Introduction

Over the past thirty years, severe disruptive behavior among American youth has evolved from a relatively minor concern, shared by only a few educators and parents, to a major day-to-day crisis experienced by many. Veteran teachers continually report that the students entering their classrooms today are vastly more challenging than the ones they taught as recently as a decade ago. Clearly, both educators and the general public view child discipline as one of the most challenging and important issues facing today’s schools (American Educator, 1995-96; Elan, Rose & Gallup, 1996; Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 1998). Mirroring these concerns has been research documenting significant increases in the frequency of behaviors ranging from minor disruptions (Walker, Colvin & Ramsey, 1995) to fatal violence (Koop & Lundberg, 1992; Rutherford & Nelson, 1995).

There is no doubt that educators and parents are experiencing ever-increasing needs for practical ways of preventing discipline problems, teaching pro-social behavior, and promoting responsibility. Research has shown that punishment-based approaches actually increase disruptive behaviors (Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 1998; Mayer & Sulzer-Azaroff, 1991). Further, approaches that fail to provide clear behavioral limits and consequences have also yielded less poor results (Mayer, 1995). Out of dissatisfaction with many traditional approaches, concerns over the increasing numbers of at-risk students, and requests from parents and educators throughout the United States, the Love and Logic theory and set of discipline techniques was developed (see Cline & Fay, 1990; Cline & Fay, 1992; Fay & Funk, 1995; Fay & Cline, 1997). At the theoretical core of this approach is the idea that success for children of all ages rests on a balance of unconditional compassion, firm behavioral limits, and logical consequences.

The primary goal of the Love and Logic program is to give parents, educators, and others working with children practical strategies for reducing behavior problems, increasing motivation, and building assets which contribute to life-long responsibility and resiliency. Benson, Galbraith and Espeland (1995) in their study of 270,000 students grades six through twelve, observed a number of resiliency factors, or “developmental assets” which help children avoid academic failure, emotional problems, criminal behavior, substance abuse, and other negative outcomes. Similar findings have been obtained by others studying the phenomenon of resilience in children (see Garnezy, 1985; Luthar & Zigler, 1991; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Werner & Smith, 1992). The Love and Logic theory and set of techniques give specific and practical tools for building the following assets:

Developmental Assets Addressed by the Love and Logic Program
1. Highly supportive and loving families and schools.
2. Parents who establish open communication with their children.
3. Positive parent-teacher relationships and parent involvement.
4. Positive school climate.
5. Appropriate standards for behavior at home and school (i.e., limits).
6. Positive school and parental discipline.
7. Positive relationships between children and adults other than parents.
8. High achievement motivation and aspirations.
9. Learning to use empathy with others.
10. Decision-making skills.
12. Hope, or a positive view, of the world and the future.

Theoretical and Empirical Roots of the Love and Logic Program

The theoretical and empirical roots of Love and Logic stem from two areas: (1) studies examining basic principles of learning and conditioning, including cognitive or social learning theories (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Pavlov, 1927; Rescorla, 1988; Thorndike, 1905; Skinner, 1953; Watson & Reyner, 1920) and (2) research examining human emotional needs and their relationship to motivation (e.g., Glasser, 1969; Maslow, 1954; Ng, 1980; and Rogers, 1961)

Supporting Theory and Research

The Becoming a Love & Logic Parent program is guided by five basic principles, each firmly grounded in research:

1. Preserve and enhance the child’s self-concept.
2. Teach children how to own and solve the problems they create.
3. Share the control and decision-making.
4. Combine consequences with high levels of empathy and warmth.
5. Build the adult-child relationship.

A key component of the program involves giving parents and educators a firm rationale for each of the above principles, as well as practical tools for following them.
Preserve and enhance the child’s self-concept.

The Love and Logic program teaches that each and every intervention or technique must be designed in a way to preserve or enhance the child’s self-concept. Research has clearly shown that one’s view of self has significant motivational influences on behavior and cognition (Harter, 1986). Further, Bandura (1977) proposed that self-efficacy beliefs stem directly from one’s cognitive appraisal of task difficulty, one’s abilities, and whether effort or struggle will yield success. The Love and Logic program focuses heavily on engineering situations that encourage children to struggle with solvable problems, receive guidance from adults, achieve success, and attribute their success to effort. Weiner (1979) observed that these types of internal attributions to effort or struggle are key to developing high levels of achievement motivation.

Teach children how to own and solve the problems they create.

A key concept guiding the Love and Logic program is the idea that children develop problem-solving skills only when two conditions exist: (1) they are required by the adults around them to think about and solve the problems they create; and (2) these adults teach problem-solving skills through modeling and instruction. Regarding this first condition, Kerr and Bowen (1988) argued that one of the most important tasks for individuals and systems is to develop clear boundaries regarding problem-ownership. When parents or educators own problems that should be solved by children, and when children take on adult problems, the health of the family or school system suffers. Everyone is involved in everybody else’s problems, and nobody has the energy to deal with their own. In contrast, when adults solve their own problems, and guide children to do the same, the system functions smoother (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Foster, Prinz & O’Leary, 1983) and those within it have more opportunities to develop self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

Regarding the second condition above, when parents and educators model solving their own problems, and guide children to do the same, children begin to learn these crucial skills. Spivak and Sure (1974) in their pioneering research on social problem-solving, have noted that modeling and direct instruction are key strategies for teaching problem-solving skills. Similar propositions have been made by Bandura, 1976; Bandura & Jeffery, 1973; Cormier & Cormier (1991). The Love and Logic program gives parents and teachers specific guidelines for using modeling, direct instruction and feedback to teach the following problem-solving process:

1. Identify and define the problem.
2. Brainstorm solutions.
3. Evaluate each solution.
4. Implement the solution chosen.

For research supporting this problem-solving model, see D’Zurilla (1986), as well as Cormier & Cormier (1991).
Share the control and decision-making.

The Love and Logic program emphasizes healthy control as a basic human emotional need, and it provides specific parent and educator strategies for enhancing children’s perceptions of control. Supporting this approach is research showing that shared control enhances general levels of cooperation (Brehm & Brehm, 1981; Glasser, 1969), people’s ability to cope with stressful situations (Glass, McKnight, & Valdinardo, 1993; Glass, Singer, Leonard, Krantz, Cohen, & Cummings, 1973; Rodin, 1976), academic motivation (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978; Saponia, Bauer, & Philips, 1989; Slavin, 1985) and physical health (Langer & Rodin, 1976; Schulz, 1976).

Combine consequences with high levels of empathy and warmth.

The Love and Logic program is based on a unique combination of research conducted by behavioral psychologists, as well as studies examining the essential components of helping relationships. From the early work of Thorndike (1905) and Skinner (1953), educators posited a very simple relationship between behavior and its consequences. Behaviors yielding positive consequences tend to increase in frequency, whereas those producing negative consequences tend to diminish. From this basic “Law of Effect,” a variety of programs applying behavioral principles to school discipline were developed. Anecdotal feedback from educators across the country, as well as outcome research, has shown that a focus on behavioral principles and consequences alone has the following limitations:

1. Fails to prevent behavior problems.
2. Fails to teach appropriate replacement behaviors.
3. Contributes to student withdrawal, avoidance, or retaliatory aggression.

Researchers examining the behavior change process have repeatedly observed that the rigid application of behavioral principles to human relationships is insufficient for long-term positive change. In contrast, when such principles are combined with high levels of trust, empathy, and warmth, students are more likely to be cooperative and to copy prosocial behavior modeled by adults (Egan, 1990; French & Raven, 1959; Ng, 1980; Rogers, 1958; Strong, 1968). The Love and Logic program places strong emphasis on teaching parents, educators, and other adults how to model healthy behavior, provide logical consequences, and do both in a very warm, empathic way.

Build the adult-child relationship.

Pivotal components of the 9 Essential Skills for the Love and Logic Classroom teacher training program are strategies designed to enhance teacher-student relationships and create a positive school climate for all students. Research has clearly demonstrated that at-risk students who lack positive relationships with their teachers and other adults at school display more disruptive behavior, are more likely to disengage from academic activities and are likely to drop-out before they graduate (Eccles, Midgley, Wigfield Buchanan, Reuman, Flanagan, & Mac Iver, 1993; Finn, 1989). Other research has shown significant improvements in behavior, academic achievement, and on-time attendance
when students experience caring relationships with their teachers and when the overall school climate feels supportive (Baker, Terry, Bridger, & Winsor, 1997; Finn, 1989; Kramer-Schlosser, 1992; Swartz, Merten, & Bursik, 1987).

Although limited empirical research has been conducted on the Love and Logic parent and educator training programs, the limited data available at this time appear promising. One study, conducted at the Livingston Family Center in Michigan, examined the effects of The Becoming a Love and Logic Parent program with parents going through divorce court, as well as parents with children involved in the Juvenile Justice system (Hayek, 2000). Results revealed significant reductions in the use of illegal substances, in parent-child conflict, and general negative child behavior. Similar results were obtained by La Rosa et al. (2001).

Applying Love and Logic in an elementary school, Weir (1997) observed high levels of teacher “buy-in” and use of the program in this school. After implementing this program: (a) 87% of teachers reported having more effective tools for managing student behavior; (b) 84% reported improved relationships with their students; (c) 68% reported decreased time spent managing behavior disruptions; (d) 71% reported increased time spent teaching curriculum; and (e) 82% reported having more control over discipline. Weir also observed a 48% decrease in the number of main office referrals for discipline during the first year this school applied the Love and Logic program.

Using single-subject methodology, McKenna (1997) examined the effects of one Love and Logic technique on a nine-year-old female student’s academic motivation, personal hygiene, classroom behavior, general demeanor, and self-concept. Outcome measures included teacher ratings, teacher anecdotal observations, and student’s performance on the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. For a period of nine weeks, two teachers applied the “One-Sentence Intervention,” an approach to enhancing student-teacher relationships by systematically noticing and encouraging unique student strengths and interests. Teacher ratings and anecdotal observations revealed: (a) improved personal hygiene; (b) an elevated frequency of positive peer and adult interactions; and (c) increased rates of homework completion. Pre and post test scores on the Piers-Harris Self-Concept scale revealed a statistically significant 16-point improvement over the course of intervention.

The current investigation was undertaken to gather pre and post test data from a significantly larger sample of parents than studied in these earlier evaluations.

**Method**

Subjects were 2409 parents in several states, representing a wide range of socio-economic and ethnic groups.

Each subject participated in the Becoming a Love and Logic Parent course. Each course was presented over a seven week period, with one session conducted per week. Each session lasted approximately two hours.
Before the first session, each participant completed the “Before Program” questionnaire (See appendix A). This questionnaire was designed to assess pretest perceptions of their parenting competence, parenting stress, and their child’s behavior. If participants had more than one child, they were instructed to complete this questionnaire considering the one child they were most concerned about.

After the final course session, participants complete the “After Program” questionnaire, to assess any posttest changes in perceived parenting competence, stress, and their child’s behavior. This questionnaire was identical to the “Before Program” measure.

Based on nearly two decades of positive anecdotes from parents participating in this program, it was hypothesized that statistically significant improvements would be observed on each of the scales assessing parents’ perceptions of their children’s behavior, as well as their own parental competence.

**Results**

First, we grouped the 10 survey items (Appendix A) into two theoretically-distinct subscales: The Child Misbehavior Scale (first 6 items) and the Parenting Stress Scale (last 4 items). Items were reverse coded as appropriate (e.g., “My child completes chores without reminders and without pay”) so that the final subscale scores provided an indicator of the extent of child misbehavior (ranging from 6 to 30) and parenting stress (ranging from 4 to 20) respectively. We employed paired samples t tests for all mean comparisons to examine whether there were any significant pre-post differences in the survey items and subscales. We also tested the normality assumptions—i.e., homogeneity of variance, skewness, and kurtosis—underlying the use of the t test (Katz, Restori, & Lee, 2009). We then performed Wilcoxon's signed-ranks test, a non-parametric test that is not sensitive to normality violations (Blair & Higgins, 1985), for any subscale mean comparison that violated one or more of the normality assumptions. We set alpha at .05 for all primary analyses. Whenever possible, we included \( r \) as an indicator of effect size to reflect the proportion of variance that taking the Love & Logic class accounted for in the outcome variables (child misbehavior and/or parenting stress). We used values of \( r = .10, .24, \) and \( .37 \) as indicators of small, medium, and large effect sizes respectively as per Cohen’s (1992) classification.

**Child Misbehavior**

As Table 1 and Figure 1 display, parent-reported child misbehavior declined significantly from pre- to post-class (\( t (2408) = 40.25, p < .001 \)), with subscale scores reduced by 3.41 points (out of 30) on average, a large effect (\( r > .37 \)). Although the distribution was relatively symmetric (skew = .06), it was leptokurtic (kurtosis = .96), indicating that further non-parametric analyses were warranted. We thus conducted a Wilcoxon's signed-ranks test, which showed that the mean pre-post difference was still statistically significant at \( p < .001 \). In terms of individual items, all showed significant pre-post reductions (\( p < .001 \)); the two largest pre-post decreases following completion of the Love & Logic class were that parents reported their children arguing or talking back
less often (item 1) as well as dawdling or making it hard to get ready to go somewhere less frequently (item 3).

**Parenting Stress**

As Table 1 and Figure 1 show, self-reported parenting stress also declined significantly from pre- to post-class \((t(2430) = 41.09, p < .001)\), with subscale scores reduced by 2.56 points (out of 20) on average, a large effect \((r > .37)\). The distribution was relatively symmetric (skew = -.04) and mesokurtic (kurtosis = -.18), so no further non-parametric analyses were performed. With regard to individual subscale items, all showed significant pre-post changes in the predicted direction \((p < .001)\); parents reported the largest increases in having fun being a parent and letting kids solve their own problems more after having taken the *Becoming a Love & Logic Parent* class.

Table 1

*Effects of Love & Logic Class on Child Misbehavior and Parenting Stress Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-test (Mean, SD)</th>
<th>Post-test (Mean, SD)</th>
<th>Paired Samples</th>
<th>Pre-Post Significance</th>
<th>Effect size (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child</strong></td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>18.87 (4.14)</td>
<td>15.46 (3.69)</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misbehavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting</strong></td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>12.05 (2.84)</td>
<td>9.49 (2.56)</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Possible score range on the Child Misbehavior Subscale was 6 to 30; possible score range on the Parenting Stress subscale was 4 to 20. Higher scores reflect more parent-reported child misbehavior or parenting stress.
Discussion

Perceptions of their children’s behavior

Hypotheses were supported by statistically significant improvement on all scales assessing parents’ perceptions of their children’s behavior. The most profound improvement was observed in the area of parent-child arguments. Patterson (1976) observed that children with parents who frequently become embroiled in parent-child arguments suffer a significantly greater risk of developing severe behavior disorders than children with parents who don’t. According to his research, Patterson hypothesized that parents who lack the skills to avoid such “negative-coercive” interaction patterns become victims of negative reinforcement or avoidance conditioning. To avoid verbal battles with their children, they begin to avoid setting and enforcing essential behavioral limits. Given this prior research and theory, the current results appear particularly important.

Perceptions of parental competence

As hypothesized, analyses revealed statistically significant improvement on all scales assessing participant perceptions of their own parenting competence. The largest
improvement was observed on the scale worded, “With my child (children) I find myself staying calm when I have to discipline.” Large improvements were also observed on the scale worded, “With my child (children) I find myself feeling really stressed out.” These findings suggest that participation in this program may serve as a helpful intervention for the prevention of child maltreatment.

Qualitative Results

Parents were also asked to include their personal comments pertaining to the most important thing they learned from the class. These anecdotes supported the statistical results, indicating significantly more favorable perceptions of their children’s behavior, as well as their competence as parents. Select comments to “Identify the most valuable thing you learned in this class” are included below:

- Remembering to whisper when I feel like yelling.
- After applying Love and Logic more, my kids are much happier (and me too!) and seem to feel release in the encouraged thinking and responsibility.
- Parenting is fun…not simply something to be endured.
- It’s so much easier to not get into power struggles and arguments now that I know the way to do it. I feel a lot more calm about discipline.
- This class has helped me calm down and not get so frustrated!
- How to control myself not my child. I react differently now and so does he. More positive interaction over conflict.
- Child learns best from consequences and empathy rather than lectures and anger.
- Empathy, empathy, empathy! Because anger is my old pattern and because empathy helps me calmly think about appropriate actions/consequences.
- I loved it. I plan to bring my mother to a session.

Methodological shortcomings and directions for future research

The results of this preliminary investigation suggest that the Becoming a Love and Logic Parent program is a highly promising program for assisting parents in the development of attitudes and skills for improving the quality of their lives with their children, preventing
child maltreatment, and developing competencies within youth that contribute to pro-
social, responsible behavior.

While the current results appear promising, the preliminary nature of this investigation
requires that they be interpreted with caution. Future studies are needed to address
methodological shortcomings and to expand our understanding of specific situational,
child, and demographic variables contributing to the effectiveness of this program.

While sessions were implemented by independent facilitators, design planning and data
analysis were conducted by the program developer. Future studies should be conducted
entirely by an independent investigator.

Future studies must also gather more specific and comprehensive demographic data in
order to evaluate how well the participant sample represents the general population.
These data would also prove most valuable in evaluating the effectiveness of this
program for varying socioeconomic and ethnic groups, as well as parents with children of
varying ages.

To control threats to internal validity (e.g., testing, history, maturation, etc.), random
assignment of subjects to a “waiting list” control group, or to a comparison group
receiving a different parenting program, should be strongly considered.

Follow-up data are needed to determine whether positive gains are maintained over
months and years.

Finally, additional research examining the effectiveness of Love and Logic for teachers
and schools is needed.

In summary, preliminary results suggest that the Becoming a Love and Logic Parent
program possess promise as an effective approach to giving parents the attitudes and
skills they need to raise responsible kids in today’s very challenging societal climate. One
participant summarized his thoughts as follows:

I realized that my parenting style was being a “Drill Sergeant.” Not fun
for myself or the kids. The skills I learned in this class taught me that I
have more power in situations than I previously thought and can approach
all situations with calming empathy, compassion, and the skills I need to
make parenting fun.
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Appendix A

Pretest Questionnaire

Becoming a Love and Logic Parent
Before Program Questionnaire

Thanks for joining us! Soon you’ll be hearing plenty of easy-to-learn and powerful skills for raising responsible kids and having more fun in the process.

Will you help us by completing the following questionnaire? The information you provide will NOT be shared with anyone, and your participation is completely voluntary.

If you choose to participate, we will also ask you to complete a similar questionnaire after the last class. To help us match your first and second questionnaires, please include your name in the following blank. ______________________________

Circle how much you agree with the following statements about your child or children.

**My child (or children)...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>argues or talks back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completes chores without reminders and without pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dawdles and makes it hard for me when we’re getting ready to go somewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throws tantrums or “fits” (at home or in public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes good decisions and behaves responsibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (Continued)

acts poorly during meals

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

Circle how much you agree with the following statements about yourself as a parent.

With my child (or children) I find myself...

having fun being a parent

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

feeling really stressed-out

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

staying calm when I have to discipline

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

letting my kids solve their own problems

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

By the time you complete this program, what question or questions would you most like answered? (Include this in the space below.)
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Posttest Questionnaire

Becoming a Love and Logic Parent
After Program Questionnaire

Thanks for participating in our class!

On the first day, you completed a questionnaire, which asked you some questions about how your kids act and how you feel as a parent. To evaluate the effectiveness of this program, we’d appreciate your help once more. Again, the information you provide will NOT be shared with anyone, and your participation is completely voluntary.

To help us match this questionnaire with your first one, please include your name in the following blank. _______________________________

Circle how much you agree with the following statements about your child or children.

My child (or children)...

argues or talks back

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

completes chores without reminders and without pay

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

dawdles and makes it hard for me when we’re getting ready to go somewhere

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

throws tantrums or “fits” (at home or in public)

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

makes good decisions and behaves responsibly

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree
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acts poorly during meals

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

Circle how much you agree with the following statements about yourself as a parent.

**With my child (or children) I find myself…**

*having fun being a parent*

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

*feeling really stressed-out*

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

*staying calm when I have to discipline*

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

*letting my kids solve their own problems*

1---------------2---------------3---------------4--------------5
Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree

Identify the most valuable thing you learned in this class, and explain why you feel this way.

*(Optional question)*
Describe a parenting situation you handled successfully with Love and Logic.
Immediate consequences work really well with rats, pigeons, mice, and monkeys. In real-world classrooms, they typically create more problems than they solve.

Problems with Immediate Consequences:
1. Most of us have great difficulty thinking of an immediate consequence while we are teaching.
2. We “own” the problem rather than handing it back to the child. In other words, we are forced to do more thinking than the child.
3. We are forced to react while we and the child are upset.
4. We don’t have time to anticipate how the child, his/her parents, our administrators, and others will react to our response.
5. We don’t have time to put together a reasonable plan and a support team to help us carry it out.
6. We often end up making threats we can’t back up.
7. We generally fail to deliver a strong dose of empathy before providing the consequences.
8. Every day we live in fear that some kid will do something that we won’t know how to handle with an immediate consequence.

Take care of yourself, and give yourself a break! Here’s how:
The next time a student does something inappropriate, experiment with saying, “Oh no. This is so sad. I’m going to have to do something about this! But not now... later. Try not to worry about it.”

The Love and Logic Anticipatory Consequence allows you time to “anticipate” whose support you might need, how the child might try to react, and how to make sure that you can actually follow through with a logical consequence. This Love and Logic technique also allows the child to “anticipate” or worry about a wide array of possible consequences.

The Love and Logic Anticipatory Consequence technique gains its power from this basic principle of conditioning. When one stimulus consistently predicts a second, the first stimulus gains the same emotional properties as the second. Stated simply: When “try not to worry about it” consistently predicts something the child really must worry about, “try not to worry about it” becomes a consequence in and of itself... an “Anticipatory” Consequence.
Love and Logic Solution:

The Rules of Love and Logic

RULE #1
Adults set firm limits in loving ways without anger, lecture, or threats.

RULE #2
When a child causes a problem the adult hands it back in loving ways.
1. In a loving way, the adult holds the child accountable for solving his/her problems in a way that does not make a problem for others.
2. Children are offered choices with limits.
3. Adults use enforceable statements.
4. Adults provide delayed/extended consequences.
5. The adult’s empathy is “locked in” before consequences are delivered.
Love and Logic Solution:

Two Ways to Neutralize Childhood Arguing

1. LOVE AND LOGIC INSTANT EMPATHETIC RESPONSE

The expression of genuine empathy has the amazing ability to soak up emotions. Learn to use an empathetic statement that comes right from your heart. Use the statement that feels natural to you. Use it every time.

Examples of empathetic statements that work:
“Oh, no. I bet that feels terrible.”
“Wow. What a bummer.”
“I can’t imagine how bad that feels.”

Examples of statements that don’t work:
“I know how you feel.”
“I know just what you mean.”
“I understand.”

2. LOVE AND LOGIC ONE-LINERS TO NEUTRALIZE ARGUING

It is important that Love and Logic One-Liners be used in the “broken record” form.

Example of a Love and Logic One-Liner that should become a habit for you:
“I love you too much to argue.”

Sample dialogue:

CHILD: You never let me do what I want.
PARENT: I love you too much to argue about that.

CHILD: But Sally always gets to do what she wants.
PARENT: I love you too much to argue about that. Come talk to me later about something fun. See you, sweetie. Thanks.
Love and Logic Solution:

Guidelines for Sharing Control Through Choices

Love and Logic Rules for Choices

• Never give a choice on an issue that might cause a problem for you or for anyone else.
• For each choice, give only two options, each of which will be OK with you.
• If the child doesn’t decide in ten seconds, decide for him or her.
• Only give choices that fit with your value system.

Some Love and Logic Examples of Little Choices

• Would you like to wear your coat or carry it?
• Are you going to clean the garage or mow the lawn this week?
• Will you have these chores done tomorrow? Or do you need an extra day to get them finished?
• Are you having peas or carrots as your vegetable tonight?
• Are you going to bed now? Or would you like to wait 15 minutes?
• Can you stay with us and stop that, or do you need to leave for a while and come back when you are sweet?
• Are you going to put your pajamas on first or brush your teeth first?
• Will you be home at 10:00? Or do you need an extra half hour with your friends?
• Are you guys going to stop bickering? Or would you rather pay me for having to hear it?
Love and Logic® Solution:
HOW TO CREATE A LOVE AND LOGIC CLASSROOM

1. The following tapes and books are excellent for the purpose of learning the Love and Logic philosophy and techniques:
   a. Teaching With Love and Logic
   b. Quick and Easy Classroom Interventions
   c. Schoolwide Discipline Plan Without the Loopholes
   d. Calming the Chaos: Behavior Improvement Strategies for the Child With ADHD
   e. Creating Classrooms Where Teachers Love to Teach and Students Love to Learn

2. Most people benefit from reviewing these Love and Logic materials several times. This “over-learning” will enable you to more readily apply these Love and Logic techniques while teaching.

3. Start slow. Pick just one Love and Logic technique and begin to experiment. Here are some examples to chose from:
   a. Neutralizing arguing with the Brain Dead technique
   b. Locking-in sadness or empathy before delivering consequences
   c. Setting limits with enforceable statements
   d. Sharing control through lots of small choices
   e. Building relationships with the One Sentence Intervention
   f. The Anticipatory Consequence

4. One-by-one, start experimenting with additional Love and Logic techniques.

5. Call the Love and Logic Institute at 1-800-338-4065, and ask for a copy of the Creating Your School’s Core Beliefs worksheet. There is no charge for this. Choose between five and seven of these principles to guide your disciplinary decisions. Feel free to modify or add principles as long as each is consistent with Love and Logic.

6. Review pages 51 and 52 of Schoolwide Discipline Plan Without the Loopholes, and the example of a Love and Logic classroom discipline plan developed by an actual teacher, it is part of this document. Refer to this example to help yourself get started. Once you have a Love and Logic plan developed, give a copy to each parent to help them understand your discipline plan.

7. In your classroom, post a list of expectations, describing how you will run your classroom. When developing this list, be certain that you can actually enforce these expectations. In other words, avoid making threats that you cannot back-up, such as "Keep your hands to yourself" or "Be quiet when I’m teaching." Use what we term "Enforceable Statements" to set these Love and Logic limits and expectations in your classroom. See page 75 of Schoolwide Discipline Plan Without the Loopholes for examples.
8. **DO NOT WARN STUDENTS ABOUT SPECIFIC CONSEQUENCES IN ADVANCE!**

Just indicate that you will respond to each problem in an individualized manner, depending upon the unique situation.

Here are two examples of Love and Logic lists:

### Classroom Expectations (Example #1)
1. Feel free to do anything that does not cause a problem for anyone else.
2. I teach when there are no distractions or other problems.
3. I listen to students who raise their hand.
4. I listen to one person at a time.
5. Please treat me with the same respect I treat you.
6. If someone causes a problem, I will do something.
7. What I do will depend on what happened and what the person is willing to do to solve the problem.

### Classroom Expectations (Example #2)
1. I allow students to remain in my classroom as long as they do not cause a problem for anyone else.
2. If they cause a problem, I will ask them to fix it.
3. If they can’t or will not fix it, I will do something.
4. What I do will depend on the unique situation.

9. When making disciplinary decisions, ask yourself, "How is my proposed intervention consistent with my Core Beliefs of discipline that I have included in my plan and my posted list of expectations?" Encourage yourself to handle discipline problems on a case-by-case manner, focusing on the unique characteristics of each situation.

10. If you don't know what to do at any given moment, delay the consequence, refer to your plan, and discuss possible solutions with other teachers, your administrators, the child's parents, or others.

11. Your goal is to achieve consistency by basing each of your decisions on this same set of values or principles…rather than trying to treat every problem the same using a "cookbook" approach. Consistency with values is more attainable than consistency between students, situations, and consequences.
AN EXAMPLE LOVE AND LOGIC CLASSROOM
DISCIPLINE PLAN
Guidelines and Code of Ethics for Discipline
Mrs. Krochmal 1996-97

Rules in my classroom are few. I believe that as all children are different, and all actions and reactions very personal in nature, effective discipline involves a few overriding tenets rather than a long list of specific rules. Situations are dealt with as they arise with the focus on enabling the child to grow and learn from his or her actions.

Guidelines for Student Behavior

1. You may engage in any behavior which does not create a problem for you or anyone else in the world.

2. If you find yourself with a problem, you may solve it by any means which does not cause a problem for anyone else in the world.

3. You may engage in any behavior that does not jeopardize the safety or learning of yourself or others. Unkind words and actions will not be tolerated.

In ensuring that the above guidelines are adhered to, I will operate with the following principles as my guide:

1. I will react without anger or haste to problem situations.

2. I will provide consequences that are not punitive but that allow the child to experience the results of a poor choice, enabling him or her to make better choices in the future.

3. I will proceed in all situations with the best interest of the child who—foremost in my mind—academic, social and emotional well-being will be fostered.

4. I will guide students toward personal responsibility and the decision-making skills they will need to function in the real world.

5. I will arrange consequences for problem situations in such a way that the child will not be humiliated or demeaned.

6. Equal is not always fair. Consequences will be designed to fit the problems of individual students, and they may be different even when problems appear to be the same.

7. I will make every effort to ensure that, in each situation, the students involved understand why they are involved in consequences.

8. If I at any time act or react in a way that a child truly feels is unjust, that student need only say to me, “I’m not sure that’s fair.” I will arrange a private conference during which the student can express to me why he or she feels my actions were not fair. This may or may not change my course of action. I am always open to calm, rational discussion of any matter.
HOW TO CREATE A LOVE AND LOGIC SCHOOL

I. INTRODUCE LOVE AND LOGIC TO YOUR STAFF BY DOING ONE OF THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS:

1. Have the staff listen to the first two stories on the audio CD *Four Steps to Responsibility*. Make the CD available to those who are interested.

2. Play one of the video clips from the Love and Logic teacher training program, *9 Essential Skills for the Love and Logic Classroom*.

3. Invite a staff member from a Love and Logic school to make a presentation to your staff about the use of Love and Logic in their school.

4. Invite a consultant from the Love and Logic Institute to make a presentation to the school or the school district. For information on hiring Jim Fay or Dr. Charles Fay, phone 1-800-424-3630.

II. CREATE A STUDY GROUP

1. **DO NOT MANDATE LOVE AND LOGIC!** This group should be made up of volunteers who are the most enthusiastic about learning new ways of working with students.

2. If possible, provide 1 hour of release time on a repeated basis for this select group to study the training program, *9 Essential Skills for the Love and Logic Classroom*. These staff members conduct experiments with the Love and Logic techniques and informally share their enthusiasm for the results. The best results come when the administrator is part of the study group.

3. Create additional study groups as needed.

4. Provide the same kind of study opportunities for support staff members.

III. DEVELOP A LENDING LIBRARY OF TRAINING MATERIALS

1. Visit our Love and Logic customer service department for suggestions and ideas about the most efficient use of your budget. Call toll free 1-800-338-4065.
IV. CREATE A BUILDING-WIDE LOVE AND LOGIC PHILOSOPHY OF DISCIPLINE

1. Develop an agreed-upon set of basic Love and Logic principals that serve as a guide for all disciplinary interventions. Here are some suggested steps in developing this philosophy:

   a. Provide each staff member with a copy of the sheet entitled, Creating Your School’s Core Beliefs, which can be obtained from the Love and Logic Institute.

   b. Ask each staff member to take some time to circle five or six of the Love and Logic values or principles they would be proud to endorse.

   c. Encourage faculty members to change the wording of these Core Beliefs if they feel a strong need.

   d. Have grade-level meetings where members discuss the Core Beliefs they circled. Next, use this discussion to develop an agreed-upon set of Core Beliefs representing the entire grade level. List these Love and Logic principles on paper.

   e. Conduct a meeting with teachers from all grade levels. Vote on the principles developed by each grade level to develop a school-wide list of Love and Logic principles.

   f. Post these Love and Logic principles in every room of the school.

   g. Share this Love and Logic document with parents and other community members, asking for their support in helping the school meet this commitment.

   h. When developing Love and Logic disciplinary interventions, ask, "How is my proposed Love and Logic intervention consistent with our overall principles of discipline?"

   **Note:** This entire process may take up to six months. Don't rush it. Let it evolve.

   **Special Note:** This entire process is useless if the administrators are unwilling or unable to monitor staff implementation.

2. Encourage each staff member to deal with discipline situations in their own unique ways based upon the merits of the situation, provided that the actions taken by the adult are consistent with the posted Love and Logic principles of the School Wide Philosophy.
V. PROVIDE PARENTING WITH LOVE AND LOGIC TRAINING FOR THE COMMUNITY

1. Purchase the parent training program, *Becoming a Love and Logic Parent*. This program has been designed to be used without prior training. It is very practical and easy to teach. Just follow the simple lesson plans.

2. Make it available to parents of all age children.

3. Consider the parents of preschool and kindergarten children as a target audience.

Note: You will find that each parent who takes this course will be much more supportive of the school staff. In just a few short years, you can have the entire community speaking the same language about raising kids…and your job will get a lot easier!

Special Note: Many schools have found that it is very easy to get Kindergarten parents to these classes. The school secretary is the important cog in this wheel. When parents sign up their children for Kindergarten, the secretary says, "Here are two forms. One is to register for Kindergarten and the other is to register for the parenting class that all Kindergarten parents take. You may register for the fall class or the spring class. It’s your choice."
Is Love and Logic research based? Listed below is a sampling of some supporting theory and research:

**Neutralizing Student Arguing**


**Delayed Consequences**


**Empathy**


**The Recovery Process**


**Developing Positive Teacher/Student Relationships**


### Using Choices to Prevent Power Struggles


**Quick and Easy Preventative Interventions**


**Guiding Students to Own and Solve their Problems**


**Data on the 9 Essential Skills Program**

Is there any empirical data supporting the effectiveness of the *9 Essential Skills for the Love and Logic Classroom* teacher training curriculum? The answer is yes:

- Spencer (2008) observed that teachers trained in the program believed that it:
  - Had a positive impact on their school’s learning environment
  - Had a positive impact on student achievement
  - Allowed them to maximize instructional time
  - Enabled them to spend less time dealing with student misbehavior
  - Prepared them to deal more effectively with this misbehavior


- Bullock (2011) observed similar findings, with teachers indicating that the program:
  - Helped them remain calmer and more positive
  - Enabled them to avoid arguing with students
  - Allowed them to spend more time teaching
  - Helped them gain more cooperation from students
  - Improved their relationships with students

Our Own Research

We’ve also been conducting our own research. Beginning in 2002, when the curricula first became available to schools, we’ve collected data on teacher’s perceptions of: (1) how the 9 Essential Skills affected student behavior; and (2) how these skills affected their own level of stress and confidence as educators. At the time of this printing, we’ve analyzed 1,426 questionnaires completed by educators around the United States. Tabulated below are basic data describing this sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent or Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>61.4% Regular Teacher; 11.5% Special Educator; 3.0% Counselor/Social Worker/Psychologist; 1.8% Administrator; 8.4% Paraprofessional; 13.9% Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to receiving training in the 9 Essential Skills curricula, participants in this study were asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 how much they agreed with a series of statements pertaining to the behavior of their students, as well as their own perceptions of their experience as educators. (A rating of “1” indicated “Strongly Disagree” whereas a rating of 5 indicated “Strongly Agree”) Participants were also asked to complete these ratings after receiving the training. Pre and Post mean scores for each scale are tabulated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Pre training mean</th>
<th>Post training mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The most behaviorally challenging students…</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...argue with me.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...interrupt me when I am teaching.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...cooperate with me.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...take responsibility for their decisions.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...refuse to do their work.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...solve their own problems with guidance.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I find myself…</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...having fun with students.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...feeling really stressed-out and exhausted.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...confident that I can handle discipline problems.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...enjoying good relationships with challenging students.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further analyze these data, we first, grouped the 10 survey items into two theoretically distinct subscales: The Student Misbehavior Scale (first 6 items) and the Educator Stress Scale (last 4 items). Items were reverse coded as appropriate (e.g., “The most behaviorally challenging students take responsibility for their poor decisions”) so that the final subscale scores provided an indicator of the extent of student misbehavior (ranging from 6 to 30) and educator stress (ranging from 4 to 20) respectively. We employed paired samples t tests for all mean comparisons to examine whether there were any significant pre-post differences in the survey items and subscales. We also tested the normality assumptions—i.e., homogeneity of variance, skewness, and kurtosis—underlying the use of the t test (Katz, Restori, & Lee, 2009). We then performed Wilcoxon’s signed-ranks test, a non-parametric test that is not sensitive to normality violations (Blair & Higgins, 1985), for any subscale mean comparison that violated one or more of the normality assumptions. We set alpha at .05 for all primary analyses.
Whenever possible, we included $r$ as an indicator of effect size to reflect the proportion of variance that taking the *Nine Essential Skills for the Love & Logic Classroom* training accounted for in the outcome variables (student misbehavior and/or educator stress). We used values of $r = .10$, .24, and .37 as indicators of small, medium, and large effect sizes respectively as per Cohen’s (1992) classification.


**Student Misbehavior Scale**

As tabulated below, educator-reported student misbehavior declined significantly from pre- to post-training ($t (1360) = 28.63, p < .001$), with subscale scores reduced by 3.67 points (out of 30) on average, a large effect ($r > .37$). Although the distribution was virtually symmetric (skew = .02), it was leptokurtic (kurtosis = .35); thus, further non-parametric analyses were performed. We ran a Wilcoxon's signed-ranks test, which showed that the mean pre-post difference was still statistically significant at $p < .001$. In terms of individual items, all showed significant pre-post reductions ($p < .001$); the two largest pre-post decreases following completion of the *Love & Logic* curriculum for the classroom were that educators reported their students misbehaving less often (item 2) as well as taking more responsibility for their own poor decisions (item 4).

**Educator Stress Scale**

In the table below, you will also see that self-reported teacher/educator stress also declined significantly from pre- to post-training ($t (1394) = 18.75, p < .001$), with subscale scores reduced by 1.49 points (out of 20) on average, a medium effect ($r > .24$). The distribution was both highly positively skewed (skew = 3.05) and highly leptokurtic (kurtosis = 45.15), indicating that further non-parametric analyses were warranted. We therefore conducted a Wilcoxon's signed-ranks test, which showed that the mean pre-post difference was still statistically significant at $p < .001$. With regard to individual subscale items, all showed significant pre-post changes in the predicted direction at $p < .001$, with the exception of “As an educator, I find myself having fun with my students,” which decreased significantly at $p = .012$, but only by .11 points on average. Educators reported the largest increases in their confidence for handling classroom discipline after having taken the *Nine Essential Skills for the Love & Logic Classroom* training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-test (Mean, SD)</th>
<th>Post-test (Mean, SD)</th>
<th>Paired t statistic</th>
<th>Pre-Post Significance (p value)</th>
<th>Effect size (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Misbehavior</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>20.08 (3.92)</td>
<td>16.41 (4.35)</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Stress</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>9.54 (2.66)</td>
<td>8.05 (2.65)</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Possible score range on the Student Misbehavior Subscale was 6 to 30; possible score range on the Educator Stress subscale was 4 to 20. Higher scores reflect more educator-reported student misbehavior or educator/teacher stress.

To inquire about updates to supporting research, please phone us at 1-800-338-4065. One of our friendly customer care representatives will be happy to assist you.

If you are interested in conduction research on this curriculum, please contact us as well!