on just *how* TAs are employed in classrooms and the extent and type of their interactions with pupils. A main aim of the DISS study therefore was to provide such a systematic description of support staff activities and interactions. The aim was to get precise estimates of the time spent supporting pupils in classrooms as opposed to not working directly with them, and on the balance of interactions with individuals, groups or the whole class; and how much time was spent moving around the classroom.

Beyond a general picture of deployment, and in line with the three areas mentioned above, we addressed:

i. Teachers vs. support staff

One aim was to compare the teacher and the TA on key observation measures, e.g., the extent of individual attention, pupil active and sustained interactions, and different types of behaviour, e.g., the extent to which they were related to the task or controlling pupil’s behaviour.

ii. Differences by level of SEN

Given what has been said so far about the deployment of TAs, it seemed important to obtain systematic information on the deployment of support staff with regard to different types of pupils. In the Class Size and Pupil Adult Ratio (CSPAR) project results pointed to TAs being used to interact directly with pupils, supporting certain children, in particular, those with SEN, low ability or difficult behaviour (Blatchford, Russell, Bassett, Brown, and Martin, 2007). Only rarely did support staff seem to work with higher attaining pupils. In England and Wales there are three levels of need: 1. ‘School Action’ (pupils who required provision different from, and additional to, other pupils); 2. ‘School Action Plus’ (pupils who receive help or help is sought from sources external to the school); and 3. ‘Statemented’ (pupils with more severe or complex needs that require exceptional provision). Difficulties arising when children with SEN are taught by TAs have been identified (Ofsted, 2006; Giangreco, Edelman, Luiselli and MacFarland, 1997). Interest was therefore in obtaining a systematic description of how TAs and teachers

varied in their interactions with pupils with different levels of need (including those the majority of pupils without extra support), in terms of the amount of individual attention and active interactions involving initiations, responses and sustained interactions vs passive interactions within which pupils listen. We need to know more precisely if TAs spend most of their time with pupils with SEN or whether they interact with other pupils as well. How do TAs interactions with different kinds of pupils differ from teachers?

iii. Primary vs. secondary

The DISS study aimed to provide more detailed information across both primary and secondary stages. There are many important changes to children over these years, and to the curriculum and assessment arrangements, which will have implications for pupils' learning and teaching, but little is known about the possibly changing role and impact of support staff over these stages. This suggests the value in obtaining a detailed comparison of the deployment of TAs in primary and secondary schools.

Impact of support staff on teachers and pupils

At the beginning of the century the Government claimed that support staff had "been central to what has been achieved so far in raising standards" (DfES, 2001a), and planned to push ahead with reform, though there was limited evidence of their impact on teaching and learning. Obtaining good information on impact is one of the most important yet problematic aspects of research in this area. Giangreco and Doyle (2007) state that studies to date offer "limited guidance to policymakers and practitioners", as they provide "only the most basic descriptive findings...virtually devoid of efficacy data". Some studies have painted a largely positive picture (e.g., Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education, 2002; Mortimore et al., 1992). In DISS Strand 1 Waves 1 and 2, teachers were mostly positive about the impact of support staff on teaching (Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, Russell and Webster, 2007). But evidence on the impact of support staff on pupil academic outcomes has so far been inconclusive (Finn, Gerber, Farber and Achilles, 2000; Howes, Farrell, Kaplan and Moss, 2003). Findings covering effects on academic outcomes are taken up in later reports; here we concentrate on effects on pupil and adult behaviour in class.

Much existing information on impact rests on teacher's experiences and judgements, rather than from an objective description of practice. In this paper, the impact of TAs was addressed again in terms of the three main themes described above.

i. Teachers vs. support staff

Interest was in whether TA presence had effects on adult interactions with pupils and whether this was different for teachers and TAs. On the basis of the CSPAR study one would predict that effects on teachers' interactions with pupils would be positive in the sense that the presence of support staff would lead to more teacher to pupil interactions.

ii. Differences by level of SEN

We wanted systematic information on the effect of TA presence on pupil engagement and the extent and type of adult and teacher interactions with all pupils but also whether these varied for pupils with and without SEN.

iii. Differences between primary and secondary

There is evidence from interventions in schools, such as class size reductions, that the youngest pupils benefit most in terms of academic outcomes (Finn and Achilles, 1999; Blatchford, Bassett, Goldstein and Martin, 2003). There is also evidence of age effects in terms of the effect of class size on pupil engagement (Blatchford, Bassett and Brown, 2005) but there is a dearth of

information available about whether there are age differences in the effect of TAs on teacher and pupil interactions and pupil classroom engagement.

We now describe in more detail two main sets of behaviours examined in relation to the impact of TAs:

1. Teacher-Pupil and Adult-pupil Interactions

a. Overall amount of teaching

In the CSPAR study it was found that TAs allowed more overall teaching from adults. In this study we wanted to see, as might be expected, whether pupils with SEN, or who are seen by schools to be in need of extra provision, experience more teaching overall with TAs present, in order to help them catch up.

b. Individual attention to pupils

One of the main benefits of TAs as seen by teachers is that they allow more individual attention to pupils (Blatchford, Russell, Bassett, Brown, and Martin, 2007). Moreover it was found in the CSPAR project that when a TA was present, pupils were more likely to be the focus of the teacher's attention, that is, there was more individualised teacher attention. It might also be predicted that TA presence will lead to more individual attention to pupils with SEN and on School Action and School Action Plus.

c. Easier classroom control and management

Teachers argue that the presence of TAs can help with classroom management (Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, Russell and Webster, with Babayagit and Heywood, 2007). It might be predicted that this would involve TAs taking on responsibility for pupils who contribute most to classroom disruption, and therefore reducing overall the amount of talk dealing with negative behaviour. It was therefore predicted that the presence of TAs in a classroom would reduce the amount of teacher talk dealing with negative behaviour.

2. Pupil classroom engagement and off task behaviour

a. On and off task behaviour

One main element of children's successful adjustment to school is likely to involve their productive engagement in classes, as reflected in the extent of their work related interactions with teachers, other pupils and when working on their own. Some studies, e.g., Werts, Zigmond and Leeper (2001) and Loos, Williams and Bailey (1977) have found that classroom engagement and on task behaviour increased when support staff were close to pupils (with disabilities). It was therefore predicted that the presence of TAs would have most effect on pupils with SEN and School Action;

b. Pupil active involvement with teacher

In the CSPAR, when there was a TA present in the classroom pupils had a more active form of interaction with the teacher, in the form of initiating contact, responding, or being involved in sustained interaction (Blatchford, Russell, Bassett, Brown, and Martin, 2007). It was therefore predicted that this result would be replicated; however, in the present study we separated TA and teacher interactions and interest was in whether this would be similar for TAs and teachers, whether it varied for pupils who differed in terms of need, and between primary and secondary schools.

Summary of predictions

It was predicted that with TAs present in classrooms there would be more teaching overall, more individual attention from TAs and teachers; and better classroom control as seen in less adult and teacher talk about negative behaviour. Predictions regarding pupils with SEN, School Action Plus and School Action, and primary vs secondary, were not clear cut but generally it was anticipated that effects would be most obvious for primary aged pupils and pupils in most need.

It was predicted that with TAs present there would be more pupil on task and less off task behaviour and more pupil active involvement with teachers. It was predicted that effects would be most marked for pupils with SEN, School Action Plus and School Action. Predictions regarding differences between primary and secondary were less clear cut but generally it was anticipated that effects would be most obvious for primary aged pupils.

Method

Comment on research methods

There are a number of limitations to previous studies with claims often based on anecdotal and informal comments. Finn, Pannozzo and Achilles (2003) point to the need for studies that make use of systematic observations, in order to provide reliable evidence on classroom processes. The current paper builds on this suggestion by collecting systematic observation data of moment by moment classroom engagement and behaviour.

There are huge challenges for research seeking to measure effects of TAs on pupil outcomes in the context of normal school conditions. The overall strategy was to employ a naturalistic research design, random selection of participating schools, and sophisticated statistical analyses that examined effects of TAs on moment by moment behaviours while controlling for factors likely to interact with or confound any TA effect. It recorded TA presence as found on an everyday basis in schools rather than in specific curriculum interventions. Although it is commonly recognised that hierarchical, or multilevel, models are necessary because observations are not always independent of each other (pupils within schools and classes are more similar to each other than pupils in different classes and schools), a feature of this paper is that it allowed for the clustered nature of observation data *within pupils*. More details are given below.

Sample

Schools

Systematic observations were carried out over 2005/6 in 49 mainstream schools. These schools were originally chosen at random from a national survey as part in the DISS project and they then agreed to field work by researchers. There were 27 primary schools and 22 secondary schools. Two year groups were generally observed in each school, either Year 1 and Year 3 (5/6 and 7/8 years) or Year 7 and Year 10 (11/12 and 14/15 years). Observations were conducted in 88 year groups.

Characteristics of pupils

The observations were on a sub-sample of eight pupils per class, randomly selected by the teacher, from three groups that differed in terms of level of support. Information on the level of pupils' special needs status (taken from the forms completed by schools staff during observation visits) was then used to classify them into three groups for the purposes of analysis: 1. no special needs, 2. School Action and 3. School Action Plus/Statement (these last two categories were combined to help balance numbers of pupils in groups and also because by definition they were the highest level of special need). This classification into three groups was used because of the obvious way in which it affected the amount of support received, as well as its likely effect on learning and attainment. For convenience, the three groups will be called 'no SEN', 'School Action' and 'SEN'. Pupils were also classified into three attainment groups - low, medium or high - based on a classification made by the teacher.

There were 686 pupils observed in total. Details of the sample are given in Table 1. The variables listed in the table were also included in the analyses.

Table 1: Systematic observation component: characteristics of pupils

Characteristic	Category	Number	Percentage
Year	1	200	29%
	3	183	27%
	7	152	22%
	10	151	22%
Gender	Female	335	49%
	Male	351	51%
SEN status	None	319	55%
	School Action	141	24%
	School Action +	57	10%
	Statement	68	12%
Attainment group	Low	123	21%
	Medium	241	41%
	High	221	40%

Observation system

The observations provided a moment by moment description of each pupil's behaviour. The basic principle was to observe when classroom based activities took place, and to provide a representative and systematic account of pupils' behaviour. Observations were conducted on each child in turn in blocks of 10 ten-second time intervals, with gaps of twenty seconds between observations to allow recording of what took place in the previous ten seconds. There were 34,420 ten-second observations in total. Visits lasted four days except when observations were only possible in one year group (such as infant or junior schools) – they then lasted two days - and observations were made in maths, English, science and Welsh lessons.

The observation categories were devised on the basis of well established systems, as used in the CSPAR and SPRinG studies (Blatchford, Bassett and Brown, 2005; Blatchford, Baines, Rubie-Davies, Bassett and Chowne, 2006). Not all categories feature in this paper and brief definitions of categories used in this paper are as follows:

Adult to child talk

Adult teach: adult behaviour directly concerned with the substantive content of subject knowledge, i.e. communicating concepts, facts or ideas by explaining, informing, demonstrating, questioning, suggesting.

Adult on task: as adult teach plus *task preparation*.

Other categories: *procedure/routine, monitor/observe, dealing with negative behaviour, social matters and other.*

Pupil role

Pupil 'focus': target child is the focus of the teacher's or TA's attention, and this could be in the context of one-to-one, group or whole class sessions. These were coded separately as 'short', i.e., not for the whole ten second interval, and 'long', i.e., contact continued through the whole ten second period.

Pupil is audience: another child is the focus of the adult's attention in the group or class involving target child, or adult interacts to same extent with all children.

Pupil to adult interaction

Pupil to adult - attend/listen: the child simply listens to the adult during the interval and does not interact by responding or initiating.

Other categories: pupil to adult – initiate (begins an interaction), *respond* (responds to an adult initiation), and *sustain* (i.e., interaction extends over a ten-second time interval). Also *eavesdropping*, and *not attending*.

Pupil on task to adult: all child behaviours in contact with adult that are concerned with work.

Pupil off task to adult: child behaviour when in contact with the adult obviously inappropriate or unrelated to situation either passively (e.g. not attending) or actively (e.g., wandering around room, talking to others).

Other categories: pupil to adult procedure/routine, social matters.

Pupil-pupil interaction

Target and pupil on task: all contacts with other pupils that are concerned with work and allocated tasks.

Target to pupil off task: behaviour with other children that is deliberately off-task, e.g., mucking about or aggressive towards others.

Individual behavior/not interacting

Individual on task: target child is involved in own work activity.

Individual off task (active): target child focuses on something other than task in hand.

Individual off task (passive): target child is disengaged during task activity, for example, daydreaming.

Computed categories

Pupil on task: total on task behaviours, i.e., behaviours related to the substantive nature of allocated work or preparation for the work across the three social modes, i.e. child to teacher on task, target and child on task, and individual on task.

Pupil off task: total off task behaviours, i.e., all off-task behaviours in the three social modes, i.e., child to teacher off task (active or passive), target to child off task, and individual off task (active and passive).

Active interaction with adult: the sum of the three child to teacher categories where the child's role was an active and not a passive one, i.e., the child initiates, responds or sustains interactions with the adult.

Activities of support staff

In addition, one section of the systematic observation forms required observers to code the general activity of support staff in the same classroom as the observed pupils. This was done at the end of each block of ten observations. The data provide a systematic account of support staff activities when working and not working with pupils.

Measure of support staff presence

At the time of each observation (i.e., each ten-second time interval) a note was made of the presence of support staff in the classroom at the time.

Reliability checks

Reliability coefficients for the main sets of mutually exclusive categories were high with kappa coefficients ranging from 0.80 to 0.77.

Statistical methods and analysis of Systematic Observation data

Analysis of observation data was conducted with the ten-second observation interval as the unit of analysis. This allowed the basis for powerful analyses of the co-occurrence of behaviours – e.g., whether certain behaviours occurred more when a TA was present or not. This kind of analysis is not possible when simple totals for each pupil are used. The observation variables therefore took the form of binary variables, in the sense of each either being performed, or not being performed, during one time interval.

Deployment

The analyses of deployment were conducted by use of simple cross tabulations. This allowed an initial descriptive account of basic frequencies of behaviours and whether certain behaviours differed between teachers and support staff, between different types of pupils and between primary and secondary schools. Because of the problem of lack of independence of observations within pupils, statistical tests of cross tabulations based on frequencies are not really appropriate.

Impact

The analysis of the impact of support staff was much more sophisticated. There were two main features. Firstly, the effect of TA presence and other explanatory factors thought likely to influence the observation outcomes were examined jointly. The aim was to estimate the effect of TA presence, controlling for the effects of the other possible explanatory factors. As all outcome variables were binary in nature, logistic regression models were used to examine the effects of the various explanatory variables upon the outcomes.

In addition to support staff presence, the following variables were included in the analyses:

- SEN status of pupils (none, School Action, School Action Plus/SEN)
- Gender
- Number of teachers
- Subject
- Pupil start of year attainment

This therefore tells us whether the presence of support staff has an independent effect. In addition, the interaction between TA presence and pupil SEN status was assessed. This examined if the effect of TA presence varied for pupils of different SEN status. Where significant interactions were found, the results are reported separately for each subgroup.

The second feature, in contrast to much previous research, was the use of multilevel statistical models. These were required as it is likely that observations from pupils in the same class will be more similar than two observations from pupils in different classes. Similarly, two observations from the same pupil are more likely to be similar than two observations from different pupils. Therefore, the observations cannot be regarded as independent of each other, and so multilevel regression models (Goldstein, 1995) are required.

Results

Deployment of classroom based support staff: observations of support staff

The general activity of support staff in the same classroom as the observed pupils is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Deployment of class based support staff: systematic observations (frequencies and percentages)

	Primary	Secondary	Total
Not working with pupils			
Listening to the teacher teach	406 17.2%	352 23.7%	758 19.7%
Talking to the teacher	109 4.6%	55 3.7%	164 4.3%
Materials	304 12.9%	62 4.2%	366 9.5%
Marking	16 0.7%	6 0.4%	22 0.6%
Other non-pupil based activity	65 2.8%	13 0.9%	78 2%
<i>Total not working with pupils</i>	38.2%	32.9%	36.1%
Working with pupils			
Working with 1 pupil alone	589 25%	532 35.8%	1121 29.2%
Working with a group	509 21.6%	71 4.8%	580 15.1%
Walking ('roving') whole class	220 9.3%	375 25.2%	595 15.5%
Teaching part class	4 0.2%	0 0%	4 0.1%
Teaching whole class	52 2.2%	1 0.1%	53 1.4%
Other pupil based activity	81 3.4%	20 1.3%	101 2.6%
<i>Total working with pupils</i>	61.8%	67.1%	63.9%
Overall Total	100%	100%	100%

At a general level, support staff were twice as likely to be working with pupils as not working with them (64% vs 36% of observations). The most common individual activities were working with one pupil (29% of all observations) and listening to the teacher teach (20%). Support staff, at least during these observations, very rarely took the whole class or even part of the class.

There were some differences between primary and secondary schools. There was not much difference in the overall amount of time spent working with pupils (62% vs 67%) but support staff at secondary worked more with individuals (36% vs 25%) while at primary they were much more likely to work with groups (22% vs 5%); secondary staff were more likely to work with different pupils in a roving role (25% vs 9%).

The deployment of support staff in classrooms: data from pupil based observations

In this section we examine basic frequencies of the main observation categories, coded every ten seconds.

Adult-pupil interaction: differences between teachers and support staff and the three pupil groups.

Teachers were present in almost all observations (95%; 32644 observations) and support staff in 52% of observations (17922). We combined all the other adults involved in interactions with pupils into an ‘other’ category. These occurred in 12% of all observations. There were overall differences between the three pupil groups in the number of interactions with different adults in the classroom (see Table 3). The no SEN group interacted more with teachers (91% of interactions with adults), compared with School Action and SEN pupils (80% and 76%), while the pupils with higher levels of SEN spent more time interacting with support staff (22%, 16% and 7% of all pupil adult interactions for SEN, School Action and no SEN groups respectively).

Table 3: Interactions with adults: pupil level of need X type of adult: number and percentage of observations

	No SEN	School Action	SEN	Total
Teacher	8663 90.7%	3794 80%	3388 76.2%	15845 84.5%
Support Staff	628 6.6%	756 15.9%	979 22%	2363 12.6%
Other	264 2.8%	195 4.1%	82 1.8%	541 2.9%
Total	9555	4745	4449	18749

Table 4: Pupil role in interaction with adult x type of adult

	Teacher	Support staff	Other	Total
Focus short	106 5.6%	37 19.4%	4 11.8%	147 6.9%
Focus long	95 5%	83 43.5%	6 17.6%	184 8.7%
Group audience	37 1.9%	32 16.8%	19 55.9%	88 4.1%
Class audience	1610 84.8%	37 19.4%	5 14.7%	1652 77.8%
Other	50 2.6%	2 1%	0 0%	52 2.4%
Total	1898	191	34	2123

Adult attention: ‘audience’ vs ‘focus’ modes

As seen in Table 4, pupils were much more likely to be in ‘audience’ mode, usually as a member of the whole class (78%) or a group (4%), rather than the focus of attention (16%). When they were the focus of attention this was more likely to be ‘long’ (9%) than ‘short’ (7%), i.e., sustained for the length of the ten second time interval, as opposed to a brief occurrence no longer than ten seconds

Differences between teachers and support staff, and the three pupil groups

There were marked differences in pupil interactions with teachers and support staff (also shown in Table 4). Pupils were six times more likely to be the focus of attention of support staff (63%) compared with teachers (11%). The biggest contrast was for extended one to one contact (‘focus long’): 44% vs. 5%. Conversely, in the vast majority (87%) of pupil interactions with teachers, pupils were in ‘audience’ mode (i.e., listening to the teacher talk); this compared with only 36% of support staff interactions with pupils

The three pupil groups differed in the extent to which they were the focus of attention of different adults. The amount of extended one to one contact with support staff increased with level of pupil need, so that the SEN group had by far the most contact of this sort, as a proportion of support staff interactions with pupils, and the no SEN group the least (56%, and 20% respectively).

Conversely, the no SEN group spent more time in audience mode with teachers (90%) but also, interestingly, more time in audience mode with support staff (59%, compared with the School Action and SEN groups: 47% and 27% respectively). This suggests that the no SEN pupils are more likely to be in groups within which support staff are focusing primarily on children designated as SEN or School Action.

Adult to pupil interactions: type of talk

There was little difference between teachers and support staff in the general type of adult to pupil task; both were as likely to be engaged in task interactions with pupils (88% and 83% respectively). The three groups of pupils engaged in about the same amount of on task, task preparation, procedure and other behaviours with teachers and support staff.

Pupil talk to teachers and support staff

With regard to pupils' talk to adults (see Table 5), most time was spent in attending (70%), followed by not attending (13%). Active interaction with an adult (the total of 'begins', 'responds' and 'sustains') occurred in only 16% of interactions with adults. Overall, then, pupils tend to be in a passive mode when interacting with adults.

Table 5: Pupil to Adult interactions x type of adult

	Teacher	Support staff	Other	Total
Begins	47 2.5%	20 10.1%	1 3%	68 3.2%
Responds	88 4.6%	30 15.2%	3 9.1%	121 5.7%
Sustains	66 3.5%	74 37.4%	6 18.2%	146 6.8%
Attend/listen audience	1294 67.9%	51 25.8%	9 27.3%	1354 63.4%
Attend/ working	131 6.9%	10 5.1%	0 0%	141 6.6%
Not attending	244 12.8%	11 5.6%	14 42.4%	269 12.6%
Eavesdropping	26 1.4%	2 1%	0 0%	28 1.3%
Other	9 0.5%	0 0%	0 0%	9 0.4%
Total	1905	198	33	2136

Table 6: Pupil to adult type of interaction X type of adult

	Teacher	Support staff	Other	Total
On task	1610 84.3%	175 88.4%	22 64.7%	1807 84.4%
Procedure/routine	17 0.9%	1 0.5%	0 0%	18 0.8%
Social	1 0.1%	2 1%	0 0%	3 0.1%
Off task active	114 6%	11 5.6%	7 20.6%	132 6.2%
Off task passive	144 7.5%	8 4%	5 14.7%	157 7.3%
Other	23 1.2%	1 0.5%	0 0%	24 1.1%
Total	1909	198	34	2141

As with adult interactions with pupils, pupil talk to adults (Table 6) was predominantly task related (84%), with 14% off task, either actively (6%) or passively (7%).

Differences between adults

Pupils' talk to teachers and support staff was very different (see Table 5). In terms of the pupil role in the interaction, they tended to 'attend' far more to teachers (75% vs 31% with support staff). Conversely, they engaged in far more active interaction with support staff, i.e., the total of 'begins', 'responds' and 'sustains' (63% compared with 11% for teachers). Sustained interaction was more common with support staff compared to teachers (37% vs 4%). Pupil interactions with support staff are therefore more active and longer. Pupils were twice as likely to not attend to teachers as support staff (13% vs 6%).

As for the kinds of behaviours in which pupils engaged when with teachers and support staff, there were again few differences (see Table 6), although pupils were slightly more likely to be off task with teachers (14% vs 10%), especially off task 'passive' (8% vs 4%), probably reflecting disengagement from whole class teacher led sessions.

Type of adult and pupil group

There were signs that off task behaviour was more prevalent with teachers in comparison to support staff, especially in the case of SEN pupils (17% with teachers vs 7% with support staff). Given that most of the off task behaviour of SEN pupils with teachers is off task passive (66%), this suggests that such pupils are more likely to be disengaged from teacher talk to them in comparison to support staff talk to them.

Impact of support staff on adult pupil interactions in the classroom

In this section we analyse the impact of support staff presence on adult pupil interaction and classroom engagement. In the case of adult pupil interaction, the analyses were done twice, once with adults overall and then separately for teachers alone.

Where there was a significant interaction between SEN status and support staff, the effect of support staff is given for each SEN group. Results are expressed in terms of odds ratios. The figures are the odds of a given behaviour when a member of support staff was present compared to when support staff were not present. An odds ratio greater than one means that the behaviour was more likely with support staff present, whilst an odds ratio less than one means that the behaviour was less likely with support staff present. This can offer a reliable estimate of the

degree of difference between the groups; for example, an odds ratio of 2.0 means that the odds of this occurring were doubled. Also given are 95% confidence intervals and p-values indicating the significance of each result.

Overall amount of pupil interaction with teachers

First we examined whether the presence of support staff affected the overall amount of interaction between pupils and teachers. Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: The effect of support staff presence on interactions with teacher

Pupil group	Subgroup	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	No SEN	0.76 (0.68, 0.86)	<0.001
	School Action	0.32 (0.27, 0.39)	<0.001
	SA+ / SEN	0.35 (0.28, 0.45)	<0.001
Secondary only	No SEN	1.05 (0.83, 1.32)	0.70
	School Action	0.80 (0.65, 0.98)	0.03
	SA+ / SEN	0.63 (0.52, 0.76)	<0.001

For primary and secondary pupils separately, there was a significant interaction between support staff presence and SEN status, suggesting that the relationship between support staff and the amount of interaction with a teacher varied by SEN group. However, despite this, in almost all analyses there was a significant effect of support staff on the interaction with a teacher, that is, it was almost always less likely with support staff present. . In general, the effect of support staff was strongest in pupils with a higher level of SEN status, and, though present, was less strong for pupils with lower levels of, or no, SEN.

Amount of teaching

Next we analysed whether the presence of support staff affected the overall amount of adult ‘teaching’ e.g. when adults were engaged in the substantive topic, or preparing pupils for the task (i.e., whether or not the adult was ‘on task’ when interacting with the child).

Table 8: The effect of support staff presence on teaching from an adult

Pupil group	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	0.99 (1.10, 1.08)	0.84
Secondary only	1.33 (1.06, 1.66)	0.01

As seen in Table 8, for secondary pupils there was significantly more adult teaching when support staff were present in the classroom. The odds of adults teaching were over 30% greater

Teaching from the teacher

The effect of support staff on the amount of teaching just from teachers was also examined, and the results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: The effect of support staff presence on teacher teach

School type	Subgroup	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary	All pupils	1.04 (0.90, 1.21)	0.52
Secondary	All pupils	1.44 (1.16, 1.77)	<0.001

For secondary but not primary schools there was a highly significant effect of support staff. Teacher ‘teach’ was more common when support staff were present, with the odds over 40% higher. The results were therefore similar to those for adults in general and did not vary between pupils of differing attainment.

Adult individual attention to pupils

Table 10: The effect of support staff presence on individualised attention (‘focus’) from adults

Pupil group	Subgroup	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	No SEN	1.33 (1.09, 1.63)	0.006
	School Action	2.09 (1.56, 2.70)	<0.001
	SA+ / SEN	1.98 (1.47, 2.68)	<0.001
Secondary only	No SEN	0.85 (0.55, 1.31)	0.46
	School Action	1.14 (0.84, 1.54)	0.40
	SA+ / SEN	2.43 (1.89, 3.14)	<0.001

For primary pupils the presence of support staff led to more individual pupil attention (see Table 10), though this varied by pupil group; the odds of the pupil being the focus of the adult increasing by over 30% for pupils with no SEN, whilst the odds of the outcome occurring doubled for the SEN and also the School Action group. For secondary pupils, there was a highly significant effect of support staff only for the School Action Plus/SEN group; the odds of the pupil being the focus of adult attention were over twice as high as when not present

Table 11: The effect of support staff presence on individualised attention (‘focus’) from the teacher

School type	Subgroup	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary	All pupils	1.00 (0.83, 1.20)	1.00
Secondary	All pupils	0.56 (0.44, 0.71)	<0.001

Pupil focus of teacher

For secondary schools, there was a large effect with the odds of being the focus of teacher almost halved when a member of support staff was present (see Table 11). There was no evidence of an effect at primary level.

These results contrast with those from the analyses of adult only which indicated more pupil focus of adult with support staff present for all pupils in primary schools, and also more pupil focus of adult in secondary schools for School Action Plus and Statemented pupils only.

Dealing with negative behaviour

Table 12: The effect of support staff on adults dealing with negative behaviour

Pupil group	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	0.74 (0.56, 0.98)	0.04
Secondary only	0.69 (0.53, 0.92)	0.01

For primary and secondary pupils there was less dealing with negative behaviour when support staff were present (see Table 12). The effect did not vary by SEN status.

Table 13: The effect of support staff on teacher dealing with negative behaviour

School type	Subgroup	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary	All pupils	0.76 (0.55, 1.05)	0.09
Secondary	All pupils	0.75 (0.56, 1.01)	0.06

Teacher dealing with negative behaviour

Results for teachers only were similar though this was not quite statistically significant for either primary or secondary schools (see Table 13). For both school types teachers were less likely to deal with negative behaviour when support staff were present and the effect did not vary for pupils with different SEN levels.

Impact of support staff on pupil engagement in class and active involvement with adults.

Classroom engagement: total on task behaviour

The total of all on task behaviours was calculated by adding up on task behaviours in each of the three social modes (i.e., when not interacting, when interacting with other pupils and when interacting with adults) (see Table 14). The same procedure was followed for off task behaviour (see Table 15).

Table 14: The effect of support staff presence on total on task behaviour

Pupil group	Subgroup	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	No SEN	1.30 (1.10, 1.54)	0.002
	School Action	0.84 (0.66, 1.06)	0.14
	SA+ / SEN	1.00 (0.76, 1.32)	1.00
Secondary only	No SEN	1.24 (0.92, 1.69)	0.16
	School Action	1.48 (1.15, 1.90)	0.002
	SA+ / SEN	2.01 (1.60, 2.53)	<0.001

For primary schools there was a significant effect for the no SEN group only; they were 30% more likely to be on task with a member of support staff present.

For secondary schools there was a significant increase in on task behaviour with support staff present for School Action pupils, and especially for the School Action Plus/SEN group. For this last group the odds of being on task were around twice as high.

Table 15: The effect of support staff presence on total on task behaviour

Pupil group	Subgroup	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	No SEN	0.64 (0.53, 0.77)	<0.001
	School Action	1.09 (0.84, 1.41)	0.51
	SA+ / SEN	1.00 (0.75, 1.33)	1.00
Secondary only	No SEN	0.87 (0.62, 1.20)	0.38
	School Action	0.83 (0.64, 1.08)	0.17
	SA+ / SEN	0.47 (0.37, 0.60)	<0.001

Total off task behaviour

As with on task behaviour, the effect of support staff on off task behaviour varied for different SEN groups. When only primary school pupils were considered, the group with no SEN was significantly less likely to be off task when a member of support staff was present.

The analysis for secondary pupils indicated a significant effect of support staff for the School Action Plus/SEN group only. The odds of this group being off task with support staff present were around half of those when support staff were not present.

Pupil active interaction with adults

Table 16: The effect of support staff presence on pupil to adult active interaction

Pupil group	Subgroup	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary only	-	1.56 (1.34, 1.81)	<0.001
Secondary only	No SEN	0.86 (0.56, 1.32)	0.50
	School Action	1.13 (0.84, 1.53)	0.42
	SA+ / SEN	2.52 (1.95, 3.28)	<0.001

For all primary pupils there was an increased likelihood of pupil active interaction (in the sense of beginning, responding to, or sustaining interaction) with adults, with the odds over 50% higher when support staff were present (see Table 16). For School Action Plus/SEN secondary pupils the presence of support staff was highly associated with an increased occurrence of pupil active interaction.

Table 17: The effect of support staff presence on pupil to teacher active interaction

School type	Subgroup	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Primary	All pupils	0.87 (0.73, 1.07)	0.21
Secondary	All pupils	0.59 (0.46, 0.75)	<0.001

Pupil active interaction with teacher

The results for pupil active interactions with the teacher showed no significant effect for primary schools (see Table 17). For secondary schools there was a significant effect with the odds of pupil active interaction with the teacher nearly halved when support staff were present. The results for both primary and secondary schools did not vary for pupils by SEN status.

These results contrast with those for all adults, which indicated that active interaction with an adult was more common with support staff present in primary schools for all pupils. The results for secondary schools indicated that the outcome was more likely with support staff present for School Action Plus/SEN pupils only, and no effect for other pupils.

Discussion

Deployment of support staff in classrooms

One form of analysis provided a general description of the activities of classroom based support staff, stemming from observations of all support staff and divided into categories involving contact (or not) with pupils. We found that classroom based support staff were twice as likely to be working with pupils in comparison to not working directly with them.

These results can be supplemented by other results from the DISS project which provided a broader description of the deployment of all categories of support staff, in terms of activities undertaken and based on timelogs completed by support staff (see Blatchford et al, 2008). When all sources of data from the DISS project are taken together results show conclusively that classroom based support staff spend much of their time in a direct pedagogical role, supporting and interacting with pupils, and this exceeds time assisting the teacher or the school.

The systematic observation analysis provided more detail on how support staff supported pupils and how this varied between primary and secondary schools. The most common activity overall was working with one pupil (29%). The results showed that at secondary level support staff tended to work with individuals and rove the classroom, while at primary level they worked with groups of pupils.

A second type of analysis of deployment also came from the systematic observations and stemmed from the ten second, moment by moment, descriptions of individual pupils. This provided a systematic and objective description of support staff behaviour as experienced by pupils. These results showed important differences in the interactions pupils had with teachers and support staff. Pupils were six times more likely to be the focus of attention with support staff compared to teachers. Conversely, with teachers pupils were more often in 'audience' mode; they are more likely to be one of a crowd, and this applies particularly to the no SEN group. The main group of pupils without SEN interacted more with teachers, while the pupils with SEN and School Action spent more time interacting with support staff. The amount of individualised attention from support staff increased with level of pupil need but all received more from support staff than teachers. Pupil interactions with support staff were also more active and more sustained, and it was the SEN pupils who engaged in most of this kind of behaviour.

Impact of support staff on adult pupil interactions

Much coverage of the impact of support staff has relied on the reports of teachers (see Howes et al, 2003). But in this paper we were able to address their impact on teachers through the systematic observations. These results indicated that the presence of support staff had a seemingly beneficial effect overall on interactions. First, support staff allowed more *individualisation of attention from adults in the classroom*, as seen in the greater amount of individual attention ('focus'). Second, there seemed to be benefits in terms of *classroom control*, with reductions in the amount of talk dealing with negative behaviour. Third, with support staff present there was more teaching from adults overall and from teachers separately. These benefits are similar to those found in studies of the effect of class size reductions on pupil behaviour (Blatchford, Bassett and Brown, 2005).

The logistic regression analysis showed several differences between primary and secondary schools and differences between pupils with and without SEN. In primary schools all pupils seemed to benefit from support staff presence in terms of: more individualised attention for

pupils, and better classroom control. At secondary level all pupils benefitted again in terms of better classroom control and also more overall teaching. For School Action/SEN pupils there was more individualised attention. This last result probably reflects other results from the study which indicated that the deployment of support staff varies between the two sectors. In secondary school, support staff tended to interact more exclusively with the pupil they were supporting. In such circumstances it is no surprise if the supported pupils showed most effects.

However, the presence of support staff also led to supported pupils having less overall contact with the teacher and less individual attention from them (at secondary level), showing that individualization of attention was provided by support staff not teachers. We return to this point below.

Impact of support staff on pupil engagement and active interaction with adults

Further analyses indicated that the presence of support staff had a seemingly beneficial effect on pupils in terms of: 1. increased *classroom engagement*, as seen in the increase in pupil on task, and the reduction in off task, behaviour; 2. a more *active role in interactions with adults*, as seen in the extent of beginning interactions, responding to adults and sustaining interactions. However, as with results on individual attention, when we looked separately just at teacher to pupil interactions we found that at secondary level the presence of support staff led to less active interactions with teachers. This means that active interactions are with support staff instead of teachers.

Again, there were several differences between primary and secondary schools and differences between pupils with and without SEN. In primary schools all pupils seem to benefit from support staff presence in terms of a more active pupil role in interaction with adults. Children with no SEN showed more classroom engagement. For secondary schools there was more total on task behaviour for School Action and SEN groups, and less total off task behaviour for the SEN group only. There is therefore a strong suggestion that the presence of support staff at both primary and secondary school is of particular benefit in improving the attention of children in most need.

These results are at odds with those reported in the CSPAR study where it was found that the presence of support staff increased individual attention from teachers (Blatchford, Russell, Bassett, Brown, and Martin (2007)). While difficult to be sure this might be accounted for by different research designs and age groups used in each study.

Reduced teacher pupil interaction

Perhaps the most significant finding from this study is that the amount of contact with teachers tended to decline when support staff were present. Pupils with more classroom support have less interaction with the teacher and at secondary level the presence of support staff reduced by about half the amount of individual interaction between teachers and pupils and active contributions from pupils to teachers. This means that, as a consequence of being supported by TAs, pupils miss out on everyday mainstream teacher to pupil interactions. This can occur in the context of within class support and also occasions when support staff take pupils out of the classroom, e.g., for literacy catch up programmes.

We believe these results are significant because they may help explain the apparent contradiction between the general perception among teachers and headteachers that support staff provide a valuable extra resource in classrooms, while at the same time the research evidence to date has

not shown an obvious benefit to academic progress. What the current results show is that support staff have a positive effect in terms of increased individualisation of attention, pupils' active role in interaction with adults, easier classroom control, and increased classroom engagement. We also found at secondary level more teaching occurring when support staff were present, and this might be connected to less time being spent on classroom control. Elsewhere we have found that with more support there was also a beneficial effect for the youngest pupils studied (Year 1) in terms of positive approaches to learning (e.g., in terms of motivation, working independently, completing assigned work and following instructions from adults). Other data from the DISS project reveals that teachers feel that support staff have a positive impact in terms of teacher job satisfaction, stress and workload, and on teaching (Blatchford et al, 2008). It is therefore understandable if teachers and headteachers feel that support staff have a positive effect.

But we have also found that individualised attention is provided not by teachers but by support staff, and, moreover, it is provided instead of interactions with the teacher. Typically the few pupils in most need are supported in lessons, and at times in pull-out sessions, by support staff, while the teacher is then able to teach the rest of the class. Current observations in schools, as part of Strand 2 Wave 2, are supporting those reported in this paper in indicating that the tasks support staff and supported pupils work can often be differentiated either by level or type from the rest of the class. Such pupils therefore miss out on interactions with the teacher and contact with the mainstream curriculum. This is a less positive consequence and one that might hinder pupil's academic progress.

It seems likely that the positioning of support staff close to students they support is the reason for the positive effects just cited. This is in line with studies of support for pupils with SEN, referred to above. However, there are also concerns that proximity may have unintended consequences. That the presence of support staff leads to supported pupils having less contact with the teacher, particularly less individual attention and less active interactions with the teacher (at secondary level), is one such consequence. Some researchers and commentators have been concerned that increased support, though beneficial in some ways, may not translate into better pupil learning (Ofsted, 2006; Loos et al, 1977; Giangreco et al, 1997). Furthermore, Giangreco and Broer (2007) list other "unintended detrimental effects", including "interference with...peer interactions, decision making by underqualified personnel [and] the development of unnecessary dependence".

This discussion indicates that there are possibly different effects of TAs across different outcomes and that some may be positive and some negative. Research currently underway in the final stage of the DISS project will enable a deeper assessment of the impact of support staff on pupils to be made. But on the basis of results reported in this paper we feel it is appropriate to query the way in which children in most need can now get *less* of the teacher's attention. Before teachers had TAs in the classroom they would have had responsibility for all pupils and quite likely provided further support for these pupils themselves. Respondents in current field visits to schools argue that teachers have a higher level of subject and pedagogical knowledge – and this seems appropriate given their level of qualifications and training. It would therefore seem appropriate to argue that ALL pupils should get at least the same amount of the teacher's time, and, indeed, that those in most need are most likely to benefit from *more* of a teachers time, not less.

Differences for pupils with SEN

One of the aims of the study was to establish whether effects of TA presence were different by pupil type, in particular whether effects were more marked for pupils with SEN and School

Action. In general this prediction was supported. The amount of individualised attention from support staff increased with level of pupil. There was a strong suggestion that the presence of support staff at both primary and secondary school was of particular benefit in improving the attention of children in most need. While effects on pupil interactions with teachers were similar for all groups of pupils, effects for adults in general interacted with pupil type, with effects more marked for pupils with SEN and School Action.

It seems that the present situation has arisen because of the interconnection in practice of two separate policy developments. There has been a huge increase in the number of pupils with SEN in mainstream schools and at the same time there has been a huge increase in classroom based support staff. Both are new phenomena and they have in practice come to be connected. This appears to be true in other countries as well, e.g., in the U.S., Marks, Schrader and Levine (1999) found that support staff had ‘assumed the primary burden of success for the inclusion of students’. Thus teachers appeared to act as ‘hosts’. Giangreco, Yuan, McKenzie, Cameron and Fialka (2005) make the point even more strongly: “Paraprofessionals have served as an analgesic for the perceived pressures of including more diverse populations of students with disabilities.”. In the UK, TAs have become an essential component of practice (if not policy) with regard to the integration of pupils with SEN in mainstream schools. It seems to us that we need to carefully consider pedagogical practice in relation to the deployment of TAs, perhaps especially those pupils with SEN and learning difficulties.

Secondary vs primary

Another main aim of the study was to see whether there were differences between primary and secondary stages. There is no evidence that primary aged pupils show more marked effects as a result of TA presence in classrooms but the results have shown a number of ways in which primary and secondary schools differed in the deployment of TAs. These results probably reflect differences between the sectors in the deployment of classroom based support staff, e.g. in secondary schools support staff tended to interact more exclusively with the pupil they were supporting compared with primary.

Future research

Results from the Strand 2 Wave 1 systematic observations provide systematic data on the effects of support staff on pupil behaviour and interactions, but results are at a general level. A study of what might be called the ‘wider pedagogical role’ of support staff is currently underway as part of the DISS project. This would situate the interactions between support staff and pupils and teachers into a wider context, for example, by examining decisions about support staff roles in lessons, and also support staff pedagogical and subject knowledge, and communication and feedback between support staff and teachers. It will also be of value to examine ways in which support staff are supporting pupils using recording techniques which will allow a detailed analysis of the interactions at the level of (for instance) the nature of adult questioning and explanations. Study of the strategies they are adopting and how these compare with teachers will allow documentation of what works and what does not work well – and also help inform improvements to classroom practice and pupils’ progress.

References

- Beeson, C., Kerry, C. & Kerry, T. (2003) *The Role of Classroom Assistants* (Birmingham, National Primary Trust).
- Blatchford, P., Baines, E., Rubie-Davies, C., Bassett, P., & Chowne, A. (2006) The effect of a new approach to group-work on pupil-pupil and teacher-pupil interaction, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 750–765.
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Goldstein, H., & Martin, C. (2003) Are class size differences related to pupils' educational progress and classroom processes? Findings from the Institute of Education class size study of children aged 5-7 years, *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(5), 709–730.
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., & Brown, P. (2005) Teachers' and pupils' behaviour in large and small classes: A systematic observation study of pupils aged 10/11 years, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(3), 454–467.
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., Webster, R. & Heywood, N. (2006) *The deployment and impact of support staff in schools: Report on findings from a national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Strand 1, Wave 1 – 2004)* (DfES Research Report 776) (London, Department for Education and Skills).
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., & Webster, R. (2007) *The deployment and impact of support staff in schools: Report on findings from the second national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Strand 1, Wave 2 – 2006)* (DCSF Research Report 005) (London, Department for Children, Schools and Families).
- Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., & Webster, R., with Babayigit, S & Haywood, N. (2008) *The deployment and impact of support staff in schools and the impact of the national agreement: Results from Strand 2 Wave 1 – 2005/6* (DCSF Research Report 027), (London, Department for Children, Schools and Families).
- Blatchford, P., Russell, A., Bassett, P., Brown, P., & Martin, C. (2007) The role and effects of teaching assistants in English primary schools (Years 4 to 6) 2000–2003, *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(1), 5–26.
- Burgess, H. (2008) *Primary Workforce Management and Reform (Primary Review Research Survey 6/4)*, (Cambridge, University of Cambridge, Faculty of Education).
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008) *School workforce in England (including pupil:teacher ratios and pupil:adult ratios) January 2008 (provisional) SFR 10/2008* (London, Department for Children, Schools and Families).
- Department for Education and Skills (2001a) *Schools achieving success* (London, Department for Education and Skills).
- Department for Education and Skills (2001b) *Professionalism and trust: The future of teachers and teaching* (London, Department for Education and Skills).
- Department for Education and Skills (2002) *Time for standards: Reforming the school workforce* (London, Department for Education and Skills).

Department for Education and Skills (2003) *Raising standards and tackling workload: A national agreement* (London, Department for Education and Skills).

Department for Education and Skills (2005) *The Education (Review of Staffing Structure) England Regulations 2005* (London, Department for Education and Skills).

Farrell, P., Balshaw, M. & Polat, F. (1999) *The Management, Role and Training of Learning Support Assistants* (London, Department of Education and Employment).

Finn, J. D., & Achilles, C. M. (1999) Tennessee's class size study: Findings, implications, misconceptions, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), 97–109.

Finn, J.D., Gerber, S.B., Farber, S.L., & Achilles, C.M. (2000) Teacher aides: An alternative to small classes?, in: M.C. Wang & J.D. Finn (Eds) *How small classes help teachers do their best* (Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Center for Research in Human Development).

Finn, J.D., Pannozzo, G.M., & Achilles, C.M. (2003) The "why's" of class size: Student behavior in small classes, *Review of Educational Research*, 73(3), 321–368.

Giangreco, M.F. & Broer, S.M. (2007) School-based screening to determine overreliance on paraprofessionals, *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 22(3), 149–158.

Giangreco, M.F. & Doyle, M.B. (2007) Teacher assistants in inclusive schools, in: L. Florian (Ed.) *The SAGE handbook of special education* (London: Sage).

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S., Luiselli, T.E., & MacFarland, S.Z.C. (1997) Helping or hovering? Effects of instructional assistant proximity on students with disabilities, *Exceptional Children*, 64, 7–18.

Giangreco, M.F., Yuan, S., McKenzie, B., Cameron, P., & Fialka, J. (2005) "Be careful what you wish for...": Five reasons to be concerned about the assignment of individual paraprofessionals. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 37(5), 28–34.

Howes, A., Farrell, P., Kaplan, I. & Moss, S (2003) *The impact of paid adult support on the participation and learning of pupils in mainstream schools* (London, EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2002) *Teaching assistants in primary schools: An evaluation of the quality and impact of their work* (London, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education).

Loos, F.M., Williams, K.P., & Bailey, J.S. (1977) A multi-element analysis of the effect of teacher aides in an open style classroom, *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 10, 437–448.

Marks, S.U., Schrader, C. & Levine, M. (1999) Paraeducator experiences in inclusive settings: Helping, hovering, or holding their own? *Exceptional Children*, 65, 315–328.

Mistry, M., Burton, N. & Brundrett, M. (2004) Managing LSAs: an evaluation of the use of learning support assistants in an urban primary school, *School Leadership and Management*, 24(2), 125–137.

Moran, A. & Abbott, L. (2002) Developing inclusive schools: The pivotal role of teaching assistants in promoting inclusion in special and mainstream schools in Northern Ireland, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 161–173.

Mortimore, P. & Mortimore, J with Thomas, H., Cairns, R. & Taggart, B. (1992) *The innovative uses of non-teaching staff in primary and secondary schools project: final report* (London, Institute of Education).

Office for Standards in Education (2006) *Inclusion: does it matter where pupils are taught?* (London, Office for Standards in Education).

Schlapp, U., Davidson, J. & Wilson, V. (2003) An ‘extra pair of hands’?: Managing classroom assistants in Scottish primary schools, *Educational Management and Administration*, 31(2), 189–205.

School Teachers’ Review Body (2001) *School Teachers’ Review Body: Tenth Report 2001* (London, Office of Manpower Economics).

UNISON (2002) *Teaching Assistants: A report on the role, pay and employment conditions of teaching assistants* (London, UNISON).

UNISON (2004) *School Support Staff Survey 2004: A report on the role, training, salaries and employment conditions of school support staff* (London, UNISON).

Werts, M.G., Zigmond, N., & Leeper, D.C. (2001) Paraprofessional proximity and academic engagement: students with disabilities in primary aged classrooms, *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 36, 424–440.