

---

## Effect of Positive Behavioural Intervention on Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive Education

**\*Dr. G.Victoria Naomi**

*Professor & HoD*

**\*\*Mrs. M. Revathi**

*Research Associate, Department of Special Education*

---

**Abstract:** Schools today face a number of challenges in educating students. In addition to the responsibility of effectively teaching academic subjects such as math, reading, science, the arts, and writing, educators must increasingly deal with nonacademic factors that influence the instruction they provide. Among these factors, one of the most challenging is emotional and behavioural disorders. It is estimated that approximately 10% of children and adolescents globally suffer from some form of mental illness that significantly impairs their ability to function in everyday settings (Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006; Shaffer et al., 1996). The prevalence rates of behavioral problems across various studies conducted in different states in India reported about 22.7% of children among the total study population were found to have behavioral problems (Anindya Kumar Gupta, Monica Mongia, and Ajoy Kumar Garg-2017). In Indian context, studies have been conducted to identify the prevalence of behavioural problems associated factors and predictors. But the available literature hardly speaks of treatment modalities and psycho social interventions. The study was conducted to study the Effect of Positive Behavioural Intervention Support on Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive Education which is a new paradigm in India. Thirty two students from Inclusive education were assessed for behavioural functioning using universal screening and the students were grouped in to different Tiers and received Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support . The results revealed that the study the Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support have significant improvement on behavioural functioning of the selected sample.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In the general school population, approximately 20% of children and adolescents have severe behavioral problems (Hoagwood & Erwin, 1997; Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). The prevalence rates of behavioral problems across various studies conducted in different states in India reported about 22.7% of children among the total study population were found to have behavioral problems (Anindya Kumar Gupta, Monica Mongia, and Ajoy Kumar Garg-2017). Addressing the behavioral problems within inclusive school settings is complex. A study by Srinath et al., in 2005, conducted on a community-based sample in Bengaluru, revealed the prevalence rates of behavioral problems to be around 12.5% in children up to 16 years of age.

### 2. RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Schools today face a number of challenges in educating students. In addition to the responsibility of effectively teaching academic subjects such as math, reading, science, the arts, and writing, educators must increasingly deal with nonacademic factors that influence the instruction they provide. Among these factors, one of the most challenging is emotional and behavioural disorders. It is estimated that approximately 10% of children and adolescents globally suffer from some form of mental illness that significantly impairs their ability to function in everyday settings (Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006; Shaffer et al., 1996).

In Indian context, studies have been conducted to identify the prevalence of behavioural problems associated factors and predictors. But the available literature hardly speaks of treatment modalities and psycho social interventions. The study was conducted to study the Effect of Positive Behavioural Intervention Support on Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive Education which is a new paradigm in India.

School-wide PBIS is an evidence-based prevention model used to reduce challenging behavior and promote safe and healthy learning environments in schools (Sugai & Horner, 2002; McCurdy, Mannella, & Eldridge, 2003). The PBIS

approach includes three tiers. Tier 1 implements primary prevention efforts that address school and classroom-wide universal interventions to support positive behavior for all students, Tier 2 implements secondary targeted interventions for use with students with at-risk behaviors, and Tier 3 implements tertiary or intensive individualized interventions designed for students with the most severe behavioral issues (Sugai & Horner, 2002). This study using the positive Behaviour frame work is very new entity in Indian Context.

### **3. METHOD**

#### **Sample**

The sample selected for the study is Thirty two students from Corporation Primary School students (19 males and 13 females). The participant sample was drawn from Corporation Primary School serving students with diverse abilities.

#### **Method of Positive Behaviour intervention In Indian School:**

##### **Preparation of Behaviour Check list :**

The investigator developed The Student Behavior Checklist: Teacher's Nomination Form, which was used to measure the behavioral functioning of students. The checklist consists of 10 externalizing behaviour items, such as crying, fighting, teasing, and stealing and so on. The teacher rates each student on each item and indicates the severity of the behaviour on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (Frequently), 1 (Occasionally), 2 (Rarely) and 3(Never).

##### **Universal Screening of Student at risk for behavioural problem**

Universal Screening of behaviour Pre test was assessed for the selected sample with The Student Behavior Checklist: Teacher's Nomination Form. Each student behaviour was screened by the researcher using the checklist. The teachers of the respective student were reported on student behaviour. The Universal Screening was conducted three times per year for every three months. Five phase of Universal Screening was conducted in this study namely Pre test, Post test1, pos test 2, post test 3 and follow up. Students were grouped and regrouped according to the universal screening scores.

##### **Identifying & Grouping student at risk for behavioural problem**

With the Universal Screening Score for each student was calculating from The Student Behavior Checklist: Teacher's Nomination Form scores. The score range of 0-30 indicates high risk of behavioural problems, 31-60 is moderate risk and 61-90 is low risk of behavioural problems. Each student data was analyzed and students were grouped as 0-30 as Tier 3, 31-60 as Tier 2 and 61-90 as Tier 1.

##### **Implementing Positive Behaviour Intervention**

Positive Behavioural Intervention Support was implemented in five phases with the 32 participants in different tiers. All 32 participants received Tier1 PBIS intervention and T2 & T3 children received small group intensive intervention for behavioural concerns. T1 intervention was given to the student for 20 minutes per day. The Tier 1 intervention was whole Class program. It consist of defining Behaviour Expectation of the School, Establishing routine, modeling appropriate behaviour and monitoring & reinforcing appropriate behaviour. For example for the problem behaviour Aggressive or Fighting with others the Tier 1 intervention would be Teaching Behavioura Expectation of the School as Be Safe of Own self, others and belongings through modeling the behaviour , portraying with behaviour charts and acknowledging positive behaviour

Tier 2 group students received specific intervention for the problem behaviour. Monitoring and reinforcement mechanism was established through interventions like Check In Check Out & Behavioural Contract. The students were taught about strategies to cope up with the school expectation. For example Social Stories and Self Correction strategies were taught to Tier 2 students in a small group for 20 minutes per intervention for 2 interventions per week.

Tier 3 group received more intensive intervention for the specific problem behaviour for 20 minutes per intervention for 3 times per week. For example Tier 3 student is have a problem behaviour of Aggressiveness or

fighting with others the Tier 3 intervention was teaching Coping Skills and Teaching Relaxation Techniques & Behavioural Monitoring with using Daily behaviour form.

#### 4. RESULTS

**Table 1:** Test wise Mean and Standard Deviation of the Behavioural Functioning in Pre, Post and follow-up of the Positive behaviour Intervention

Behavioural Functioning	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pre Test	32	6.15	1.95
Post Test1	32	7.43	2.46
Post Test 2	32	9.56	2.15
Post Test 3	32	10.81	2.19
Follow up	32	11.84	2.32

A descriptive analysis was made to find out the influence on Positive Behaviour Intervention on Behavioural Functioning. From the table 1, it is evident that the mean value is increased from Pre Test to Follow Up from 6.15 to 11.84. It reveals that there is a significant improvement in Behavioural Functioning. Hence it is concluded that Positive Behaviour Intervention was efficacious in enhancing Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive School.

**Table 2:** Multivariate tests for Behavioural Functioning

Multivariate Tests<sup>a</sup>

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Study Skills	Pillai's Trace	0.96	178.45	4	28	.000	0.96
	Wilks' Lambda	0.03	178.45	4	28	.000	0.96
	Hotelling's Trace	25.49	178.45	4	28	.000	0.96
	Roy's Largest Root	25.49	178.45	4	28	.000	0.96

A multivariate test was made between 32 students from Pre Test to Post Test to Follow Up to find out the effectiveness of Positive Behaviour Intervention on Behaviour Functioning. The table 2 reveals that the effect size of the intervention is 96%, it shows that Positive Behaviour Intervention has been found to have significant impact on Behavioural Functioning of the Students in Inclusive Education.

**Table 3:** Tests of within Subjects on Behavioural Functioning in the five phases of Intervention

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Behavioural Functioning	Sphericity Assumed	706.71	4	176.67	171.57	.000	0.801
	Greenhouse-Geisser	706.71	2.37	298.12	171.57	.000	0.801
	Huynh-Feldt	706.71	2.58	273.95	171.57	.000	0.801
	Lower-bound	706.71	1.00	706.71	171.57	.000	0.801
	Sphericity Assumed	127.68	124	1.03			0.801
Error(Study Skills)	Greenhouse-Geisser	127.68	73.48	1.73			
	Huynh-Feldt	127.68	79.97	1.59			
	Lower-bound	127.68	31.00	4.11			

A one way repeated measures of ANOVA was done among 32 students to assess the effectiveness of the five phase Intervention on study skills. The results show that the Positive Behaviour Intervention has significant improvement in Study skills from Phase 1 to Phase 5  $F(2.37, 73.85) = 171.57, p = .00, r = .801$ . It was also found to cause significant effect within the students from Pre Test to Post test to Follow Up and the effect size is 80%.

#### 5. DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study to find out the effectiveness of Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support on Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive Education. The study results were found in three ways that is descriptive statistics, multivariate test among students and one way ANOVA between students. All three result scores were statistically significant and thus it is revealed that Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support

enhanced the Behavioural Functioning of Students in Inclusive Education. This study results were on par with Effects of School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports on Child Behavior Problems by Catherine P. Bradshaw and Tracy E. Waasdorp, & Philip J. Leaf. In this study Multilevel analyses were conducted on teachers' ratings of children's behavior problems, These findings provide support for the hypothesized reduction in behavior problems and improvements in prosocial behavior and effective emotion regulation after training in SWPBIS. Hence the Positive Behavioural intervention appears to be a promising approach for enhancing behavioural functioning of students in Inclusive Education.

## REFERENCES

- Flannery, K. B., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2009). School-wide positive behavior support in high school early lessons learned. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 177–185.
- Gupta, A. K., Mongia, M., & Garg, A. K. (2017). A descriptive study of behavioral problems in schoolgoing children. *Industrial psychiatry journal*, 26(1), 91–94. doi:10.4103/ipj.ipj\_39\_17
- Lassen, S.R., Steele, M.M. and Sailor, W. (2006) The Relationship of School-Wide Positive Behavior Support to Academic Achievement in an Urban Middle School. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43, 701-712.
- McCurdy, B. L., Mannella, M. C., & Eldridge, N. (2003). Positive behavior support in urban schools: Can we prevent the escalation of antisocial behavior? *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 5(3), 158–170.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 24(1-2), 23–50.
- Timalsina, M., Kafle, M., & Timalsina, R. (2018). Psychosocial Problems among School Going Adolescents in Nepal. *Psychiatry journal*, 2018, 4675096. doi:10.1155/2018/4675096