Chapter 1

Introduction

1.0 Introduction

Challenging behaviour in schools is a worldwide phenomenon and in all countries, school authorities, teachers and parents are often concerned about the adverse effects of challenging behaviours because the school is expected to be a safe place for children (Nickerson & Spears, 2007), where teaching and learning can take place. However, the presence of challenging behaviours in schools can constitute a threat to safety of some children and impede effective teaching and learning. In Thailand, there has been a growing concern about the escalating prevalence of challenging behaviours across schools (Assanangkornchai, Rerngpongpar & Samangsri, 2010) and this study intends to investigate behaviours that are of concern to teachers and how they manage those behaviours.

1.1 Defining challenging behaviour

As there is no consensus on the definition of challenging behaviour, it is important to explore different definitions in order to contextualise the nature of challenging behaviour in this study. According to Klass and Guskin (1995), "challenging behaviour is any behaviour that interferes with children's learning, development, success at play; is harmful to the child, other children, or adults; and puts them at high risk for later social problems or school failure" (p.5). On the other hand, Smith and Fox (2003) define challenging behaviour in young children as any behaviour that interferes with or is at risk of interfering with optimal learning or engagement in pro-social interactions with peers and adults.

The above definition sheds light on the fact that there are different behaviours that might be considered challenging and suggests that challenging behaviour is any behaviour that is of concern to teachers in a school setting, one that interferes with a child's optimal development, learning, or play, that tends to inhibit pro-social behaviour and is likely to harm the child and those within the reach of the child (Dunlap, Blair, Umbreit, & Jung, 2007). Such behaviours include aggression (both physical and verbal), severe tantrums, self-injury, non-compliance, and withdrawal. They also include high levels of talking in class and not settling for learning tasks, hitting, spitting, biting, bullying and destruction of property. Others include attention seeking, oppositional, impulsive, anti-social, out of control, temper tantrums, attention-deficit, aggressive posture and self-withdrawal (Dunlap, Fox, Hemmeter, Joseph, & Strain, 2003; Elton report, 1989; Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2007).

Students are known to display different forms of challenging behaviours in schools and it has been found that these behaviours bring about teachers' negative feelings in diverse ways (Arbuckle & Little, 2004; Lopez et al., 2008; Ross et al., 2008; Thompson & Webber, 2008). For example, a study conducted in Egypt about the most frequent challenging behaviours in classrooms revealed that 71% of the total sample, 33, selected "misbehaviours" such as disrespect for teachers, rudeness, and impoliteness as those most frequently displayed by students (Ding et al., 2008; Shen et al., 2009). Other studies found "off task" or talking out as the most frequent challenging behaviour (Arbuckle & Little, 2004; Ross et al., 2008).

The different definitions show that challenging behaviour takes a number of forms and manifests in a number of dimensions, of low intensity or high intensity. The educational literature does not contain a unified and consensual definition; the lack of consensus in defining challenging behaviour can be attributed to variations in cultural perceptions of what

behaviours are acceptable or unacceptable, appropriate or inappropriate (Division for Early Childhood, 1999). In this study, the definition given by Klass and Guskin (1995) will serve as a good reference point: challenging behaviour will include repeated actions of behaviours such as aggression, non-compliance, off-task behaviour, out-of-seat behaviours, among others, that are repetitive or interfere with learning over an extended period of time in the classroom.

Whatever the form of behaviour labelled "challenging" it is a type of behaviour most unlikely to respond to a variety of routine intervention strategies available for use by schools. Thus, it puts the child in danger of truncating his/her learning, and forestalling him or her from getting along with peers as the child does not have much control over such behaviour and he or she may be unable to regulate feelings or actions. Consequently, the child may use abusive words against his or her peers, may damage facilities and inflict injuries on others by engaging them in physical assault. These actions are likely to result in the child being rejected by his or her peers, and experience difficulty joining a new group (Campbell, 1990). These challenging behaviours affect their care placement and interactions within the family.

The causes of challenging behaviour can be biological, for example, pain, medication or sensory stimulation. Other causes include social factors such as boredom and seeking social interaction; environmental factors such as noise, lighting and access to preferred objects or activities; psychological factors such as feelings of being excluded, devalued, labelled, disempowered; and physical factors such as suffering a condition such as intellectual disability (Farmer & Aman, 2009; Matson & Boisjoli, 2007, 2009a, 2009b; Matson & Nebel-Schwalm, 2007; Rojahn et al., 2009). These possible causes are linked to a number of

behaviour characteristics that make some children difficult to control and which include intensity, persistence, sensitivity, perceptiveness, adaptability and energy (Kurcinka, 1998).

The effects of these behaviours are that they interfere with pupils' learning, challenge day-to-day functioning of the school, deny the right of staff and pupils to a safe or orderly environment (Irish National Teachers Organization, 2002).

1.2 The School System in Thailand

The Thai education system is divided into four levels, namely, pre-school education, primary, secondary, and higher education. Basic education covers pre-primary kindergarten (Anuban), primary (Prathom), secondary (Mathayom), upper secondary (e.g., general education or vocational education), and higher education includes universities, colleges or other institutions of higher learning (Kannikar, Prapin, & Usa, 2007).

The basic school structure in Thailand is hinged on four key stages. The first three years of elementary school, known as "Anuban", represent stage 1; stage 2 covers Prathom 1–6; while stage 3 covers Matthayom 1–3 (lower secondary), Matthayom 4–6 (upper secondary); and vocational stream which is run in two semesters of a school year. In addition, stage 4 covers university and college education (ONEC, 2004). On the completion of each level, students are required to pass NET (National Educational Test) examinations such O-NET (Ordinary) and A-NET (Advanced). Thus the Thai educational system is basically a 6–3–3 model followed by a wide range of post-secondary options. Formal education in Thailand takes at

least 12 years of basic education, which is followed by higher education in any tertiary institutions (ONEC, 2004).

According to the Office of the National Education Council (ONEC) and as revealed by Thailand Educational System overview for pre-primary, primary and secondary education (ONEC, 2004), there are about 44,903 pre-primary schools of which 6,619 are private pre-primary schools, 31,129 public primary and lower secondary schools, 2,660 public lower and upper secondary schools, and 409 public vocational schools. Public schools in Thailand are controlled by the Thai Ministry of Education while the Office of the Private Education Commission (OPEC) within the Ministry of Education oversees the supervision of private schools. In addition, the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment is charged with the responsibility for evaluation of educational achievements of schools in Thailand (OPEC, 2005).

The Thai Ministry of Education has embedded a special program in the Thai Education system to cater for children with disabilities by ensuring special schools are arranged for them (OEC, 2007). The Thai National Education Act recommends inclusion of children with mild or moderate disability in inclusive classrooms (ONEC, 2002). Therefore the most disadvantaged students are enrolled in regular public schools otherwise called Inclusive schools, Welfare schools, and Border Patrol Police schools (OEC, 2007, p.14). Special schools in the Thailand Education system are classified into four types, namely, special schools for children with mental impairments, hearing impairments, visual impairments, and physical impairments (p.16). Furthermore, non-formal education services are catered for by

both public and private education providers and supervised by the Office of Non-formal and Informal Education (OEC, 2007).

The aim of Thai education is to develop students' morality, ethics and social skills necessary for leading peaceful social lives (ONEC, 1998). This means that schooling is supposed to train students to behave well. In order to achieve this goal, the Thailand government enacted the National Education Act (NEA) in 1999 to facilitate educational reform as a step to bringing about full development of people in all respects (ONEC, 1999b). One objective of the reform is to decentralise the Thailand educational system which has been highly centralised and characterised by compliance culture whereby orders from above should be followed accordingly (Hallinger, Chantarapanya, Sriboonma, & Kantamara, 1999). The Education reform was also aimed at bringing about changes to the professional actions and behaviours of school authorities, and the culture of schools (Caldwell, 1998)**,** because the current situation restricted teachers from acting freely in handling students' misbehaviour without any consultation with the head teacher or school authority regardless of the gravity of the students' challenging behaviour. Despite the reform, challenging behaviours remain and students continue to demonstrate unacceptable and sometimes challenging behaviour in school, which gets worse as they move into high school. A study conducted on high school students by Assanangkornchai, Rerngpongpar, and Samangsri (2010) reported a high prevalence of unacceptable behaviours including students carrying weapons and using physical violence on others in school settings. In another study Pitaksirikul (1989) pointed out that challenging behaviours start while students are in lower grades and become more aggressive in higher grades when students are at a critical age, especially Mathayom 3, which is equivalent to Year 9 in Thailand. On the other hand, in most primary schools across

Thailand challenging behaviours are known to be fairly managed by schools and the problem is not as serious as in high schools.

In the past caning was banned in Thailand schools and educators were urged to employ alternative strategies. These strategies have an increasing order of severity starting from reprimanding, assigning punitive activities, probation, suspension from school and finally dismissal from school (Walker et al., 2004). It is believed that controlling or eliminating these undesirable behaviours would lead to improvement in the learning and teaching processes of the whole classroom and foster new opportunities for students' academic achievement. In the face of the increasing levels of challenging behaviour in schools in Thailand, the Education Minister, Suwit Khunkitti in 2002 proposed the need to reintroduce caning in schools across Thailand as a suitable punishment for intractable students who had become increasingly bold since physical discipline was banned in schools (The Nation, 15 January, 2002). The use of caning is limited and it is used only as a deterrent for misbehaviour in some cases in Thailand schools. In spite of this, there has not been any significant improvement in the level of challenging behaviour of students across Thailand. Many teachers in Thailand reported unruly students had become more aggressive and teachers are left with no options to effectively punish these students and make them change their behaviour. While no recent studies have been done with regard to punishments, a study by Martin and Pear (2003) found that the use of punishments was a source of emotional problems among students and prevented the occurrence of desirable behaviour, because punishments served as a short-term measures for correcting students' perceived challenging behaviour but did not allow them to learn about their behaviours.

In the past, most teachers in Thailand schools applied reactive methods, including punishment — scolding, reprimand, flogging, pinching, removing a disruptive student from the classroom as well as giving negative feedback when addressing challenging behaviour (Impeumpoon, 1979; Juthangkha, 1974; Lebkrut, 1974; Poonpatarachewin et al., 1978; Thanyawong, 1974; Unprasert, 1976, as cited in Pumwaree, 1986). These studies suggest that most teachers appeared not to have long-term strategies for behavioural modification; instead, they used punishment, which is a kind of aversive control that can cause physical pain and may also violate the human rights of the child. Such approaches do not provide long-term solutions to these behaviours and alternative strategies are needed.

Miltenberger (2008) suggested that alternative ways of managing these behaviours, such as behaviour modification, are necessary and such methods need to be designed to address challenging behaviour beforehand. In this regard, the use of reinforcement has been shown to be useful to help the child to practise the desirable behaviour. Some reinforcement procedures which can be employed by teachers include differential reinforcement of incompatible behaviour (DRI), differential reinforcement of alternative behaviour (DRA), differential reinforcement of other behaviour (DRO) and differential reinforcement of low rates of responding (DRL). These approaches are meant to bring about a reduction in the occurrence of interfering behaviours such as tantrums, aggression, self-injury, or stereotypical behaviours while optimising the use of more adaptive, communicative or acceptable behaviours that bring about a positive and humane teaching environment to facilitate learning. Therefore, differential reinforcement helps in reinforcing target behaviours that are more adaptive than the interfering behaviour and decreasing inappropriate behaviour. All of these procedures have been proven to effectively decrease undesirable behaviour such as stereotypy and off-task behaviour (Newman, Tuntigian, Ryan, & Reinecke, 1997; Taylor,

Hoch, & Weissman, 2005), phobias (Shabani & Fisher, 2006), non-compliance (Piazza, Moes, & Fisher, 1996), aggressive and destructive behaviour (Adelinis, Piazza, & Goh, 2001), and unresponsivity to social stimuli (Lee, McComas, & Jawor, 2002; Shabani et al., 2002; Williams, Donley, & Keller, 2000).

Given the success of these strategies, teachers in Thailand can also use positive reinforcements to manage undesirable behaviours, which can serve as effective tools in promoting more desirable behaviours (Kalish 1981 as cited in Iemsupasith, 2000). It is expected that by using these strategies, schools across Thailand may start to witness success in behavioural modification and create desired changes in the behaviours of students (Chuchom, Sukharom, & Srichindarat, 2006; Iemsupasith, 2000).

1.3 Thai Culture and its Underlying Influence on Students' Behaviour

An exploration of Thai culture reveals that Thai children are brought up to demonstrate behavioural restraint, deference, and politeness in their day-to-day engagements in their society, especially in schools (Phillips, 1965; Suvannathat, 1979). However, a multi-method study of challenging behaviour among Thai and American children in school (Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, Weiss, Achenbach, & Walter, 1988) reported that Thai children are noted for displaying a wider range of challenging behaviours than American children. The findings were intimately linked to the differences in their respective cultures. To start with, a large number of Thai populations (approximately 95 per cent) are Buddhist and they follow Buddhist precepts. Thus their children are taught to be obedient, non-aggressive, not to show

their emotions, respectful to others especially their teachers and elders (Gardiner, 1968; Gardiner & Suttipan, 1977; Moore, 1974; Sangsingkeo, 1969; Suvannathat, 1979; Suwanlert, 1974; Weisz, 1989).

In other words, Thai children are encouraged by their parents to demonstrate "krengchai", an attitudinal disposition of acting with humility and self-effacement in such a manner to forestall an occurrence of a situation that will cause disturbance or inconvenience to others (Phillips, 1965; Suvannathat, 1979). This attitude is one of the most important aspects of Thai social interactions and it is also an integral part of "wai". In Thai culture, "wai" refers to one taking a respectful bow with hands pressed together in a prayerful position. Students across all levels of education are commonly seen in schools to "wai" their teachers. In Thai society, teachers are placed very highly and children are taught to follow teachers' instructions and respect them because they convey societal values and thus teachers are generally called by the honorific term "achaan". However, research studies have revealed that not all Thai children follow the "wai" principles all the time. For instance, Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, Weiss, Achenbach et al. (1988) reported that Thai primary school children were notably known to display challenging behaviours including conduct disorder in greater dimension than American children. This observation was contrary to the notion that Thai children conduct themselves better in their classrooms compared to American primary school children (noted in Weisz et al., 1988). The Thai primary school children's problem behaviours could be attributed to the level of concern shown by adults in response to their challenging behaviour and which also determine the necessity for interventions to follow (cf. Walker, Bettes & Ceci, 1984; White, 1982). Child behaviours that are not considered serious by adults are related to the culture of the society. Some behaviours may not be considered serious in America but can draw attention in Thailand or even be a source of distress.

A number of factors are likely to inform the level of concern raised by adults in response to the challenging behaviour displayed by these children, and one such factor could be culture. For instance, Thai adults' perceptions of behaviours such as shyness, fear, anxiety or social withdrawal and under-controlled challenging behaviours such as disobedience, fighting or aggression are less serious and do not arouse adults' concern. This level of concern by Thai adults could be ascribed to the application of Buddhist teachings (see Jumsai, 1980; Suvannathat, 1979). Some of the teachings point out that everybody faces times of dissatisfaction and unhappiness; also that every situation in the life of the individual is transient and cannot be permanent; and that an individual's behaviour does not reflect an enduring personality. Hence, cultural differences may be a reason why some challenging behaviours were responded to with little or no concern but in other cultures such challenging behaviours might be considered serious (see Draguns, 1973). Further, notable Thai researchers affirm that conscientious practices of the tenets of Buddhism among Thai people influence adults' behavioural expectations such as quietness, politeness and inhibition from children as acceptable benchmarks in Thai society (Sangsingkeo, 1969, p. 292). Therefore, Thai adults have a positive perception of over-controlled behaviours such as shyness, fear, and social withdrawal as much less distressing to them compared with under-controlled challenging behaviours such as disobedience, fighting, aggression and so on (e.g., Gardiner, 1968; Gardiner & Suttipan, 1977; Suvannathat, 1979). Hence, Suvannatha (1979) concludes that Thai adults allow a wide range of variations in children's behaviours, and their disposition in this regard was in line with some key tenets of Thai Buddhism (Daksinganadhikorn, 1973; Jumsai, 1980; see introduction). Therefore, children's challenging behaviours are not likely to concern Thai adults as compared to American adults. This could perhaps be explained by the notion that culture is about how people go along with their day-

to-day problems and to some extent, in extreme situations of adversities. Furthermore, research evidence suggest that a reasonable number of Asian Americans are not inclined to outburst in their social interactions with other people as they do not want to upset others and thus prefer to be reticent (Hsu, 1971; Kleinman, 1977) or more likely to contain their distress within themselves (Narikiyo & Kameoka, 1992). This probably could be one of the reasons why some Thai teachers choose to ignore some challenging behaviours. Also a fairly recent study points out that Thai children were twice as likely as American children to use covert coping methods such as not talking back (McCarty et al., 1999). However, other studies established that Thai children use different coping styles in response to different types and degree of challenging behaviours (Weisz et al., 1997).

1.4 The problem

In Thailand, challenging behaviour in schools is a major concern for educational authorities (Thai Department of Education, 2008). Students are demonstrating many varied challenging and antisocial behaviours in Thailand schools, and the situation is exacerbated by family separation and the distant relationship between teachers and students as well as by little attention being given by adults to the young people's emotional development (The Nation, 2003). The increasing spate of challenging behaviour among students in Thailand has become an issue of concern and yet many teachers have limited knowledge and skills of the different behaviour management strategies to deal with these behaviours. Thai teachers' behaviour management methods/approaches involving physical punishment observed by Unprasert (1976) and Pumwaree (1986) over two decades ago still prevail (Samangsri et al., 2010). These authors reported that many teachers in Thailand use reactive methods such as physical

or verbal punishment in the form of scolding, flogging, giving negative feedback and asking students to leave the classroom for displaying challenging behaviours.

Only one recent study has been done on problem behaviours in Thailand (Samangsri et al., 2010) and it suggests that teachers seem to be using mainly punishment in line with the Ministry of Education's policy recommending the return to caning. This action shows that many teachers in Thailand are lacking knowledge of evidence-based proactive behaviour management practices which can be used to reduce challenging behaviour. Also they seem not to recognise the fact that both negative and positive behaviours are learned, and to reduce challenging behaviours and promote positive behaviours, teachers need to put a concerted effort into teaching their students appropriate behaviours (Ray, Blanco, Sullivian, & Holliman, 2009). If teachers in Thailand are to be supported to develop better behaviour management approaches, then understanding the kinds of behaviours that are of concern to teachers and how they manage these behaviours is useful. There is therefore a need to investigate what kinds of behaviours are of concern to teachers in Thailand and how they manage the behaviours. This will provide an opportunity to provide more targeted training to teachers on alternative ways of managing problem behaviours in the classroom.

1.5 Aim of study

This study aimed to find out what problem behaviours of students are of most concern to teachers in Thailand schools and the behavioural strategies teachers use to manage these problem behaviours. It also examined the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategies used to respond to challenging behaviour of students (whether or not the students have been identified as having special needs).

1.6 Research questions

RQ1: What problem behaviours of students are of most concern to teachers in Thailand schools?

RQ2: What behaviour management strategies are used by teachers in Thailand to address the challenging behaviours?

RQ3: What are the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of these strategies to manage challenging behaviours?

RQ4: How do teachers rate the level of difficulty of managing the challenging behaviours?

RQ5: Are there any significant relationships between teachers' background variables and their concerns about challenging behaviours, their behaviour management strategies, their perceptions of effectiveness of strategies and their reported difficulty in managing behaviours?

1.7 Significance of the research study

This study focused on investigating challenging behaviours that are commonly displayed by students in schools across Thailand and on exploring what strategies teachers use to control such behaviours. School teachers in Thailand are constantly beset with problems of how best to manage effectively problem behaviours displayed by students and I am also one of those teachers who teach students of diverse socio-economic backgrounds with challenging

behaviour. In an effort by teachers to control these challenging behaviours, teachers spend much of the teaching time controlling behaviour and still the problem behaviour remains pervasive.

In this regard, this study is designed to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies used by teachers in addressing challenging behaviour in a selection of schools across Thailand, and to make suggestions regarding what should be done differently. This study will address an aspect of education which has not been well addressed in Thailand, but needs urgent attention in order to reduce an increasing number of students dropping out, student referrals and detention, and to promote the idea of inclusion regardless of the severity of students' challenging behaviour. The study will raise the awareness of teachers and authorities in the education sector in Thailand and provide a basis for further investigation of similar studies concerning students' challenging behaviours. In the end, this study will help to draw attention of school authorities and teachers to a number of evidence-based behavioural strategies to replace the most commonly used traditional behavioural control practices in Thailand which are believed to be ineffective. At the end, this study is intended to make a number of suggestions and recommendations which may be useful as additional guiding principles in handling challenging behaviours of students.

1.8 Chosen framework for the study

Even though teachers in Thailand may use a range of behaviour strategies based on all these theories discussed above, the framework that underpins this study is Positive Behaviour

Support (PBS) because it allows schools and teachers to note behaviours of concern, plan for school and classroom actions that both promote positive behaviour as well as manage unacceptable behaviour and therefore enable school climates to become more proactive and positive (Muscott et al., 2008). The Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) model promotes a positive school environment, via raising issues of behaviour immediately, sustaining appropriate behaviour, as well as gaining life skills that can potentially decrease prevalence, reduce severity and address individual needs in a more efficient way (Burns & Hickie, 2002).

The growing incidence of students' misbehaviour in many Thai schools and other countries worldwide indicates that teachers are experiencing a diverse range of students' challenging behaviours in their classrooms which elicits their efforts to seek support for students' engagement toward maximising their learning outcomes (Dempsey & Arthur-Kelly, 2007). To this end, teachers are putting more effort into applying effective behaviour management strategies in an attempt to sustain an improved learning process by reducing the frequency of occurrence of students' challenging behaviours (Reinke et al., 2008). In this regard, some teachers are of the opinion that the use of positive behaviour practices such as praise, reward, and giving students an opportunity to contribute in the decision to address their behaviour are the best management strategies. Other teachers have seen the use of aversive strategies such as reprimands and punishments to be more effective than positive behaviour management strategies (Axup & Gersch, 2008). A growing body of research findings has revealed that aversive approaches such as punishment, detention, caning and suspension were commonly used in many countries in the past (Croner & Horner, 2003; Horner, Carr, Strain, Todd, & Reed, 2002), and students are still found to be repeating the challenging behaviours (Gershoff, 2008; Mayer, 1995). In light of this situation, non-evidenced-based practices such as caning and corporal punishments have been discouraged or even eliminated in Thailand

and many developing nations (Gary, 2001; Gershoff, 2008). Nowadays, teachers are found using a wide range of alternative behaviour management strategies such as assertive discipline (Canter & Canter, 1992), cognitive-behavioural modification and Positive Behaviour Support strategies (Finch, Nelson, & Ott, 1993). Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) is introduced among other reasons to prevent and reduce challenging behaviour in schools (Dunlap et al., 2000) as the framework is known to be useful in building skills, bringing about the manipulation of consequences and redesigning of environment in a school-wide context (Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009). In addition, the Positive Behaviour Support framework also creates room for students' specific behavioural needs by using its embedded Functional Behavioural Assessment (FBA) to provide a specific behaviour intervention plan (BIP) for addressing the challenging behaviour and matching it with more socially appropriate behaviour (Arthur-Kelly, 2006). For example, the use of PBS in Thailand and other Asian countries has been seen to yield promising results in a number of schools (Apichatabutra, 2009; Baba & Tanaka-Matsumi, 2011) and likewise in western contexts (Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006; McCurdy, Mannella, & Eldridge, 2003; Sherrod, Getch, & Ziomek-Daigle, 2009). It was against this backdrop that the Thai Ministry of Education put in a policy to assist schools and teachers toward supporting students with challenging behaviour in their diverse classrooms and to encourage teachers to refrain from applying punishment to students (OBEC, 2009b). For example, the 1999 National Education Act of Thailand has in place a behaviour support framework with the focus of child-centredness and development of Thai people (OBEC, 2009a). This effort has produced a meaningful impact on students' behaviour management practices used by Thai teachers (Thanasetkorn, 2009). However, according to Harris et al. (1996) teachers of students with learning disabilities have reported the prevalence of physical aggression, non-compliance, disruption and hyperactivity while

behaviours such as property destruction, talking out and self-injurious behaviours were reported as severe challenging behaviours.

In this study, I will be finding out what challenging behaviours of students are of most concern to teachers in Thailand schools as well as behavioural strategies teachers use and reasons for their choice. In addition, this study will examine the effectiveness of the strategies used in dealing with challenging behaviour and the perennial difficulties teachers encounter in the process of dealing with problem behaviours displayed by students. Since PBS assesses the nature of the behaviours and implements strategies to prevent them as well as managing the behaviours using non-reactive strategies, it provides a good framework for this study. More importantly, this study data might reveal how often teachers use Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) strategies to treat students with challenging behaviour. The dimension of students' challenging behaviour is growing across schools in Thailand, and it is becoming increasingly difficult for teachers to control because behaviour and learning problems tend to be progressive in nature. Therefore, using PBS will help me capture the picture of how teachers perceive the behaviours and how they manage them across selected schools.

1.9 Definition of Terms

Aggressive Behavior (AB): refers to a regular pattern of behaviour that brings about harm or threatens safety of other people in such a way that it violates the basic rights of others, the societal norms and rules, or is a source of damage to social or academic functioning. Elements of aggressive behaviour include verbal (taunts or threats), physical (tantrums,

throwing, or fights), instrumental (goal-directed), reactive (unplanned retaliation), proactive (bullying, provocation), overt (externalised), covert (lying, stealing, cheating, drug use) and indirect or relational, for example, social manipulation (Fraser, Nash, Galinsky, Darwin, 2001).

Antisocial Behaviour: is a kind of behaviour that is a product of constitutional mix, which is made up of genetic and neurobiological, and environmental factors such as family and community (Reid et. al., 2002). Examples include bullying, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and learning disorders.

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: refers to a behavioural disorder which bears patterns of behaviours that are similar to inattention, hyperactivity, impulsivity as well as overlapping with behavioural symptoms such as oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, and affective disorder: depression, anxiety, learning disabilities and communication disorders (APA, 2000; Barkley, 1990a, 1990b). A child who displays this kind of behaviour is often found to fidget with hands, squirm a lot, run about or climb a lot; has trouble paying attention; or is often seen talking too much or displaying actions that suggest being driven by a motor.

Behaviour rehearsal: is a method by which an individual practises appropriate behaviour responses to establish and strengthen basic skills within the context of a social setting as used in a social-skill training program (APA, 2013). In other words, behavioural rehearsal is an approach to raise the level of an individual's interpersonal skills and social interactions by practising behavioural patterns, which are recommended by the therapist until one is able to practise these patterns of behaviour in real-life situations. That is, behaviour rehearsal is a way by which modelled behaviours are reproduced in line with some given guidelines.

Check In/Check Out (CICO): is a school-based behaviour educational program that is put in place to provide day-to-day support and a close watch for a student who is at risk of coming up with severe problem behaviour (Crone, Hawken, & Horner, 2010).

Counselling: is an approach involving the use of purposeful conversation through which an individual is assisted by another person with the aim of identifying practical solutions to an identified challenging behaviour. The counselling process involves a number of steps such as getting started, introductory talk, identifying the issues, coping with feelings, identifying possible solutions, agreeing on a plan, implementing the plan and finally review (The Education Trust, 2000).

Debriefing: refers to a special kind of feedback process whereby participants who had been deceived in some way in the course of conducting a study are informed of the true nature of the investigation. The debriefing process involves seven core structural elements, which include the person who carries out debriefing, participants to debrief, an experience, the impact of the experience, recollection, report, and time (Ziegler & Lederman, 1991).

Instructional Approach (IA): is a behaviour management strategy that sees students' challenging behaviour as a teaching issue in which the perceived misbehaviour should be removed and appropriate responses need to be taught and strengthened (Patterson, De Baryshe & Ramsey, 1989).

Oppositional Defiant Disorder: refers to a regular pattern of unyielding angry behaviour such as an unwarranted disturbance to others. An individual with Oppositional Defiant Disorder is not ready to be responsible for accepting mistakes. This behaviour often precedes or occurs at the same time as conduct disorder such as severe verbal and physical aggression, property destruction and persistent deceit behaviour for a long period of time (Kazdin, 1993).

Planned Ignoring: refers to a form of intervention strategy that is designed to weaken, minimise, or eliminate behaviour of concern displayed by a child (Sheuermann & Hall, 2008). This approach is used to signal to the child that the irritant behaviour that is displayed will not yield the desired outcome as expected by the child (Alberto & Troutman, 2006).

Praise: refers to the communication of approval and positive regard, which is used for showing an acceptance of good behaviour of students (Mayer & Sulzer-Azaroff, 2002).

Pre-correction: refers to a proactive strategy aimed at forestalling or distracting an attempt by an individual to display a predictable challenging behaviour while it also increases the chances of occurrence of an expected behaviour (Stormont, Lewis, & Covington, 2007).

Restraint: is an action taken to immobilise a child or deny the child a freedom of movement either by using physical force such as holding a child or mechanical means such as using a chair with strap to keep the child in position or by applying chemicals such as tranquillisers to maintain the child's immobility (CEC, 2009).

Response cost (RC): refers to a punishment that is given in addition to the package of contingencies to enhance the effectiveness of contingencies when an attempt to use reward is not sufficient enough to change students' behaviour (Simonsen, Fairbanks, Briesch & Sugai, 2006).

Social Skill Training (SST): refers to the teaching of a set of skills such as empathy, anger management, and problem solving to students with problem behaviours by using standard instructional techniques for teaching, practising, and reinforcing the skills so that students can gain the new skills, and start to use them during the school day and at home (Trower, 1982).

Seclusion: Otherwise known as an involuntary confinement, seclusion refers to keeping a child alone in a room or an isolated area and the child is constrained from leaving the area;

for example, denying a child interactions or social activities as a result of being isolated from his or her peers and caregivers for a specified period of time (Department of Health, 2008).

Temporary compliance: refers to cooperation that results from something being offered to someone with intent to achieve an immediate cooperation but in the end is short-lived (Kohn, 1993).

Time-Out (TO): is a technique that involves the removal of students for a limited time or entirely from their colleagues or situations where they are unable to control their behaviour (Ryan, Peterson, & Rozalski, 2007).

1.10 Overview of Chapters

The rest of the chapters of this study are presented as follows: Chapter 2 outlines the literature review, Chapter 3 describes the methodology, Chapter 4 presents the results, and Chapter 5 centres on the discussion of the results.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.0 Challenging Behaviours as a Worldwide School Problem

Challenging behaviour in schools is a concern in Thailand and other countries. This is because schools are expected to be safe places for children (Nickerson & Spears, 2007). In countries such as USA, UK, and Australia, challenging behaviours are known to be increasing not only in the classroom, but also in the society at large (Kowalski, 2003). This situation makes it contingent on schools and educators to find means to address the occurrence of school aggression and violence by putting in place ready preventative and intervention strategies to minimise the incidence of challenging behaviours in the school environment (Massey et al., 2007). The issue of challenging behaviour has become part of learning at school with regards to students' defiance of school rules coupled with their incessant display of disruptive behaviours (Morris & Howard, 2003). Therefore, the issue of students' challenging behaviour has become apparently intractable for schools to deal with (Hemphill & Hargreaves, 2009).

The emerging problems that are precipitated by the occurrence of challenging behaviour in schools are undisputedly known to threaten the security and attainment of other students and also constitute a source of stress or even depression for teachers (Dunham, 1984). The idea that students' challenging behaviour has been consistently linked to teachers' reports of stress was further corroborated by Blasé (1986), Geving (2007), Yoon (2002), Wald and Losen

(2003). For example in the United States researchers such as Wald and Losen (2003) have reported that challenging behaviours are of concern to teachers and in a bid to stem the problem, many US schools put in place zero tolerance policies in the 1990s which resulted in a sharp rise in out-of-school suspensions and expulsions. This effort caused controversies on the ground of disparities in suspension and expulsion rates based on race and cases whereby students are suspended for minor infractions such as making a paper gun (American Psychological Association, 2006).

The rise in suspension is problematic because studies have indicated a higher dropout rate for students affected by suspension (Ekstom, Goertz, Pollack, & Rock, 1986). Also research indicates that schools where the principal applies zero tolerance are noted for higher rates of suspension and expulsion (Advancement Project & Civil Rights Project, 2000; Skiba & Rausch, 2006).

Likewise, in Australia, parents questioned departmental guidelines on suspension and the way schools implement them, to the extent that it led to 33 per cent increase in suspension rates in state public schools between 2005 and 2009 (Uniting Care Burnside, 2011). In a separate Australian study Hemphill et al. (2010) found that the higher rates of suspension are prevalent among children in disadvantaged communities. Consequently, frequent exclusion of student compounds their academic difficulties, reducing their engagement, and also increasing their antisocial behaviour (Hemphill et al., 2010). With this development, and that of about 42 per cent of suspension given to students with recurrent disobedience, there is clear need for more proactive approaches to facilitate appropriate behaviour and students' re-engagement. This is simply because students' level of connectedness to school has been

found to reduce behavioural problems (Loukas et al., 2010), increase wellbeing (Shochet et al., 2006) and enhance school achievement (Bond et al., 2007).

In Thailand, challenging behaviours in schools are a major concern for educational authorities (Thai Department of Education, 2008). For instance, Thailand Basic Education Commission (BEC) (2007) confirms schools tend to expel students with challenging behaviour rather than working to resolve their behaviour and that students who quit tend to get more into a cycle of socially problematic behaviour such as taking drugs or committing crimes. It was against this backdrop that BEC put in place programs to support students who are at risks of dropping out as most schools appeared to be doing nothing to help.

2.1 Effects of problem behaviour

The main reasons for concern about challenging behaviours are that these behaviours can impact on student learning and consume a lot of teacher time (Clayton, Stephenson et al., 2008; Little, 2005; Sela-Shavovitz, 2009). Challenging behaviours are also known to be sources of interference with a child's education, opportunities for participation in mainstream schools, community environment and family adjustment and satisfaction (Emerson, Moss & Kiernan, 1999; Tonge, 1999). There is also evidence to suggest that behavioural problems are linked to a number of academic and social problems (Conway, 2005) and child misbehaviour in the classroom results in decreased opportunities to learn for the individual child and their peers (Elkins & Izard, 1992).

The other effects of problem behaviour relate to teachers' ability to teach and the threat to personal safety and the safety of peers to the extent that most schools and other alternative learning avenues were hesitant to accept individuals who exhibited aggression (de Zubicaray & Clair, 1998). Teachers have also reported that students' challenging behaviour is their number one difficulty (Coates, 1989; Elan, Rose, & Gallop, 1996). Mooney et al. (2008) also state that the implications of student behaviour for learning are becoming a major concern of teachers, parents and policy makers in Australia. On their part, Masteropieri (2001) and Perkins and Leadbetter (2002) have pointed out that teachers pay particular attention to issues concerning students' aggressive behaviours.

In general, challenging behaviours lead to negative teacher attitudes and concerns about teaching and also about particular groups of students. For example, teachers' attitudes toward integration and mainstreaming of students with special needs and challenging behaviours in mainstream classrooms have been found to be less positive (Aniftos & McCluskie, 2002; Bender, O'Vail, & Scott, 1995; Center & Ward,1987; Gilmore, Cambell, & Cuskelly, 2003; Konza, 2008; Kuyini & Desai, 2007; McLeod, 2000; McNally, Cole, & Waugh, 2001). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) and Lewis (1999) make the case that aggressive student behaviour, in particular, impedes learning outcomes for students and impacts negatively on teacher efficacy and wellbeing. It has also been stated that this kind of behaviour is linked to teachers' stress (Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997). Furthermore, teachers who experience frequent student challenging behaviour consequently suffer diminishing satisfaction and are likely to give up their position that may exacerbate the poor learning outcomes and challenging behaviours (Howard & Johnson, 2002). In these stressful situations, teachers are forced to apply approaches that are ineffective and coercive (Lewis, 1997). Thus challenging behaviour influences classroom life by interrupting the learning

environment and thus reducing students' potential academic achievement and also teachers' performance (O'Hagan & Edmunds, 1982; McCormack, 1997) and constitutes a significant reason why teachers leave the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

2.2 Theories of Behaviour

The literature in this regard will be reviewed in two parts: first, will be theories and second will be research studies on problem behaviours.

2.2.1 Behaviour theory

The variables of challenging behaviour and teachers' interventions in the classroom can be explained in terms of a number of behaviour theories. Classroom behaviour management practices are aspects of teaching that require extra efforts on the part of educators, involving application of behaviour theories. They ensure teachers can achieve both their teaching and social goals as educators of their students. The theories include Applied Behaviour Analysis, Assertive Discipline, Cognitive Behaviour Theory, Humanism, Glasser's Control Theory, Neo-Adlerian theory and System theory.

Assertive discipline is a model that uses insistence to facilitate the desired behaviour from students by following certain procedures to offer corrective discipline. It involves teachers stating clear expectations, limits and consequences for students, being firm, using non-verbal gestures, and being assertive in situations of teacher–student confrontations. According to Canter and Canter (1976), teachers make clear what students need to do and follow up with actions so as to maximise levels of compliance. It also protects the rights of teachers and

students. However, it may result in psychological trauma for students because the strategy is harsh in nature with some militancy and gives no room for students to build values that are precursors for responsible behaviours (Dreikurs, 1968). In addition, Assertive discipline appears to make students feel threatened and humiliated, without teaching them what they should desist from, and no options of what they should do instead (Charles, 1989, p. 71).

On the other hand, **William Glasser's Control Theory** points out the influence of five important needs which drive people's actions. They include the need to belong, to gain power, to have freedom, to have fun, and to survive. However, students hold very little power in the classroom because they are compelled to do assignments, which may not interest them. In this regard, the students' interest can be raised by using learning teams to gain students' commitment on tasks which they rarely display in the classroom but do so in sports. More importantly, it gives teachers a sense of direction to put in place structures on which students can build with elements of power to take decisions on what direction to follow. It also helps teachers to gain an understanding of behaviour concerns with traditional schooling and how to fix them. In order words, Glasser's Control Theory means productive-team learning classrooms in which learners gain satisfaction and excitement.

Glasser asserts that every individual is social and needs the support and interest of others in a small team that is working together. For instance, students gain a sense of belonging if their team is made up of low, middle and high achievers and consequently they gain motivation. Thus, knowledge is recognised as power by which weaker students receive help and they become willing to participate because their contributions are considered to be beneficial. Therefore, they become less dependent on their teachers as they gain freedom to choose their

own path to learning which is in tandem with Glasser's emphasis on both individual and team contributions. By applying this theory, teachers are in a better position to help students evaluate their behaviour and make necessary adjustments thereby indicating a teacher's role as not to make judgments and punish students, actions which are counter-productive. In other words, teachers need to make use of positive encouragement and make clear acceptable behaviours (McInerney &McInerney, 1998, pp. 220–221).

Furthermore, **Glasser's Reality Theory** is hinged on students' need to maintain their self-worth towards achieving behavioural improvement and achievement in academics. The application of this theory involves nine steps such as confronting the student with misbehaviour, asking the student to explain the behaviour in question so as to gain an insight into the cause of the problem and emphasising the student's responsibility or repeating step 2 (asking for explanation of behaviour). This is followed by the teacher's request for the student to prepare a plan, find alternative behaviour or be restricted to a corner (isolation) in the classroom as a consequence of breaking rules until a solution is arrived at. If the behaviour continues, steps 2–5 are carried out again, the teacher works out a plan and offers support to make it work, and the student returns to class. However, if the student fails to honour his or her commitment, he/she may remain in isolation in a designated room, then steps 2, 3, 4, and 5 are repeated. The parents are notified if the student remains out of control. Glasser (1998) claims that reality theory is one of the appropriate choices for understanding reality; for successfully negotiating relations with other individuals based on an individual's capacity to fight against "the seven deadly habits of external control" and to adopt "the seven caring habits of Choice Theory" (Glasser, 1998). For example, there are over twenty "Quality Schools" that have implemented William Glasser's Choice Theory in their schools (William Glasser Institute, 2006) and it has been reported by one Superintendent who was involved

with “Quality Schools” that his school had fewer suspensions since the project began (Foderaro, 2002). Above all, some research using Glasser’s Choice Theory with students found that students’ learning and retention and overall satisfaction in class increased (Cooke, 1995; Martin, 1988).

Neo-Adlerian Theory of Alfred Adler (1870–1937) is hinged on mutual respect, cooperation and encouragement and more of a cognitive approach to behavioural management. The key principles of this theory are: teachers are to find out why a child has chosen to behave in a particular way, give them opportunity to have contributions in the decision affecting them, and allow students to responsibly relate to an individual who models the behaviour that is expected of them. Students’ misbehaviours are known to be due to students’ attention getting, power seeking, revenge seeking or display of inadequacy and can be prevented by a number of strategies (Dreikurs et al., 1982). They include teachers having a good grasp of teaching styles such as autocratic, permissive or democratic; always using encouragement instead of discouragement; putting in place reasonable consequences for rule breaking; implementing classroom discussions by using group and team approaches; and assessing other preventative strategies. On the hand, Dinkmeyer and Dinkmeyer (1989) developed a number of corrective strategies which include teachers making efforts to understand students’ motives, assisting students to replace the non-correct goal with useful ones and encouraging them to be committed to new goals, applying logical consequences to students, and instituting group discussion about class rules and problems.

For instance, according to Dreikurs, in the past, pressure could be applied to large groups but at the present time, social conditions necessitate the use of more democratic procedures

(Edwards & Watts 2008, p. 116) as students as well as groups are less likely to submit to pressure and control of others. Cornish and Garner (2008) suggest that this democratic approach shows the importance of using strategies for encouraging the positives rather than those for suppressing the negatives, because it is easier to encourage the desirable behaviour than to suppress the undesirable.

Applied behaviour Analysis and **Cognitive behaviour models** come from behaviourism, which was developed by behaviourists. Historically, behaviourism was developed by a number of behaviourists including Ivan Pavlov, Edward Thorndike, John Watson, Edward Guthrie, and Skinner (1984).

Porter (2007) outlines a range of approaches of behaviour management and school discipline and that different approaches to school discipline have different goals including order, compliance, self-discipline, emotional regulation, cooperation and integrity. She states that **Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA)** and **Cognitive behaviourism (CB)** are approaches that use positive reward to change behaviour and to sustain children's learning. For instance, when a child is given a stimulus and rewarded for giving a correct response, and as the response becomes reliable, the clues are withdrawn until he can respond independently. Therefore, according to Martin and Pear (2007) most behavioural modifications use Applied behavioural analysis introduced by Skinner. It is based on techniques requiring an understanding of the behaviour within a specific context and this is called **Functional Behaviour Assessment** (FBA). It involves making observations on Antecedents (what comes directly before the behaviour), Behaviours (what the behaviour looks like) and Consequences (what comes directly after the behaviour). ABA-based interventions are used for responding

to individuals with developmental disabilities such as Autism, while Operant conditioning techniques are very useful to address challenging behaviour of students who are poorly motivated, have high anxiety or history of failure. Behaviour, which is selected by its consequences is called operant behaviour and it applies voluntary responses. On the other hand, Respondent conditioning refers to responses in a predictable way to certain stimuli by all animals. According to Pavlov's experiment, Classical conditioning involves three steps: firstly giving a neutral stimulus, followed by a combination of neutral stimulus and unconditioned stimulus which result in unconditioned responses and, finally a conditioned stimulus is created which results in a conditioned response. Classical conditioning is linked with concepts such as extinction, spontaneous recovery, stimulus generalisation, stimulus discrimination and higher order condition (Pavlov, 1927).

Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) comes out of the ABA and CB approaches and is a model that enables schools to more effectively maintain order while including and instructing students whose behavioural issues put them at risk of exclusion (Netzel & Eber, 2003; Scoot et al., 2002, Sugai, 2003, Sugai et al., 2004).

The purpose of Positive Behaviour Support systems is to promote quality of life and minimise challenging behaviours (Carr et al., 2002). It is a three-tiered model to address the individual needs of students with specific intervention at each level, determined by the unique circumstances of the school and target student (Lane & Beebe Frankenberger, 2005). The PBS model promotes positive school environment via raising issues of behaviour immediately, sustaining appropriate behaviour, as well as students gaining life skills that can potentially decrease prevalence, reduce severity and address individual needs in a more efficient way (Burns & Hickie, 2002). According to Sugai et al. (1999), PBS is an empirically

supported intervention practice, which is based on person-centred values to raise children's capacity to manage their behaviours. It promotes an enabling environment and a better link between research-proven practices and the environment in which teaching and learning occur. It is a strategy that helps schools to effectively maintain order while including students with challenging behaviours which put them at risk of exclusion (Netzel & Eber, 2003; Scoot et al., 2002, Sugai, 2003; Sugai et al., 2004). It is a preventative and remediation strategy, which is less intensive, more cost efficient and more effective (Lane et al., 2002). It applies behavioural principles to bring about a reduction in challenging behaviours in children while building up acceptable behaviours that are socially important. The classrooms where positive behaviour support is used would tend to record improved student achievement, reduction in suspension and office discipline referral rates, dropping out of school or expulsion and fewer physical restraints (Muscott et al., 2008). In addition, benefits of using positive behaviour support include an increase in students' academic engagement, improved academic achievements and a better link between schools and families. In the end, it will facilitate the school climate to become proactive and positive.

Positive Behaviour Support refers to strategies that are individualised to a large extent, and also based on empirical facts and scientific principles that are linked to a person's values aimed at preventing challenging behaviour.

2.2.2 Research Studies about Strategies for Managing Behaviour

Teachers use different behaviour management strategies but some of them are more effective than others. The research literature shows that ineffective strategies are punishment, seclusion or detention, expulsions, time out, response cost (e.g., taking away a privilege), referrals, and

suspensions, most of which are non-evidence-based disciplinary practices. These strategies are only reactive and punitive in approach and tend to make no positive impact in the lives of the students (Horner, & Sugai, 2000). For instance, Skiba and Peterson (2000) assert that the use of severe disciplinary practices such as suspensions, loss of privileges, reprimand, and/or expulsion in controlling problem behaviour are only known in most cases to produce a negative learning environment and worsen the challenging behaviour. These strategies are carried out by providing students with information about school expectations which they are expected to follow, and making it known to them that rule violations attract strict sanctions in order to put an end to problem behaviour (Sugai, & Horner, 1999). In the end, these approaches are known to exacerbate the problem behaviour, because they are ineffective for reducing problem behaviour (Maag, 2001; Meyer, 1995; Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Townsend, 2000) and growing research evidence indicates that reprimands, detentions, punishment, seclusion and restraints are ineffective strategies for improving the behaviour in schools (Charles, 1996; Farmer, 1999; Sugai, 1996; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Williams, 1998). In addition, these strategies don't teach students skills for improving their behaviour (Maag, 2001). Consequently, students may become unwilling to learn, eventually stopping schooling, dropping out of school or experiencing school failures and increasing delinquent behaviours (Skiba & Peterson, 1999; 2000; Townsend, 2000).

On the other hand, seclusion and physical restraint are reactive procedures and intrusive means of handling children with challenging behaviours. They are commonly used when teachers do not know what else to do (Glen, Cheryl, & Lise, 2011). Seclusion is an involuntary confinement of a child alone in an isolated area, while physical restraint is the use of force such as holding a child, or use of tranquillisers to immobilise a child, which could lead to a perpetual negative effect on both student and teachers. In addition, these disciplinary

strategies are intimately associated with a number of drawbacks which include an increasing amount of abuse, physical and emotional imbalance to children.

Furthermore, research findings indicate a number of ineffective strategies which include use of corporal punishment (Doyle, 1989; Landau & Gathercoal, 2000); excessive punishment (Cotton, 2001; Skiba & Peterson, 2000); vague rules (Cotton, 2001; Landau & Gathercoal, 2000); teachers ignoring misconduct (Cotton, 2001; Rademacher, Callahan, & Pederson-Seelye, 1998); inconsistent responses to misbehaviour (Gottfredson, 1989; Rademacher et. al., 1998); and excessive use of suspensions and expulsions (Cotton, 2001; Maag, 2001).

These concerns about challenging behaviour have pushed researchers to investigate teachers' management strategies and perceived control in the classroom (Lewis, 1999; Malone, Bonitz, & Rickett, 1998; Martin et al., 1999; Stephenson et al., 2000). It is suggested that for learning to efficiently occur, barriers should be removed and preventative measures such as social skill training and positive behaviour support strategies should be consistently implemented for individual students (George, Harrower, & Knoster, 2003; Graves & Arbor, 2002).This will assist teachers to manage their classroom proceedings more effectively and allocate as much as possible of classroom time and effort to teaching and learning activities (Victor, 2005).

The use of proactive behaviour management strategies has been found to be effective and constitute practical efforts by educators to prevent misbehaviour (Cameron, 2006; Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). Likewise, according to research (Herrera & Little, 2005; Wheldall et al., 1989; Wilks, 1996, cited in Clunies-Ross et al., 2008) classroom behaviour management is most effective when proactive strategies are employed. It has also been shown in practice that

interventions that are least intrusive and restrictive seem to be more effective at controlling students′ challenging behaviours.

Research such as Blatchford et al. (2009), Evans et al. (2003), Wannarka & Ruhl (2008), and Ofsted (2005) has found that students′ challenging behaviour could be improved significantly by using a number of proactive behaviour modifications which include shaping, self-monitoring, positive programming, praise and approval, token economy and modelling, offering rewards and sanctions. The use of proactive measures of this kind and associated behaviour modification programs constitute practical efforts by educators to prevent misbehaviour (Cameron, 2006; Clunies-Ross et al., 2008). For instance, it was inappropriate to use a token economy in modifying assignment non-completion behaviour of students if verbal praise was more likely to bring about an increased rate of assignment completion (Cangelosi, 1988). Thus, praising desired behaviour in conjunction with a reward system was most often used among a number of behaviour management strategies available to teachers as indicated in the result of the 2012 NFER survey in England (NFER, 2012). For example, a 2012 NFER survey claims that primary school teachers use proactive strategies more than reactive ones with (91 per cent of respondents), often praise desired behaviour, having a system to follow through with sanctions (85 per cent), and use a reward system (82%). On the other hand, a number of strategies that were never used included detention of pupil after school (60% of teachers), sending misbehaving pupils to the head teacher or senior staff (32%) (NFER, 2012).

Research has also found that some behaviour management strategies, such as Positive Behaviour Support (PBS), are effective (Harris et al., 1996). For instance, in the UK,

Department of Education recommends schools promote positive pupil behaviour by developing curriculum for individual pupils, teaching self-regulatory techniques, using mentoring and peer support, and enhancing intrinsic motivation. These efforts are aimed at providing an orderly atmosphere without which effective teaching and learning cannot be facilitated (Department for Education, 1994a). Despite this finding the most frequently used strategy in the UK for some time was Assertive Discipline (Canter & Canter, 1992, 1993). Other strategies that are recommended for teachers and found to work include the use of a reward being given for good behaviour so as to reinforce it (Zabel, 1986).

Time-out has also been found to work effectively in a number of settings such as homes (Hawkins, Peterson, Schweid, & Bijou, 1996) and psychiatric hospitals (Bowers et al., 2010). But some researchers perceive time-out as a negative reinforcement resulting in the good behaviour being reinforced on account of removal of attention; while others view time-out as negative punishment because the bad behaviour is unlikely to be repeated due to the removal of attention (Sterling-Turner & Watson, 1999). In a bid to address children's challenging behaviour by using a time-out approach, it is commonplace to see educators applying either non-exclusionary time-out such as planned ignoring or time-out ribbon or the exclusionary type which includes contingent observation, exclusion or seclusion. Seclusion time-out is a type of behaviour management procedure that aims to punish a child by forestalling the child's access to receiving reinforcement for a specified period of time (Wolfgang, 2001). In addition, it involves placing a child in a specially constructed room which is situated in an isolated area with locks (Maag, 2004). This procedure has been a source of concern among stakeholders in education for being highly restrictive, intrusive and usually accompanied by abuses (Miltenberger, 2004; Wolery et al., 1988). It has been noted that teachers commonly use this approach in a situation of verbal and physical aggression, and destruction of property

(Alberto & Troutman, 2003; Wolfgang, 2003). However, some researchers caution against the use of seclusion time-out on the grounds that the approach does not foster a new skill or show behaviour patterns that the child can follow. For example, Alberto and Troutman (2003) argue that schools should put in place an arrangement that symbolises the duty of care in choosing a particular room for seclusion time-out. In addition, such a room should meet certain requirements which include adequate room size that is not less than 36 square feet, adequately ventilated, well lighted and cushioned, and also free of objects and other items that children can use to cause self-injury (Wolfgang, 2003). In view of the sensitive nature of seclusion time-out and the need to follow some strict guidelines in using it, it has become important for education staff that may likely use seclusion time-out to receive appropriate in-service training (Rock, 2000). As a result of training, many teachers chose to apply diligent practices to spend much of their time in encouraging responsible behaviour in children rather than responding to irresponsible behaviour (Beaman & Wheldall, 2000; Walker, Ramsey, & Gresham, 2004).

Furthermore, a number of research studies reveal the positive impact of teachers' use of contingent, behaviour-specific praise to manage students' challenging behaviour, eliciting an increase in students' academic engagement and minimising disruptive behaviour (Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Moore et al., 2010). In similar vein, Cameron, Banko, and Pierce (2001) argue that a child's intrinsic motivation tends to increase on account of teachers' use of positive reinforcement, and issues that children only sustain their intrinsic motivation when offered extrinsic reinforcement are unjustified (Akin-Little, Eckert, & Lovett, 2004). In addition, educators have also reported the use of token systems to manage a wide range of students' academic and problem behaviours (Christensen, Young, & Marchant, 2004) as well as self-management skills (Self-Brown & Matthews, 2003). The use of contingencies of this kind to

address students' challenging behaviour has been reported to bring about a significant reduction in disruptive behaviour, yielding a positive academic outcome and improvement in students' social behaviours (Lo & Cartledge, 2004). Nonetheless, the use of contingencies in managing disruptive behaviour by teachers increases positive verbal interactions and decreases negative verbal interactions (Hansen & Lignugaris-Kraft, 2005), decreases transition time, and increases achievements as well as appropriate classroom behaviour and peer social acceptance (Yarborough, Skinner, Lee, & Lemmons, 2004). Therefore, the use of a number of proactive behaviour management strategies to address students' challenging behaviour by teachers has become imperative given the shift by schools in recent times from reactive approaches to proactive ones (Lane, Wehby, Robertson, & Rogers, 2007). Hence, the choice of proactive measures to manage students' challenging behaviour in this way seems to be helpful in reducing the staggering drop-out rates in schools especially in the United States (Dynarski et al., 2008).

2.3 The Role and Effects of Rewards in the Management of Challenging Behaviour

A variety of rewards and punishments is known to constitute peculiar features of common classroom management strategies used by teachers. According to Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999) and Kohn (1993) there has been an increasing level of concern about the damaging effect these rewards and punishments have on students in an attempt to get them to perform academic tasks. However, the use of rewards to contain children usually results in a deep cut in their intrinsic motivation which dwindles in the absence of distribution of rewards to them. Likewise, teachers' use of punishments typically brings about an immediate change in

student behaviour thus reinforcing reprimand in a negative term (Maag, 2001). In spite of this, many schools across the US still apply these strategies to control students' challenging behaviour and at the same time raise their level of motivation.

A study by Banko, Cameron, and Pierce (2001) also claims that the disbursement of rewards and punishments to students is even more beneficial in increasing students' academic achievements and less damaging. The study went further to examine the effect of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation of students on their anticipation for a reward for task completion and it indicates an increased level of motivation of students as a result of rewards (Banko, Cameron, Pierce, and So, 2003). Kohn (1993) asserts that all rewards are not mainly intended to influence or persuade, or find solutions to some problems, but essentially to control (p. 27). However, Kohn continued, "Rewards can somehow change the way we act to suit the way someone wants us to act and consequently change the way we engage in a given behavior" (p. 62). Moreover, Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999) argued that performance-contingent rewards by estimation may result in a decrease in intrinsic motivation which is likely to cause permanent damage. For instance, research evidence has shown that rewards and punishments applied to primary-school students may bring about an increase in their motivation and academic achievements (Cameron & Pierce, 1994). The extent of compliance could be short-lived with such external stimuli with diminished intrinsic motivation for students to normally carry out academic work over a long period of time (p. 562).

Furthermore, the use of rewards such as an offer of prizes and money is commonly used at home and in schools in an attempt to encourage desired behaviour in children. Several studies

revealed the effects rewards had on intrinsic motivation, such as through an offer of monetary rewards (Deci, 1971), good-player awards (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973) or prizes (Harackiewicz, 1979) to children for taking part in a given activity, but in the end, they were unable to sustain their interest in it after the reward had been withdrawn. Likewise, it also applies to a situation whereby people carried out an activity in order to escape a negative consequence (Deci & Cascio, 1972). Thus, it implies that rewards may succeed in controlling the behaviours when they are current (Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983) and subsequently tend to diminish their intrinsic motivation for interesting tasks while making them internalise regulations for uninteresting tasks (Deci, et al., 1991). This situation suggests that the use of an external contingency brings about a dwindling sense of authority.

Furthermore, a number of research studies revealed that teachers' use of contingent, behaviour-specific praise has proved to elicit an increase in students' academic engagement, minimising students' disruptive behaviour and improving students' social behaviours (Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Lo & Cartledge, 2004; Moore et al., 2010). In the same vein, Cameron, Banko, and Pierce (2001) argue that a child's intrinsic motivation tends to increase on account of a teachers' use of positive reinforcement, and claims that children only sustain their intrinsic motivation when offered extrinsic reinforcement are unjustified (Akin-Little, Eckert, & Lovett, 2004). Nonetheless, the use of contingencies in managing disruptive behaviour by teachers has increased positive verbal interactions and decreased negative verbal interactions (Hansen & Lignugaris-Kraft, 2005), decreased transition time, increased achievements as well as appropriate classroom behaviour and peer social acceptance (Yarborough, Skinner, Lee, & Lemmons, 2004). Therefore, the use of a number of proactive behaviour management strategies to address students' challenging behaviour by teachers has become imperative

given the shift by schools in recent times from reactive approaches to proactive ones (Lane, Wehby, Robertson, & Rogers, 2007). Hence, the choice of proactive measures to manage students' challenging behaviour in this way seems to be helpful for teachers in controlling students' challenging behaviours.

On the other hand, a large number of teachers are aware that aversive approaches such as punishment and threats were unproductive in classroom settings as they, in most cases, expose students to pain and do not bring about a sustainable compliance. They rather make students defiant and show a desire for revenge. As a result, many educators turn to the use of rewards. For example, typical routine practices of use of rewards in many schools in the USA to promote students' good behaviour include use of stickers and stars, As and praise, awards and privileges (Fantuzzo et al., 1991). On the other hand, Deci and Ryan (1985) likened the use of rewards to "control through seduction" and whether it involves threatening or bribing the children simply translates to not being assisted by working with them. Hence, it has been pointed out that educators should try as much as possible to avoid classroom approaches that only rely on rewards and punishments, if they really want students to learn responsibility for their own actions. In essence, educators should help them to create a caring community that allows working together with them cooperatively and give them opportunity to determine what kind of classroom settings they want (Devries & Zan, 1994; Solomon, et al., 1992).

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Design of study

The design of this study was a survey design involving the use of questionnaires. This fits within the positivist or quantitative research paradigm. Quantitative research as opposed to qualitative methodology involves research where data gathering, analysis and interpretation focus on the use of numerical information. It is characterised by the use of large samples, standardised measures and a deductive approach (Babbie, 2007). In the positivist/quantitative tradition, research is characterised by developing and implementing data-collection instruments, explaining facts, testing hypotheses and using statistical analysis (Liamputtong, 2010). It assumes that results can be generalised and as such, research is undertaken in a way that can be duplicated by others (Liamputtong 2010). The major strength of quantitative research is that it allows the researcher to study responses from large populations. However, its main weakness is that it is not able to explore phenomena in detail (Cohen & Manion, 1995). The different data-gathering methods in quantitative methodology include observations and surveys, which allow researchers to use observation checklists and questionnaires to collect relevant data.

Survey, which is chosen for this study, can be described as a means of collecting data on phenomena that cannot be observed directly. In other words, surveys can be used to collect information from a selected group of respondents by using standardised questionnaires or interviews to ensure they are provided with the same stimulus (Scheuren, 2004). Surveys can take a number of formats, which include face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, group

administered survey, paper or online questionnaires. Also there are different types of survey designs, which include cross-sectional surveys and longitudinal surveys. A cross-section survey involves collection of data from a population at a particular point in time. On the other hand, longitudinal survey is a method that is used to collect data from a population over a period of time with added opportunity to analyse and describe variations across the population.

In using surveys, there are some basic procedures that are required to be followed by researchers, which include the need to determine the purpose of the survey, how to use the results, making a decision on the respondents to be surveyed, how to obtain a sample of the population, and also to make decisions about the appropriate survey for the study (Umbach, 2005). In addition, due consideration is also required to be given to issues of accessibility, literacy, language, response rates, content, bias, questions, and sampling. In surveys, sampling frames are used to locate the survey population and to gain better coverage of the respondents. Other aspects of survey frames include identification data such as names, unique ID, and address, contact data (for example, mailing address and telephone number) and classification data such as province or occupational classification (Statistics Canada, 1998).

3.2 Advantages of Survey Methods

Survey is one of the numerous methods that researchers can use to carry out research. One of the strengths of a survey is that it is a valuable instrument for an investigation involving a large number of people and can be used to determine the statistical significance of the results

as compared to other data-gathering methods. In addition, surveys can be used to collect data that represent to a very high degree the characteristics of the larger population that was investigated (Dillman, 2000). Another advantage is that surveys involve a very minimal cost to implement therefore they are very convenient for researchers to use. They can be administered to collect data from participants anywhere, including by online surveys. However, some survey methods such as focus groups and personal interviews might be relatively expensive.

3.3 Disadvantages of Surveys

On the other hand, the survey method has its own drawbacks which are not sufficient to override the strengths of the method. One of the weaknesses of a survey is its inflexibility. For example, once the survey questions are designed and the data-collection process has begun, the design becomes unchangeable throughout the process even if there is a need for some changes. Apart from this demerit, a survey is not a suitable method to gather data on issues that are controversial as the participants might be reluctant to give the precise answer to the questions (Statistics Canada, 1998). Thus, the truth surrounding such an issue might only be revealed when gathering data through methods such as face-to-face interviews and focus groups. Survey method uses questions that are generally standardised in an attempt to cater for all the participants as much as possible (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). However, questions of this kind might be deficient in some ways to the extent that they may become inappropriate for some of the respondents. Surveys can be carried out by using several tools which include interviews, group-administered survey, and questionnaires.

3.4 Questionnaires

Based on the highlighted strengths of the instrument, questionnaire is just one of the survey tools chosen to collect data in this study. Questionnaire is one of the survey methods used for collecting information from a target population through responses to a set of standardised questions about the investigation. It comprises a set of sequentially presented structured questions designed to gather data on a particular subject from research participants. The information gathered through a questionnaire can be a combination of numerical (quantifiable) and text (which can be reduced to numbers or themes). The questionnaires can be used to collect in a fast and easy way a huge amount of information such as about people's level of knowledge, attitude, personalities, beliefs or preferences. Therefore questionnaires serve as a means of providing the same stimulus to the entire population of participants by presenting them with questions in the same words in order to achieve greater statistical precision (Groves et al., 2004). The presentation of questions in questionnaires assumes a format that encompasses a unique sequencing of questions in a logical order to allow a smooth transition, wording to enhance respondents' understanding of the purpose of the research, such that the questionnaire length and output ensure reliability, validity and participant engagement (Sarantakos, 2005). These characteristics make questionnaires a functional tool for generating a data set that meets the research objectives (Bulmer, 2004; Creswell, 2003; de Vaus, 2002; McGuirk & O'Neill, 2005; Oppenheim, 1992; Parfitt, 2005; Patton, 1990; Sarantakos, 2005).

The composition of the questions may include open questions, closed questions, ranking questions, or scaled questions. Open questions are where response categories are not provided

to the respondents, but they are free to express themselves (Abramson & Abramson, 1999). On the other hand, closed questions are those where response categories are listed such that respondents are restricted to a set of predetermined responses. Therefore the researcher needs to determine what type of question–response format to use such as closed-ended or open-ended questions or a combination of both to allow for variation (Hoeplf, 1997). With closed questions, the responses will be rating scales and the result types are precise, such as yes/no or Likert scale.

3.5 Advantages of Questionnaire

Firstly, questionnaires can ensure research participants' anonymity by foreclosing any unwarranted disclosure of a participant's identity. This encourages participants to feel free to participate in the investigation and make disclosures that are of great importance to the study. Therefore the research subjects would be willing to give their consent in the knowledge that they are free to withdraw their participation at any time in the course of the investigation. Unlike other methods, questionnaires are an inexpensive way to collect an enormous data set from large numbers of people anywhere, without any need for additional resources (Statistics Canada, 1997). The data gathered through questionnaires provide strong bases for the significance of the measure and the analyses can be run by using a number of statistical packages with ease and within a short time. Results can be presented in a variety of ways such as percentages, bar-chart, pie-chart, histogram, cumulative frequency curve and so on to enhance clarity of information and readability of the analysis and results.

Furthermore, a questionnaire is generally reliable to carry out scientific research as it offers all the participants a standardised stimulus. In the end, the results obtained are generally of high reliability as the researcher's biases are reduced to nothing. With careful design, moreover, the results obtained are usually of high precision in terms of measuring what the questionnaire was designed to measure. This is because the questionnaire is scrutinised and standardised before being presented to the respondents. With large sample sizes, various statistical tests can be carried out to ensure the construct validity of the questionnaire. Therefore, there is little or no researcher's subjectivity that is likely to impact on the results. Questionnaires have proved to be a great means of data collection simply because they help to gather information from a large number of participants which translates to a high representativeness. In addition, low costs, a convenient means of data collection with resultant good statistical significance, little or no observer subjectivity and the fact that the survey method is characterised with precise results are reasons that informed the choice of survey to collect data for this research study (Thomas, 2007).

More importantly, questionnaires are less intrusive by respecting respondents' privacy and with no pressure on the participants as compared to telephone or face-to-face surveys, as respondents have time to complete the questionnaire in the absence of the researcher. Therefore the participant can choose the most convenient time to complete the questionnaire and return it to the researcher by post by using a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Also the absence of the researcher when the questionnaire is being completed protects respondents' responses from possible verbal and visual influences by the researcher. Questionnaires can be designed to maximise the accuracy of the data and the response rates, which is vital to the representativeness of the information collected. Questionnaires usually comprise a variety of questions such as open-ended and close-ended with ordered and unordered responses or

choices, partially close-ended questions, Yes/No, ranking, checklist, Likert-style scale, differential scales, choice of categories, short answer, or one or multiple response pick list which makes the whole exercise less boring and respondents are given the opportunity to express themselves more freely in a variety of ways (Leung, 2001). Therefore, it is used to capture a representative picture of a large population by selection of research subjects for an investigation with added advantages such as versatility, efficiency, reduction of bias, application of computer software packages such as SPSS to tabulate the results, carry out *t*-tests, Chi-square and generalise the outcome. On the other hand, this instrument has some drawbacks which are stated below.

3.6 Disadvantages of Questionnaire

One of the disadvantages of questionnaires is exposure of participants' responses to bias resulting from the wording of questions and different classes of participants. These factors may affect the results as well as diminish participants' interest. This survey method requires involvement of proper sampling, as well as time and funds/resources for sampling the large population of participants without which the validity of the result is affected because of effects of sampling errors, coverage errors, measurement error and non-response errors. As well, questionnaires are grossly deficient in rich data because they use structured questions instead of direct observation. Therefore the richness of the information is lost and this may affect the validity and reliability of the results.

For instance, sampling error may result owing to surveying not covering the whole population, which affects the precision of the measure. Likewise, sampling of non-members

can also result in coverage errors when the lists from which the participants were drawn did not include all the elements of the population. Measurement errors in questionnaires may result due to deficiencies from the questionnaire when respondents gave their responses. For example, a respondent's answers might be least comparable to other respondents, or incorrect and ambiguous responses might result due to badly worded questions and a shabbily constructed questionnaire (Abramson & Abramson, 1999; Fowler, 2002). Non-response errors also occur when responses are given by non-sampled respondents as well as when a large number of sampled people do not respond but responses are given by those who have completely different characteristics from the sampled individuals.

3. 7 The Reason for the Chosen Instrument

In this study, preference was given to the use of questionnaires over other tools of research such as face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews, for the following reasons.

The first reason for using a questionnaire was that it can be used to collect data from a large number of people in a short time. In this study, the researcher wanted to gather data from many teachers in a short time, therefore questionnaires were more useful than interviews which take a long time for the same purpose. Secondly, the use of questionnaires is less expensive in terms of money and time required to administer. Therefore this method was chosen to make it possible for me to spend less money and also save time on the data collected. Likewise, the data collected can be quickly analysed and the results are generated more quickly and simplify the remaining aspect of this research with a significant reduction

in time required to publish the research paper. These advantages were helpful in this study to gain rich information that is crucial for capturing the real episodes of a continuum of behavioural management strategies that are used by teachers to address students' challenging behaviour in Thailand.

3.8 Participants

A sample of 50 teachers from 10 schools — seven primary schools and three special needs schools — was purposively selected to participate in this study. The selected schools were public and private, urban and rural. The participants also included teachers from three special needs schools and centres where they specialise in managing challenging behaviours of students with special needs who are notably demonstrating challenging behaviours. The rationale behind the inclusion of special needs schools in this study was to obtain a rich data set from teachers who focus mainly on managing special needs students with problem behaviours. The participants were of varying backgrounds in terms of gender and academic qualifications such as teacher's college qualification, Bachelor degree, Master or PhD qualifications as well as years of experience.

3.9 Sample and sampling procedures

3.9.1 Sample

In this research study, it was initially anticipated that a sample population of 100 teachers would be selected. However, my experience at the respective research sites indicated that this

number of participants could not be achieved because in some schools the potential participants who met the criteria for selection numbered less than six. Therefore, a decision was taken to recruit an average of five participants from each school. The teachers included those who had been working directly with students identified as having special needs and had been managing students with special needs in the schools that were investigated. The sample was made up of professional teachers who had been handling students with challenging behaviours for at least one year and those who don't have such responsibilities.

3.9.2 Sampling procedures

Selection of Schools: Purposive sampling was used to select three special needs schools while the remaining seven mainstream schools were selected randomly across Thailand by using the list of schools given by the Thai Ministry of Education. The procedures or steps used in the selection of the schools that were investigated in this study are presented below.

The sampling procedures included:

1. The list of schools was collected from Thailand Ministry of Education.
2. The name of each school was stated on an index card.
3. The cards were thoroughly shuffled.
4. A card was drawn blindly from a large box, one at a time.
5. The selected schools were noted up to a total of 10 schools.

A total of 10 schools was invited, three of which (special needs schools or centres) were selected through purposive sampling, and the rest were selected through random sampling. Two of the schools approached did not take part in the study. The researcher had to conduct

another round of sampling to select two more schools in order to keep the number of participating schools at 10.

Selection of Teachers: Teachers were randomly selected from the staff lists given by the school's administration in each of the ten schools that were investigated. The respondents were required to fill out the questionnaires that were sent to their schools.

Sampling was considered necessary in this study for the following reasons. The length of time required to gather data from the large target population made it appropriate to consider a small group. This step is also known to enhance the validity of conclusions made from a sample of a large respondent population. It also promoted equal chances of selection of every member of the target population without excluding any of the respondents.

The teachers selected must have been teaching in the school for at least one year as a benchmark among other selection criteria. In addition, the school principal and Special Need Aides who had been familiar with the cases of students with challenging behaviour and had gathered records of the students' problem behaviours were also included in this study to obtain additional information.

3.10 Instrument of the study

The instrument used in this study is a 4-part questionnaire that consisted of:

1. Teacher background questionnaire (section A)
2. Teacher concerns about behaviour (Section B)
3. Teacher behaviour management strategies questionnaire (Section C)
4. Teachers' perception of effectiveness of strategies questionnaire (Section D)
5. Teachers' perception of difficulty managing behaviours (Section E)

Section A of the instrument required respondents to tick an appropriate box for their gender; age; levels of educational qualification such as secondary, teachers college, bachelor degree or postgraduate; number of students in class; and years of teaching experience.

Section B consisted of 19 items of the different behaviours displayed by students in classrooms identified in the literature, framed as behaviours of concern. First, respondents were required indicate "Yes" or "No" as to whether they considered each behaviour a concern. Then they were asked to rate each behaviour as follows: Not Concerned (1), Little Concerned (2), Moderately Concerned (3), Highly Concerned (4).

Section C required respondents to indicate the frequency of use in their classrooms of a range of behaviour management strategies identified in the literature. They were asked to rate their use of each strategy as follows: Not at All = 1, Sometimes = 2, and All the Time = 3.

Section D was about teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the behaviour management strategies identified in the literature, which were listed in Section C of the study Questionnaire. The participants were required to rate the effectiveness of their strategies in managing the challenging behaviour as follows: Not at all Effective (1), Moderately Effective (2), Effective (3), and Highly Effective (4).

The Fifth Section (Section E) was about teachers' perceptions of the difficulty in managing particular behaviours. To do this, respondents were required to rate their perceived level of difficulty in managing all 19 items of problematic behaviours identified in the literature as existing in classrooms and which were listed in Section B of the study Questionnaire. Participants rated their perceptions of difficulty in managing these behaviours as Not Difficult = 1, Least Difficult = 2, Moderately Difficult = 3, Most Difficult =4.

3.11 Data-collection process

The data-collection process commenced shortly after the research proposal was approved by the UNE Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) (Approval number: HE12-232; Appendix 7). The next step that was taken towards the commencement of data collection was

the letter of introduction from the University of New England (see Appendix 4) to the Thai Ministry of Education to obtain permission to collect research data from schools in Bangkok and Samutprakarn.

Following this step, permission was given by The Thai Ministry of Education for selection of schools to collect data (see Appendices 5 and 6). Firstly, a pilot study was conducted in two schools to test the questionnaires. The schools were one International school and one Institute for Special Needs students in Bangkok. Some questionnaire items were re-worded for clarity before the instrument was used in final data collection**.** For the actual data collection in the 10 schools, letters from the UNE Ethics Committee, consent forms together with letter of permission from the Thai Ministry of Education were sent out to the schools. The researcher held discussions about the study with the selected schools' administration and teachers. Subsequently, questionnaires were handed to each teacher and a date was chosen for return of the completed questionnaires. The questionnaires were packaged in an envelope with a self-addressed stamped envelope for participants to return the completed questionnaires. The questionnaire package for each participant contained information sheet (Appendix 2), consent form (Appendix 3), invitation letters bearing UNE letterhead (Appendix 7), and the questionnaire (Appendix 1). The information in the letter included the statement of the research topic, purpose and other relevant details. In addition, the participants were informed that they will not be identified by names in the final research publication, their participation is voluntary and they are free to withdraw their consent at any time. The research subjects were also informed during the debriefing session that the information given will be treated strictly confidentially by assigning a special code to each participant's name to maintain anonymity. They were also informed that the study would require them to complete questionnaires given to them in hard copy. The selected teachers met the criteria such as having been teaching in

the school for at least one year, and having experience in handling students with challenging behaviours in their classrooms.

A line of communication was opened between the researcher and the participants in order to attend to them should they have any questions in the course of administering the questionnaires. The researcher allowed sufficient time to ensure full return of the completed questionnaires from the schools. The researcher visited the schools a number of times to collect the returned questionnaires.

3.12 Data Analysis

This section presents the procedures used to analyse the data.

The Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) Software was used to analyse the data. At the initial stage the researcher carried out an internal consistency reliability test specifically by employing the Cronbach Alpha test. The outcomes of the test indicated the alpha values were found to be within the agreed range of 0.5 to 0.9 (Cooksey, 2007).

The reliability analysis for the subscales “Level of concern about behaviour” and “Behaviour management strategies” showed Alpha values of 0.88 and 0.85 respectively. These values, according to Cooksey (2007) and Devries (1996), are acceptable for research. The data were therefore used for further analysis.

The data analysis for each of the research questions was carried out using a number of statistical procedures, including Analysis of variance (ANOVA), Descriptive statistics, and *t*-test.

For research question 1, Descriptive statistics were calculated to describe the problem behaviours that are of concern to teachers.

For research question 2, Descriptive statistics were used to describe behavioural strategies that are used by teachers in Thailand to address the challenging behaviours.

For research question 3, Descriptive statistics were used to describe teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the strategies that are used to manage challenging behaviours.

For research question 4, Descriptive statistics were used to describe the level of difficulty of managing the challenging behaviours.

For research question 5, a series of *t*-tests and One-way between-groups ANOVA were calculated for each background variable (as independent variables) and each of the measures of concerns about behaviour, strategies used to manage behaviour, effectiveness of practices and difficulty managing behaviour (as dependent variables). The use of *t*-tests and One-way between-groups ANOVA procedures was deemed appropriate because the analysis for each of the variables was carried out individually rather than simultaneously (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

This chapter has discussed the research methodology employed in this study as well as the data from the investigation. The next chapter presents the results of the study.

Chapter 4

Results

4.0 Introduction

This chapter provides key details of the findings of the exploration of the behaviour management strategies used by teachers in Thailand schools. The results of the study are presented in line with the research questions as outlined in the research questions section in Chapter 1. The following topics are covered in this chapter:

1. Behaviours of students that are of most concern to teachers
2. Level of concern for challenging behaviours
3. Behaviour management strategies used by teachers
4. Teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of behaviour management strategies
5. Level of difficulty in managing behaviours of concern by teachers
6. Relationships between teachers background variables and their degree of concern about challenging behaviours, strategies used, perceived effectiveness and difficulties managing behaviours.

4.1 Research question 1: What problem behaviours of students are of most concern to teachers in Thailand schools?

To answer this question Descriptive statistics were calculated for each behaviour item. High percentage of positive responses indicates that a particular behaviour was of concern and low percentage indicates low concern (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Proportion of teachers indicating concern over particular behaviours

Behaviour Concern Type	Frequency/Percentage
Inattention	Yes (*n* = 26, 52%) No (*n* = 24, 48%)
Physical aggression	Yes (*n* = 20, 40%) No (*n* = 30, 60%)
Non compliance	Yes (*n* = 19, 38%) No (*n* = 31, 62%)
Off-task	Yes (*n* = 18, 36%) No (*n* = 32, 64%)
Hyperactivity	Yes (*n* = 16, 32%) No (*n* = 34, 68%)
Out of seat	Yes (*n* = 14, 28%) No (*n* = 36, 72%)
Talking out	Yes (*n* = 12, 24%) No (*n* = 38, 76%)
Verbal aggression	Yes (*n* =12, 24%) No (*n* = 38, 76%)
Disruptive	Yes (*n* = 12, 24%) No (*n* = 38, 76%)
Argues	Yes (*n* = 12, 24%) No (*n* = 38, 76%)
Defies Teacher	Yes (*n* = 12, 24%) No (*n* = 38, 76%)
Extreme shyness	Yes (*n* = 11, 22%) No (*n* = 39, 78%)
Attention seeking	Yes (*n* = 10, 20%) No (*n* = 40, 80%)
Withdrawal	Yes (*n* = 10, 20%) No (*n* = 40, 80%)
Forces submission of others	Yes (*n* = 10, 20%) No (*n* = 40, 80%)
Self-injury	Yes (*n* = 9, 18%) No (*n* = 41, 82%)
Disrespects teachers	Yes (*n* = 8, 16%) No (*n* = 42, 84%)

The descriptive analysis (Table 4.1) shows teachers' responses ranked from the items with the highest "Yes" responses at the top to those with the lowest "Yes" responses at the bottom. The table indicates that student behaviours with a high percentage of "Yes" responses are Inattention (52%), Physical aggression (40%), Non-compliance (38%), and Off-task (36%). On the other hand, behaviours of moderate "Yes" are Hyperactivity (32%), Out of seat (28%), and Disruptive (24%). According to the analysis, the behaviours with a low percentage of "Yes" responses are Disrespect teachers (16%) and Self-injury (18%).

4.2 Level of Concern about Behaviour

Teachers were asked to rate the level of concern they have for specific behaviours, from Not concerned (1), Little concerned (2), Moderately concerned (3), Highly concerned (4). The analysis in Table 4.2a shows that the behaviours with the highest mean scores are Self-injury (M=2.8), Physical Aggression (M=2.6), Disruption and Intrusion (M=2.5). These mean scores are within moderate level of concern on a 4-point Scale. The rest of the items in the table have mean scores ranging from 2.4 to 1.8, indicating that they are of little concern. Since all of the behaviours have mean scores above 1.5, it implies that each behaviour is considered by teachers to be of some concern. Table 4.2b also shows the percentage of responses for each item.

Table 4.2a: Mean level of concern about behaviours

Level of Concern	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-injury	2.8	1.2
Physical aggression	2.6	1.2
Disruption & Intrusion	2.5	1.1
Off-task	2.4	1.0
Antisocial	2.3	1.2
Inattention	2.3	1.0
Task non-completion	2.3	1.0
Non Compliance	2.3	.9
Forced Submission	2.2	1.0
Oppositional behaviour	2.2	1.0
Argues	2.2	1.0
Hyperactivity	2.2	1.0
Withdrawn	2.0	.9
Out of Seat	2.0	.9
Verbal aggression	2.0	1.1
Extreme Shyness	1.9	.9
Disrespect	1.9	1.1
Talking out	1.8	.9
Attention Seeking	1.8	.9

Table 4.2b: Teachers' levels of concern about behaviour: Frequencies and percentages

Behaviour	Not Concerned (N, %)	Little Concerned (N, %)	Moderately Concerned (N, %)	Highly Concerned (N, %)
Verbal Aggression	11 (22%)	16, (32%)	20, (40%)	4, (8%)
Physical aggression	6, (13%)	8, (17%)	19, (41%)	13, (28%)
Non Compliance	5, (11%)	20, (43%)	19, (40%)	3, (6%)
Oppositional Behaviour	11, (23%)	16, (33%)	18, (38%)	3, (6%)
Task non-completion	5, (11%)	17, (37%)	20, (43%)	4, (9%)
Inattention	9, (18%)	19, (39%)	16, (33%)	5, (10%)
Disrespect/Defies	5, (11%)	13, (28%)	20, (43%)	9, (19%)
Out of Seat	15, (31%)	20, (41%)	12, (24%)	2, (4%)
Talk out	15, (31%)	25, (52%)	6, (13%)	2, (4%)
Off task	4, (9%)	18, (38%)	20, (43%)	5, (11%)
Self-injury	6, (13%)	9, (19%)	15, (31%)	18, (38%)
Disrespect Teacher	15, (33%)	16, (35%)	12, (26%)	3, (7%)
Antisocial Behaviour	9, (19%)	10, (22%)	20, (43%)	7, (15%)
Hyperactivity	15, (30%)	17, (34%)	13, (26%)	5, (10%)
Attention seeking	17, (35%)	21, (44%)	9, (19%)	1, (2%)
Withdrawal	13, (27%)	22, (45%)	11, (22%)	3, (6%)
Forced submission	7, (15%)	17, (36%)	21, (45%)	2, (4%)
Extreme shyness	15, (31%)	18, (38%)	14, (29%)	1, (2%)
Argues	9, (19.5%)	13, (28%)	22, (47.8%)	2, (4.3%)

4.3 Research question 2: What behaviour management strategies are used by teachers to address challenging behaviours?

To answer the second research question, teachers were asked to rate the use of the different strategies from 1 to 3, with 1 representing Not At All, 2 representing Sometimes and 3 representing All the Time. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each of the behaviour strategies used by teachers. High mean scores indicate that the strategy is often used and low scores indicate that the behaviour strategy is not often used.

According to Table 4.3 the following behaviour management strategies used by teachers had relatively high mean scores: Praise (M=2.32), Counselling (M=2.22), Warning (M=2.20) Thumbs-up and High-five (M=2.18), Use of stickers (M=2.1), Correction (M=2.08) and Shape Behaviour (M=2.04).

Table 4.3 also shows that up to 13 behaviour strategies including Instructional approach (M=188), Behavioural rehearsal (M=1.82), Check-in-Check-out (M=1.73) and Pre-correction (M=1.72) had mean scores of less than 2 but more than 1.5. This indicates that these strategies are used less frequently.

Those behaviour management strategies with low mean scores (below 1.5) are Environmental restraint (M=1.58) Seclusion (M=1.46) Caning (M=1.32), and Special trips (M=1.30). Two of these strategies are punitive and are the least used by teachers.

Table 4.3: Use of behaviour management strategies by teachers

Behaviour	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Praise	50	2.32	.768
Counselling	50	2.22	.582
Warning	50	2.20	.670
High five and Thumbs up	50	2.18	.850
Rewards (e.g., stickers)	50	2.14	.857
Correction	50	2.08	.695
Shape behaviour	50	2.02	.622
Visual cue	50	1.96	.832
Referral	50	1.90	.735
Instructional Approach	50	1.88	.689
Story telling	50	1.84	.817
Behavioural rehearsal	50	1.82	.774
Ignore	50	1.80	.670
Social skill training	50	1.80	.728
Debriefing	50	1.76	.625
Response cost	49	1.73	.605
Pre-correction	50	1.72	.730
Check-in-Check-out	50	1.70	.839
Punishment	50	1.66	.688
Note to parent	50	1.66	.895
Exclusion	50	1.60	.728
Environmental restraint	50	1.58	.673
Seclusion	50	1.46	.646
Caning	50	1.32	.621
Special trip	50	1.30	.707
Valid N (listwise)	49		

4.4 Research question 3: What are the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of these strategies to manage challenging behaviours?

To answer the third research question, descriptive statistics were calculated for the responses given by the teachers about their perception of the effectiveness of the strategies they used to manage students' challenging behaviours. Table 4.4 shows the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the different behaviour management strategies. A high percentage of positive responses indicate that a particular strategy was perceived as highly effective and a low percentage indicates a low level of effectiveness of the strategy.

Table 4.4 shows that those behaviour strategies that had a high percentage of "not effective" responses relate to: Caning (36%) and Special trips (30%). Thus teachers did not perceive these strategies to be effective for managing challenging behaviours.

Table 4.4 also shows those behaviour strategies that teachers rated as "moderately effective" were: Seclusion (46%), Pre-correction (38%), Debrief and Exclusion (36%), Environmental restraint (32%), Caning and Check-in-Check-out (30%).

Further, the descriptive analysis in Table 4.4 shows that the following behaviour strategies had high percentage of teachers perceiving them to be effective: Response cost (54%), Thumbs-up (52%), Verbal praise (50%), Instructional Approach, Referral, Story-telling, and Social skills (44%).

Table 4.4: Teachers' responses to effectiveness of behaviour management strategies

Behaviour Strategy (effectiveness of)	Not Effective (N, %)	Moderately Effective (N, %)	Effective (N, %)	Highly Effective (N, %)
Caning	18 (36%)	15 (30%)	9 (18%)	0
Seclusion	7 (14%)	23 (46%)	15 (30%)	0
Environmental restraint	8 (16%)	16 (32%)	17 (34%)	0
Exclusion	9 (18%)	18 (36%)	13 (26%)	2 (4%)
Response cost	2 (4%)	13 (26%)	27 (54%)	5 (10%)
Referral	2 (4%)	12 (24%)	22 (44%)	10 (20%)
Debrief	4 (8%)	18 (36%)	21 (42%)	1 (2%)
Instructional Approach	8 (16%)	11 (22%)	22 (44%)	5 (10%)
Pre-correction	5 (10%)	19 (38%)	16 (32%)	6 (12%)
Behavioural Rehearsal	8 (16%)	13 (26%)	18 (36%)	6 (12%)
Check-In-Check-Out	5 (10%)	15 (30%)	15 (30%)	5 (10%)
Verbal Praise	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	25 (50%)	19 (38%)
Use of Stickers	2 (4%)	10 (20%)	19 (38%)	16 (32%)
Special trips	15 (30%)	10 (20%)	11 (22%)	6 (12%)
Visual clue	6 (12%)	11 (22%)	21 (42%)	8 (16%)
Story telling	9 (18%)	9 (18%)	22 (44%)	6 (12%)
Social skills	6 (12%)	13 (26%)	22 (44%)	5 (10%)
Thumbs-up	1 (2%)	8 (16%)	26 (52%)	11 (22%)
Others	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	6 (2%)	1 (2%)

Finally, the analysis in Table 4.4 shows that the behaviour strategies that teachers perceived as "highly effective" were Verbal praise (38%) and Use of stickers (32%). Thus these strategies were those rated as most effective by teachers.

4.5 Research Question 4: How do teachers rate the level of difficulty of managing the challenging behaviours?

Table 4.5 shows how teachers rated the level of difficulty in managing challenging behaviours. The following challenging behaviours had high mean scores: Self-injury (M=2.4**)**, Hyperactive (M=2.30), Antisocial behaviour (M=2.24), Forces Submission of others (M=2.16), and Physical aggression (M=2.16). Table 4.5 also shows that the behaviours with the lowest mean scores were Attention seeking (M=1.72), Verbal Aggression (M=1.72), Out of seat (M=1.65), Talking out (M=1.56). This result indicates that behaviour such as self-injury, hyperactive, antisocial, forces submission of others and physical aggression are those behaviours teachers perceived as more difficult to manage. On the other hand, behaviours such as attention seeking, verbal aggression, out-of-seat and talking out are the behaviours that are less difficult to manage.

Table 4.5: Teacher ratings of level of difficulty in managing challenging behaviours

Difficulty Managing Behaviours (DFM)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Self-injury	50	2.40	1.161
Hyperactive	50	2.30	.839
Antisocial	50	2.24	1.098
Submission	50	2.16	1.076
Physical Aggression	50	2.16	1.218
Non-Compliance	50	2.08	.804
Disruptive	50	2.04	.880
Oppositional behaviour	50	1.98	.769
Inattention	50	1.98	.937
Argues	50	1.92	1.047
Shyness	50	1.92	.900
Disrespect	50	1.88	1.154
Withdrawal	50	1.86	.926
Off task	50	1.82	.873
Task non-completion	50	1.76	.822
Attention Seeking	50	1.72	.834
Verbal Aggression	50	1.72	1.011
Out of seat	49	1.65	.751
Talk out	50	1.56	.812
Valid N (listwise)	49		

4.6: Research question 5: Are there any significant relationships between teachers' background variables and their concerns about challenging behaviours, perceptions of effectiveness of strategies and their reported difficulty managing behaviours?

To answer this research question, a series of t-Tests and One-way between-groups ANOVA were calculated for each background variable (as independent variables) and each of the measures of concerns about behaviour, strategies used to manage behaviour, effectiveness of practices and difficulty managing behaviour (as dependent variables). As the analysis for each of the variables is carried out individually rather than simultaneously, the use of t-tests and One-way between-groups ANOVA procedures is appropriate (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

4.6.1 Effect of teachers' background variables on level of concern for challenging behaviours

Are there any significant relationships between teachers' background variables and levels of concern for behaviours? The *t*-test analysis for gender and training in Special Education showed no significant differences. The ANOVA analysis also showed no significant differences for age variable (p = .704) and Number of children with disabilities in class (p = .052), and Teacher Qualification (p = .293), but was significant for Class-Size (p = .003). These findings are detailed below.

4.6.1.1 Age and Scores on Level of Concern for Challenging Behaviour

The mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) for the different ages of teachers are shown in Table 4.6.1, which shows that the teachers within the age bracket 31–40 years have a higher mean score (M=44.2) than the other age groups. Those teachers in the age-group 41–50 years have a slightly lower mean score (M=39.0).

Table 4.6.1: Comparison of mean level of concern by age of teacher

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
20–30 years	19	40.8	10.1
31–40 years	19	44.2	7.2
41–50 years	9	39.0	16.6
51–60 years	3	41.3	27.6
Total	50	41.8	11.7

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests were conducted to explore the effect of each of the background variables on the Level of Concern scores. The ANOVA for the Age variable showed no significant differences between the groups (p = .704) (see Table 4.6.2 below).

Table 4.6.2: Results of ANOVA: Level of Concern and Age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	199.029	3	66.343	.471	.704
Within Groups	6482.351	46	140.921		
Total	6681.380	49			

4.6.1.2 Number of students in Class and Level of Concern for Challenging Behaviour

Table 4.8 shows the means scores and standard deviations on the measure of Level of concern for challenging behaviours of teachers teaching different class sizes. Teachers with classrooms of more than 40 students as well as classrooms with between 31 and 40 students had 'high' mean scores (M=49.0) and (M=47.2) respectively.

On the other hand, Table 4.8 also shows that those classrooms with 21 to 30 students and 11 to 20 students had 'moderate' mean scores. The mean scores were M=38.5 and M=40.1 respectively. Table 4.7 also shows that classrooms with fewer than 10 students had a low mean score of M=33.2.

Table 4.7: Class Size and Scores on Level of Concern for Challenging Behaviour

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Less than 10 students	12	33.17	13.64
11–20 students	7	40.14	7.13
21–30 students	6	38.50	13.58
31 or more students	25	47.24	8.39
Total	50	41.82	11.68

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Number of Students in Class on the Level of Concern scores. The analysis revealed that Number of students in class divided into fewer than 10 students (Group 1), 10–20 students (Group 2), 21–30 students (Group 3), 31–40 students (Group 4), and above 41 students (Group 5) showed statistically significant difference at $p <$ .05 level on Level of Concern scores among the 5 groups [F (3, 572.9) = 5.311, p = .003] as indicated in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: ANOVA: Level of Concern and Class Size

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1718.796	3	572.932	5.311	.003
Within Groups	4962.584	46	107.882		
Total	6681.380	49			

The Tukey HSD post-hoc test in Table 4.10 showed that the mean difference is significant at $p >$ .05 level between classes with fewer than 10 students and those with 31 or more students

(p = .002). This indicates that teachers in large classes had higher levels of concerns about challenging behaviours.

Table 4.9: Multiple comparisons class-size and Level of concern

(I) Class- Size	(J) Class-Size	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Fewer than 10 students	11-20 students	-6.976	4.940	.498
	21-30 students	-5.333	5.193	.735
	31 or more students	-14.073*	3.648	.002
11–20 students	Less than 10 students	6.976	4.940	.498
	21-30 students	1.643	5.779	.992
	31 or more students	-7.097	4.442	.390
21–30 students	Less than 10 students	5.333	5.193	.735
	11-20 students	-1.643	5.779	.992
	31 or more students	-8.740	4.722	.263
31 or more students	Less than 10 students	14.073*	3.648	.002
	11-20 students	7.097	4.442	.390
	21-30 students	8.740	4.722	.263

4.6.1.3 Number of students with a disability in class and Level of Concern for behaviour

Table 4.10 shows that classrooms with more than 6 students with a disability and those with

between 5 and 6 students with a disability have higher mean scores (M=49.4 and 44.4 respectively) than classrooms with 3–4 students (M=37.3), classrooms with 1–2 students (M=41.2).

Table 4.10: Number of students with a disability and scores on Level of Concern for Behaviour

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
None	1	23.0	.
1–2 students	17	41.2	8.6
3–4 students	14	37.3	12.9
5–6 students	9	44.4	15.0
More than 6 students	9	49.4	6.0
Total	50	41.8	11.7

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Number of Students with a Disability in Class on the Level of Concern scores. The ANOVA was not statistically significant at $p < .05$ level ($p = .052$) as indicated in Table 4. 11.

Table 4.11: ANOVA: Level of concern and Number of Students with a Disability

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1233.020	4	308.255	2.546	.052
Within Groups	5448.360	45	121.075		
Total	6681.380	49			

4.6.1.4 Gender and Level of Concern (LC)

The table below (Table 4.12) shows that male teachers had a higher mean score (M=42.5) than female teachers (M=41.4) on level of concern. However, the *t*-test showed this difference was not statistically significant (p = .76).

Table 4.12: *t*-test for Gender and Level of concern for behaviour

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	*t (p)*
Level of Concern Total Scores	Male	18	42.5	10.8	.31 (.76)
	Female	32	41.4	12.3	

4.6.1.5 *t*-test: Training in Special Education and Level of Concern

Table 4.14 shows that teachers with Special Education training had a higher mean score (M=40.4) than those without training on the measure of level of concern for behaviours. However, the *t*-test (Table 4.13) indicates this difference was not statistically significant (p = .271).

Table 4.13: *t*-test: Special Education Training and Level of Concern (LC)

	Special Ed Training	N	Mean	SD	*t (p)*
Level of Concern Total Scores	No	11	45.3	13.4	1.1 (.27)
	Yes	39	40.9	11.1	

4.6.1.6 Teacher Qualification and Level of Concern

Table 4.15 shows means and standard deviation scores for teachers' qualification on level of concern measure. According to Table 4.15, teachers with Secondary and Teachers College qualifications have higher mean scores (M=46.80 and M=44.50 respectively) than those with a Bachelor's degree qualification (M=42.90). Those with postgraduate qualifications have the lowest mean score (M=36.50), indicating that they report minimal difficulty managing challenging behaviours.

Table 4.14: Teacher qualification and level of concern

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Secondary	5	46.80	3.834
Teachers College	2	44.50	.707
Bachelor	31	42.90	10.416
Postgraduate	12	36.50	16.105
Total	50	41.82	11.677

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Teacher Qualification on the measure of Level of Concern. The result was not significant as shown in Table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Teacher Qualification on the measures of Level of Concern

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	514.370	3	171.457	1.279	.293
Within Groups	6167.010	46	134.065		
Total	6681.380	49			

4.7 Behaviour management strategies and background variables

4.7.1 Frequently used strategies and Background variables

A series of *t*-tests and one-way between-groups ANOVA procedures were carried out for the most and least frequently used behaviour management strategies (Table 4.3) and background variables. The results showed that for the more frequently used strategies such as use of Praise, Counselling, Warning, High 5, and Rewards, there were no significant findings for gender, training in special education, teacher qualification, number of students in class and number of students with disabilities in classroom and teachers' use of these strategies.

4.7.2 Least used strategies and Background variables

A series of *t*-tests and one-way between-groups ANOVA procedures were carried out for the least frequently used strategies and background variables. The results showed that there were no significant findings for gender, training in special education, teacher qualification, number of students in class and number of students with disabilities in classroom and teachers' use of these strategies.

4.8 Effect of teachers' background variables on difficulty managing challenging behaviours (DFM)

Are there any significant relationship between teachers' background variables and level of concerns for behaviours? The *t*-test analysis for gender and training in Special Education showed no significant differences. The ANOVA analysis also showed no significant differences for age variable (p = .704) and Number of children with disabilities in class (p = .052), but was significant for Class-Size (p = .003). These results are detailed below.

4.8.1 Age and scores on Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

The mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) for the different ages of teachers are shown in Table 4.16. It shows that the teachers within the age brackets 20–30 years and 31–40 years have the highest mean scores (M=37.3) and (M=37.7) respectively. Teachers in the age group 41–50 years have a mean score M=30.7 and teachers within the age group 51–60 years have the lowest mean score (M=28.7). This indicates that younger teachers reported more difficulties managing behaviours of concern.

Table 4.16: Age and scores on Difficulty managing challenging behaviours (DFM)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
DFM Scores	20–30 years	19	37.32	7.71
	31–40 years	18	37.89	5.01
	41–50 years	9	30.67	16.77
	51–60 years	3	28.67	16.20
	Total	49	35.78	9.98

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of age on the variable of Difficulty managing behaviour. Table 4.17 shows that the result was not significant (p = .161). This indicates that despite visible differences in mean score between the groups the differences are not statistically significant.

Table 4.17: ANOVA: Age and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
DFM Scores	Between Groups	511.981	3	170.660	1.798	.161
	Within Groups	4270.550	45	94.901		
	Total	4782.531	48			

4.9 Number of students in class and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

Table 4.18 also shows that classrooms with fewer than 10 students have the lowest mean score (M=26.3) and teachers in classrooms of 31 or more students have the highest mean score, indicating that such teachers reported more difficulty dealing with challenging behaviours.

Table 4.18: Class Size, Mean and SD Scores on Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fewer than 10 students	12	26.25	11.95
11–20 students	7	36.43	9.14
21–30 students	5	34.00	13.04
31 or more students	25	40.52	3.87
Total	49	35.78	9.98

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Number of Students in Class on the measure of Difficulty with managing challenging behaviour. The analysis revealed that Number of students in class divided into fewer than 10 students (Group 1), 10–20 students (Group 2), 21–30 students (Group 3), 31–40 students (Group 4), and above 41 students (Group 5) showed statistically significant difference at $p < .05$ level on Level of Concern scores among the 5 groups [$F (3, 556) = 8.051$, $p = .000$], as indicated in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: ANOVA: Class Size and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1670.326	3	556.775	8.051	.000
Within Groups	3112.204	45	69.160		
Total	4782.531	48			

The post-hoc test (Table 4.20) showed that the mean difference was significant between teachers teaching in classes of fewer than 10 students and those teaching in classes of more than 31 students.

Table 4.20: **Multiple Comparisons: Class Size and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours**

	(I) Class-Size	(J) Class-Size	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	Fewer than 10 students	11–20 students	-10.179	3.955	.062
		21–30 students	-7.750	4.427	.310
		31 or more students	-14.270*	2.921	.000
	11–20 students	Fewer than 10 students	10.179	3.955	.062
		21–30 students	2.429	4.870	.959
		31 or more students	-4.091	3.556	.661
	21–30 students	Fewer than 10 students	7.750	4.427	.310
		11–20 students	-2.429	4.870	.959
		31 or more students	-6.520	4.074	.389
	31 or more students	Fewer than 10 students	14.270*	2.921	.000
		11–20 students	4.091	3.556	.661
		21–30 students	6.520	4.074	.389

4.9.1 Number of students with a disability in class and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

Table 4.21 shows the mean scores for classrooms with varying numbers of students with disabilities. Those classrooms with more than 6 such students, and between 5 and 6 such students, have higher mean scores than classrooms with 3–4 students (M=37.3) and classrooms with no student with a disability (M=23.0).

Table 4.21: Mean scores for class size and Difficulty managing challenging behaviours

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
None	1	18.00	.
1–2 students	16	36.88	7.154
3–4 students	14	31.93	14.536
5–6 students	11	38.82	7.209
More than 6 students	7	38.71	2.690
Total	49	35.78	9.982

4.9.2 Number of students with a disability and scores on Difficulty Managing Challenging Behaviours

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Number of Students with a Disability in Class on Difficulty managing challenging behaviours. The result was no statistically significant difference at $p <$ .05 level as indicated in Table 4.22 below.

Table 4.22: ANOVA: Difficulty Managing Behaviours and Number of Students with a Disability

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	704.787	4	176.197	1.901	.127
Within Groups	4077.744	44	92.676		
Total	4782.531	48			

4.10 Gender and scores on Difficulty Managing Challenging Behaviour (DFM)

The 17 male teachers reported lower levels of difficulty in managing behaviours of concern (M=34.8) while the 32 female teachers (M=36.3) reported greater difficulties in managing challenging behaviour. The *t*-test showed no significant difference at $p > .05$ level between male and female teachers.

Table 4.23: Gender and Difficulties in Managing Challenging Behaviour

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t (p)
DFM Total Scores	Male	17	34.8	11.6	-.51 (.61)
	Female	32	36.3	9.2	

4.11 Training in Special Education and Difficulty in Managing Challenging Behaviour

The *t*-test (Table 4.24) indicated that training in special education had no significance on Difficulty Managing Challenging Behaviour (DFM).

Table 4.24: *t*-test: Special Education Training and DFM

	Special Ed Training	N	Mean	SD	t (p)
DFM Total Scores	No	11	39.1	7.6	1.3 (.21)
	Yes	38	34.8	10.5	

4.12 Teacher Qualification and Difficulty in Managing Challenging Behaviour

According to Table 4.25 teachers with Secondary and Teachers College qualifications have higher mean score (M=42.0 and M=39.5 respectively) than those with Bachelor degree Qualification (M=37.1). Those with postgraduate qualifications have the lowest mean score (M=28.6) indicating that they report minimal difficulty managing challenging behaviours.

Table 4.25: Teacher qualification and Total scores on Difficulty in Managing Challenging Behaviour

		N	Mean	SD
DFM Total Scores	Secondary	5	42.0	4.1
	Teachers college	2	39.5	5.0
	Bachelor	31	37.1	7.3
	Postgraduate	11	28.6	15.1
	Total	49	35.8	10.0

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Teacher Qualification on the measure of Difficulty Managing Challenging Behaviour (DFM). According to the analysis Qualification, divided into secondary (Group 1), Teachers College (Group 2), Bachelor (Group 3), and Postgraduate (Group 4), has statistically significant differences at $p < .05$ level on DFM scores among the 4 [$F (3, 278) = 3.166$, $p = .033$] as indicated in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26: ANOVA for Teacher Qualification and DFM

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
DFM Total Scores	Between Groups	833.61	3	277.9	3.17	.033
	Within Groups	3948.92	45	87.8		
	Total	4782.53	48			

Although there were differences (Table 4.27) between the mean scores of teachers with secondary education and postgraduate qualifications and also between Bachelor and Postgraduate, the post hoc showed that these differences were not significant ($p = .053$ and $p = .064$ respectively).

Table 4.27: Multiple Comparisons Table

(I) Qualification	(J) Qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Secondary	Teachers college	2.5	7.84	.989
	Bachelor	4.9	4.52	.695
	Postgraduate	13.4*	5.05	.053
Teachers college	Secondary	-2.5	7.84	.989
	Bachelor	2.4	6.83	.984
	Postgraduate	10.9	7.20	.441
Bachelor	Secondary	-4.9	4.52	.695
	Teachers college	-2.4	6.83	.984
	Postgraduate	8.4*	3.29	.064
Postgraduate	Secondary	-13.4*	5.05	.053
	Teachers college	-10.9	7.20	.441
	Bachelor	-8.4*	3.29	.064

4.13 Background variables and Effectiveness of Behaviour Management Strategies

The only significant findings in the analysis of background variables and the effectiveness measure are Professional duties and School District. All other background variables showed no significant influence.

4.14 Professional duties (type of teacher)

Table 4.28 shows perceptions of total effectiveness scores for subject teacher, classroom teacher, special needs teacher and others. The classroom teacher had mean score M=53.1, subject teacher had mean score M=51.2, Special needs teacher had mean score M=30.0 and for others, M=43.0.

Table 4.28: Total effectiveness scores for different professional duties (type of teacher)

	N	Mean	SD
Subject teacher	21	51.2	9.9
Classroom Teacher	19	53.1	15.3
Special needs teacher	2	30.0	19.8
Other	7	43.0	9.7
Total	49	49.9	13.3

The one-way between-groups ANOVA with post-hoc tests was conducted to explore the effect of the background variable Professional duties on the measure of perception of Effectiveness of behaviour management strategies. The analysis revealed that Professional duties, divided into Subject teacher (Group 1), Classroom Teacher (Group 2), Special Needs Teacher (Group 3) and other (Group 4), showed no statistically significant difference at $p <$ .05 level on effectiveness scores among the 5 groups [F (3, 452) =, 2.86, p = .047] as indicated in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29: ANOVA: Effectiveness scores and Professional duties

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1358.07	3	452.7	2.86	.047
Within Groups	7129.60	45	158.4		
Total	8487.67	48			

The Multiple Comparisons Table 4.30 shows that the difference in perceived effectiveness is between classroom teachers and Special Needs teachers. The mean difference is significant (p = .079) at the 0.117 level.

Table 4.30 Multiple Comparisons and Tukey HSD for Professional Duties

(I) Prof Duties	(J) Prof Duties	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Subject teacher	Classroom Teacher	-1.9	3.99	.966
	Special needs teacher	21.2	9.31	.118
	Other	8.2	5.49	.446
Classroom Teacher	Subject teacher	1.9	3.99	.966
	Special needs teacher	23.1	9.36	.079
	Other	10.1	5.57	.279
Special needs teacher	Subject teacher	-21.2	9.31	.118
	Classroom Teacher	-23.1*	9.36	.079
	Other	-13.0	10.09	.575
Other	Subject teacher	-8.2	5.49	.446
	Classroom Teacher	-10.1	5.57	.279
	Special needs teacher	13.0	10.09	.575

4.15 School District

Table 4.31 shows the *t*-test for effectiveness of behaviour management strategies and school district of study participants. The teachers from Samutprakarn district have a higher mean score (M=57.1) than the teachers from Bangkok district (M= 46.8). The *t*-test is significant (*p*

= .01), indicating that teachers in Samutprakarn district perceive their strategies as far more effective than those in Bangkok district.

Table 4.31: *t*-Test: School District and Effectiveness Scores

School District	N	Mean	SD	*t* (*p*)
Bangkok	34	46.8	13.5	-2.7 (.01)
Samutprakarn	15	57.1	9.8	

4.16 Conclusion

The overall results indicate that teachers in Thailand primary schools are having some difficulties in managing challenging behaviours displayed by their students and they are applying a wide range of behavioural management strategies to control them.

The next chapter will focus on the discussion of the results presented in the context of Thai culture and educational systems, the literature review, and the objective of this study.

Chapter 5

Discussion of Results

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the discussion of the results of the study, which set out to find out what challenging behaviours of students are of most concern to primary school teachers in Thailand, the behaviour strategies teachers use, teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of those strategies, and difficulty managing the challenging behaviours. The discussion is organised in line with the research questions as presented in Chapter 1. This chapter also discusses the recommendations that emanate from the findings of the study, the limitations of the study, areas of further study, and conclusion of the study.

5.1 Challenging behaviours of students that are of most concern to teachers in Thailand schools

The results of the study in relation to behaviours of concern to teachers (Table 4.1) indicate that the behaviours of most concern to teachers were Inattention and Physical Aggression. This finding is similar to the result of another study that compared students' challenging behaviours in western and eastern cultures, which found inattention and off-task behaviour as most frequently occurring and of high concern to teachers (Ding, Li, Li, & Kulm, 2008; Shen et al., 2009). This finding might be surprising to teachers in other countries, but in the Thai society this could be attributed to the particular importance attached to children paying

attention to classroom proceedings, and disregard of such behaviour might be seen by teachers as utter disregard of society's norms and values. This is because Thai society encourages children to exercise self-control, emotional restraints as opposed to behavioural display such as aggression or inattention which are strongly disapproved within the practices of Thai Buddhism (Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, Weiss et al., 1987). Also physical aggression is something that is abhorred in Thai society. This link with cultural factors is in line with Evans et al. (2003) who concluded that socio-cultural factors have a profound influence on behaviours.

On the other hand, the behaviour of least concern to teachers was Disrespect towards teachers (84%). This might be due to teachers not considering such behaviour as a serious infraction and perhaps due to teachers' consideration of students as growing young children who are in the course of the learning process, or teachers' understanding that Thai students rarely disrespect adults or authority figures. This finding is similar to other studies (Phillips, 1965; Suvannathat, 1979) which have reported that Thai children are believed to be peaceful, polite, and show deference (Kren chai) and also taught to refrain from behaviours that would disturb others.

5.2 Level of concern about behaviour

In terms of the level of concern, the results of the study (Table 4.2) showed that Self-injury had the highest mean score (M=2.8). This finding reflects the fact that injuries inflicted by students on themselves are strongly disapproved of by Thai teachers. This is because the scale of such injuries might be life threatening; and the teacher might be called to question by

the school administration for negligence or lack of duty of care on the part of the teacher who is assigned the role of looking after students.

This finding is consistent with an earlier finding by Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, Weiss, Achenbach et al. (1988) where Thai teachers' behaviour management strategies were compared to their American counterparts, which showed that Thai teachers were less tolerant of students' challenging behaviours such as self-injury, fighting, impoliteness and so on and were more tolerant of over-controlled (internalising behaviour problems) behaviour such as shyness, somaticising and depression as they were taught to inhibit an open expression of anger and emotions (Gardiner, 1968; National Identity Office of the Kingdom of Thailand, 1984; Suwanlert, 1974).

On the other hand, Attention Seeking and Talking Out had the lowest mean scores and showed that they were challenging behaviours of low level of concern to teachers. This could probably be due to Thai teachers' diligent application of democratic principles in dealing with student issues and consequently giving them freedom to some extent to speak out or ask for help. This finding is also similar to the report in a study which claims that Thai primary school children's problem behaviour, such as attention seeking and talking out, were given low level of concerns by adults because they were considered not serious for necessary interventions (Walker, Bettes & Ceci, 1984; White, 1982).

5.3 Relationship between Teachers' Background Variables and Levels of Concern about Behaviours

According to the findings of the study the *t*-test analysis showed no significant difference between the teachers' background variables of Training in special education and Gender and levels of concern about behaviours. The finding in relation to training is surprising given that training is often associated with teachers having a better understanding of behaviour and it (the finding) suggests that training in special education perhaps does not cover the issues of problem behaviour adequately. The finding could also perhaps be best explained by Thai teachers' allegiance to societal norms and values when dealing with students' issues (Achencbach et al., 1988), regardless of teachers' education background, special training and gender. Achencbach et al. (1988) found that Thai adult judgments on children's problem behaviour were being influenced by cultural factors, which influence their judgment of whether a child behaviour is considered to be abnormal or unacceptable for a child at a certain age.

The ANOVA for age, class size, qualification, and number of students with disabilities in class showed no significant differences. Only Class Size showed a significant difference between the groups (p = .003). The Tukey HSD post-hoc test in Table 4.10 showed that the mean difference was between classes with fewer than 10 students and those with 31 or more students. Thus teachers in large classes reported higher levels of concern about challenging behaviours. In other words, the numbers of students in a class might make the students' behaviour more difficult to control. This could be as a result of individual personality, preferences, or teachers' differential ability to cope with stress associated with a large class size and managing students with disabilities. Large class size has also been found to be

associated with teachers' concerns and stress about catering for individual student characteristics such as disabilities or pervasive display of challenging behaviour (Kuyini & Desai, 2007, 2008). Further, studies in India on concerns about inclusive education (Bhatnagar & Das, 2013; Sharma & Desai, 2002) also found that teachers in large classes had concerns about inclusive education**.** This finding is similar to the findings of Lazear (2001), who reported that large class size was likely to trigger students' disruptive behaviour such as 'off-task' behaviour. It is also similar to the findings of Mayberry (1992) and Gregory (1992), who concluded that increases in behaviour problems are associated with large class size as compared to small class size.

According to the findings of the study, classrooms with more than 6 students with disabilities had higher mean scores on the level of concern. Even though this was not statistically significant, it translates to the idea that the teachers in those classes expressed higher levels of concern, probably because children with disabilities were known to demonstrate less interpersonal understanding compared to children without disabilities (Selma, 1980; Selman & Byrne, 1973). Also, it could be as a result of greater challenges posed by these children for teachers, challenges which are products of learning disabilities in classrooms. This finding also reflects what a vast number of studies have concluded, namely that learning disabilities are precursors of children's aggression and misconduct in the classroom (Bender & Smith, 1990; Cornwall & Bawden, 1992). In short, this kind of finding, if was significant, could imply that classrooms with higher numbes of students with disabilities could pose an elevated level of concern compared to classrooms with lower numbers of students with disabilities. Teacher concerns in this regard might be linked to perceived inability to handle the challenging behaviour effectively, perhaps due to lack of understanding of how best to address challenging behaviours of children with disabilities as compared to their counterparts

with no disabilities.

Although there were no significant findings for background variables of Age, Qualification and Number of disabilities in class, these findings are worth discussing.

For example, according to the results **(**Table …..), teachers 51–60 years of age had the highest mean score on level of concern about students' challenging behaviours. This perhaps is an indication that 'fairly aged' Thai teachers are more concerned about seeing children displaying challenging behaviours compared to the others. This concern by 'fairly aged' Thai teachers could partly be ascribed to their duty of care for young learners and their strong determination to see the children displaying good behaviours. Teachers within this age range are believed to have long teaching experience which can raise the level of growth in social and behavioural skills of children, unlike younger newly trained teachers (e.g., teachers with 1 year of teaching experience). This pattern is similar to that found by Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor (2006).

On the other hand, the findings of the results further showed that teachers aged between 61 and 70 years had the lowest concern about students' display of challenging behaviours. This might be attributed to the ageing effect or physical weakness to effectively tackle such problem behaviour, thus they might determine to 'ignore' the students' misconduct; a procedure research indicates is an ineffective behaviour management strategy (Cotton, 2001; Rademacher, Callahan, & Pederson-Seelye, 1998).

5.4 Behaviour Management Strategies used by teachers

The study found that teachers used behaviour management strategies such as Praise, Counselling, Warning, Thumbs-up and High-five, Token economies (Use of stickers), Correction, and Shaping Behaviour. According to the findings, these behaviour management strategies had relatively high mean scores: Praise (M=2.32), Counselling (M=2.22), Warning (M=2.20), Thumbs-up and High-five (M=2.18), Use of stickers (M=2.1), Correction (M=2.08) and Shape Behaviour (M=2.04). On the other hand, behaviour strategies including Instructional approach (M=188), Behavioural rehearsal (M=1.82), Check-in-Check-out (M=1.73) and Pre-correction (M=1.72) had mean scores of less than 2 but more than 1.5, indicating that these strategies are used less frequently. More importantly, behaviour management strategies such as Environmental restraint (M=1.58), Seclusion (M=1.46), Caning (M=1.32), and Special trips (M=1.30) had low mean scores. Two of these strategies are punitive and are the least used by teachers. These findings reflect the general principles enshrined in positive behaviour approaches which recommend the use of less punitive or aversive strategies (Arthur-Kelly, 2006; Baba & Tanaka-Matsumi, 2011; Horner, & Sugai, 2000; Maag, 2004). Teachers′ use of contingent, behaviour-specific praise has been shown to elicit an increase in student academic engagement, minimise students′ disruptive behaviour and improve students′ social behaviours (Chalk & Bizo, 2004; Lo & Cartledge, 2004; Moore et al., 2010). Indeed Cameron, Banko, and Pierce (2001) and Akin-Little, Eckert, and Lovett (2004) concluded that children′s intrinsic motivation tends to increase on account of teachers′ use of positive reinforcement. Further, the use of contingencies in managing disruptive behaviour increases positive verbal interactions and decreases negative verbal interactions (Hansen & Lignugaris-Kraft, 2005), and increases achievements, appropriate classroom behaviour, and peer social acceptance (Yarborough, Skinner, Lee, & Lemmons, 2004).

Therefore, the use of more proactive behaviour management strategies by Thailand teachers, as found here, although modest, is sign of a move away from reactive to proactive approaches (Lane, Wehby, Robertson, & Rogers, 2007). This finding indicates that although the teachers in the participating schools are not implementing school-wide positive behaviour supports, they are still using less of the authoritarian behaviour management styles that Porter (2007) believes can lead to over-use of teacher power and culminate in many students demonstrating more unacceptable behaviours in the classroom as a way of taking back power. The finding also provides an indicative position about teacher practice so that the Ministry of Education and Thai Teacher Training institutions can develop appropriate behaviour management training courses for both pre- and in-service teachers.

5.5 How do Teachers Rate the Level of Difficulty in Managing Challenging Behaviours?

According to the findings (Table 4.1), teachers rated the difficulty of managing the challenging behaviour Defies teachers with the highest percentage (84%) 'no' and the lowest percentage (16%) 'yes' response. This shows that Thai teachers do not consider defying of teachers seriously and perhaps merely overlook such response from students. Furthermore, the results showed that Inattention had the lowest percentage (48%) 'no' response and the highest 'yes' response (52%) for Difficulty in managing behaviour of concern. This is probably because teachers had the feeling that students are likely to be missing out in gaining curriculum knowledge during the lesson. This distractive display may have a negative impact on other students who are desirous of paying full attention during the learning process. Thus teachers end up losing a large chunk of their teaching time to the detriment of the remaining members of the class.

5.6 Background Variables and Difficulty Managing Behaviour

The main findings in this regard were that Class size and teacher Qualification influenced teachers′ ratings of the difficulty of managing challenging behaviours. Teachers in large classes reported higher levels of difficulty managing challenging behaviours. This is similar to the findings of several studies (Kuyini & Desai, 2008) which reported an impact of large class sizes on teachers' capacity to manage inclusive classrooms.

According to Table 4.26, teachers with secondary education reported higher levels of difficulty in managing behaviours while teachers with Postgraduate qualifications reported lower levels of difficulty. This was perhaps to be expected in the sense that teachers who have received more training will generally be expected to know how better to support students with a range of needs.

5.7 Teachers' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the Strategies to Manage Challenging Behaviours

According to the findings (Table 4.4), most Thailand teachers considered the least effective behavioural management strategy used in addressing students' challenging behaviour to be caning, which had the highest percentage (36%) of 'not effective' responses. This is perhaps due to students' persistent repeating of the same behaviour after the punishment had ceased. Likewise, the use of Special trips (30%) as a stimulus to control students' challenging behaviour has led to a situation whereby students repeat the display of same behaviour after

the stimulus has been withdrawn. Behaviour strategies such as Thumbs-up and Verbal praise (2%) were rated by teachers with the lowest percentage of 'not effective' responses.

According to the findings (Table 4.4), Seclusion (46%) was found by teachers to be 'moderately effective', perhaps due to students' dislike of such approaches and their tendency to curb themselves.

On the other hand, the findings of the result section also revealed that Caning, Environmental restraint, and Seclusion had 'zero' perception of effectiveness by Thai teachers. This could be because these behavioural strategies were not producing the desired results in reducing the intensity of challenging behaviour displayed by students.

According to the findings (Table 4.4), the following behaviour strategies had a high percentage of effectiveness. These behaviour strategies were: Response cost (54%), Thumbs-up (52%), Verbal praise (50%), Instructional Approach, Referral, Story-telling, and Social skills (44%). This finding shows that Thai teachers might have a positive disposition to the use of proactive behaviour management strategies to promote students' positive behaviours and diminish challenging behaviours in schools. This finding duly corroborates typical routine practices of use of rewards such as stickers, stars, As and praise, awards and privileges, and non-punitive measures in many schools in the US, practices which promote students' good behaviour (Fantuzzo et al., 1991).

Furthermore, according to the findings of the analysis in Table 4.4, the following behavioural strategies had 'low' percentages of perceived effectiveness in managing behaviour. The behavioural strategies were: Others (12%), Caning (18%), and Exclusion (26%). This showed that these strategies were not working out well for Thai teachers in reducing students' challenging behaviours but might even exacerbate the students' problem behaviour. This finding was consistent with what Skiba and Peterson (2000) found, namely, that use of severe disciplinary practices such as reprimand, suspension, loss of privileges or expulsion in controlling challenging behaviour are only known to produce a negative learning environment and worsen the challenging behaviour. This finding translates to the fact that Thai students remained unyielding to the use of coercion or punishment by their teachers in addressing their behaviour of concern. Therefore, this finding was consistent with growing research evidence which indicates that reprimands, detentions, punishments, seclusion and restraints are ineffective strategies for improving students' challenging behaviour in schools (Charles, 1996; Farmer, 1999; Sugai, 1996; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Williams, 1998). This is because such strategies are only reactive and punitive in approach and tend to make no positive impact in the lives of students (Horner & Sugai, 2000).

On the other hand, high percentages for 'highly effective' were reported for Verbal praise (38%) and Use of stickers (32%), which means that these strategies are working well for teachers in addressing perceived concerns about student behaviour. This implies that Thai teachers found the use of verbal praise and use of stickers as a behaviour management strategy that works very well in addressing students' challenging behaviour. This procedure used by Thai teachers as revealed by the findings of this study was consistent with a similar study that Thai students are eager to learn with teachers who praise and reward their behaviour and make them gain satisfaction (Sarasaen, 2000)

5.8 Background Variables and Effectiveness of Behaviour Management Strategies

The only significant findings in terms of background variables were related to Professional duties and School District.

The results (Table 4.27) showed that classroom teachers reported higher perceptions of effectiveness of their strategies (M=53.1), which implies that they were coping fairly well in managing students' challenging behaviour. Classroom teachers are closely followed by subject teachers (M=51.2). On the other hand, Special needs teachers had the lowest mean (M=30.0) of the categories. This is surprising but may be due to the fact that special teachers are dealing with children who have more severe problems on average and also do not have the same authority over entire classes as classroom teachers.

In terms of the differences between school districts, the result (Table 4.30) showed that teachers from Samutprakarn (rural) district had a higher mean score (M=57.1) for perception of effectiveness of the behaviour management strategies used to address students' challenging behaviour. This variation can be explained by the apparent differences in the school ecology between rural Thai schools and their urban counterparts in terms of their structural, cultural and political systems, as explained by Hoy and Miskel (2008). In addition, it is likely that Thai teachers in the rural areas played more active roles in the classroom ecology which enabled students to show preference for alternative behaviours (see Arthur-Kelly, et al., 2003). This could be attributed perhaps to the fact that school children in non-urban areas, who are still living more traditional lifestyles, listen more easily to teachers'

instructions, than those in the city area and perhaps there was a greater cooperation between the school and parents with familial collaboration that makes behaviour interventions used by rural schools more successful (Bambara, Goh, Kern, & Caskie, 2012; Fox, Dunlap, & Powell, 2002). On the other hand, teachers from Bangkok district had a lower mean score (M=46.8) for the perception of effectiveness of management strategies used compared to those teachers from Samutprakarn. This could be due to the general characteristics of students from Bangkok schools who had greater exposure to city life and perhaps less parental coercion on their perceived challenging behaviour displayed in schools, beyond easy control of their teachers and consequently creates behaviour control issues for their teachers. This kind of experience by urban Thai teachers may influence their responses in this study, and it has also been revealed in other studies (Blankenship, 1988; Griffith, Steptoe, & Cropley, 1999; Ministry of Education, 1989; Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, & Proller, 1988) that both new and experienced teachers do suffer stress and burnout as a result of the negative effect of students' challenging behaviour.

5.9 Limitations of the Study

This research study, like all others, has some limitations.

First, the objective of gathering data from a large number of schools across several districts in Thailand was not achieved as it became impracticable due to time and financial constraints. Therefore, data were gathered from a limited number of schools (10 schools in two districts). This limitation means that the results cannot be generalised across Thailand.

It would have been useful to observe classrooms to assess how teachers manage behaviours. However, the time and financial constraints limited the possibility of carrying out direct observation of teachers' classroom practices, which would have provided very rich data.

5.10 Areas for Further Research

The outcome of this investigation is alluding to an urgent need for an extensive investigation where people can research into what can be done to arrest the growing problem of students' challenging behaviour in the classroom. In this regard, broad studies using different data collection methods to gather information about behaviours of concerns, strategies to manage these behaviours, perceptions of their effectiveness and actual classroom practices are warranted. This would enable educators and the Ministry of Education to better understand the reasons why some students engage in problem behaviours and what could be done to improve these behaviours. The following research areas are suggested for further studies:

- A national study exploring the strategies used by Thai teachers to manage students' challenging behaviours, which should include classroom observations
- A comparative analysis of effectiveness of behaviour strategies used by Thai teachers in managing children's challenging behaviour
- An investigation of parental roles in collaboration with schools towards subduing children's challenging behaviours in Thailand schools
- An evaluation of training needs of Thai teachers in relation to managing students' challenging behaviour in schools

- An exploration of the gender ratio of the prevalence of challenging behaviours in Thai schools.

5.11 Conclusion

This study set out to explore behaviours of concern to teachers in Thailand schools, and strategies used in managing challenging behaviour, as well as the teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of these strategies.

The findings were that behaviours such as Inattention, Physical aggression, Non-compliance and Off-task were considered those of most concern. Teachers also used High-five, Thumbs-up, and Stickers strategies more than others and considered the strategies such as Verbal praise and use of Stickers more effective than all other strategies. The behaviours which teachers felt were difficult to manage were Inattention and Physical aggression. The findings showed that background variables such as of lack of training in special education, low qualifications, age, limited years of teaching experience, religion as well as students' characteristics such as students' disabilities, familiar issues and students' district influenced teacher's responses.

The findings showed that teachers' efforts to stem these problem behaviours are constrained by their school's policy, Thai societal norms and values, as well as the Ministry of Education code of conduct and limited training.

Therefore the existing approaches to handling students' behavioural problems by teachers need to be revamped in an attempt to make them effective. First, there is a need for the

Ministry of Education and schools to put in place policies or behaviour management frameworks that embody evidence-based behavioural management practices such as School-wide Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) systems, while de-emphasising the use of reactive or non-evidence-based approaches. Hence schools need to create an enabling environment that would facilitate teachers' capacities to address students' challenging behaviour more effectively.

Secondly, the Ministry of Education needs to provide better training to up-skill teachers in order to improve their practices around managing problem behaviours. This implies that schools need to put in place programs for regular training for teachers about management of students' challenging behaviours. This would raise the quality of teaching and learning, ensure safety of students and staff, and bring about a great reduction in time wasted in addressing behaviour issues in Thailand schools.

References

Abramson, J.H., & Abramson, Z.H. (1999). *Survey Methods in Community Medicine*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.

Achenbach, T.M., Hensley, V.R., Phares, V., & Grayson, D. (1988). Problems and competencies reported by parents of Australian and American children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 31*, 265–286.

Adelinis, J.D., Piazza, C.C., & Goh, H.L. (2001). Treatment of multiply controlled destructive behavior with food reinforcement. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 34,* 97–100.

Akin-Little, K., Eckert, T., Lovett, B., & Little, S. (2004). Extrinsic reinforcement in the classroom: Bribery or best practice. *School Psychology Review 33,* 344–362.

Alberto, P.A., & Troutman, A.C. (2006). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Alberto, P.A., & Troutman, A.C. (2003). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Algozzine, B., & Algozzine, K. (2009). Facilitating academic achievement through schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, R. Horner, & G. Sugai (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 521–550). New York: Springer.

Al-Issa, S. (1982). *Culture and Psychopathology.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

American Psychiatric Association (APA) (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association (2000). Diagnostic and Statistical manual disorders (4th ed.) Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Amos, P.A. (2004). New considerations in the prevention of aversive, restraint, and seclusion: Incorporating the role of relationships into an ecological perspective. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities 29* (4), 263–272.

Aniftos, M., & McCluskie, L. (2002). *On track toward inclusive education*. Australia: University of Southern Queensland.

Apichatabutra, C. (2009). *The effects of function-based academic and behavior intervention on problem behaviors and reading performance for English language learners in a Thai elementary school.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Arbuckle, C., & Little, E. (2004). Teachers' perceptions and management of disruptive classroom behaviour during the middle years (years five to nine). *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology 4,* 59–70.

Arthur-Kelly, M. (2006). Positive behavior supports: Issues and practices. In I. Dempsey (Ed.), *Community Disability Services: An evidence-based approach to practice* (pp. 171–190). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Ashton, P.T., Web, R.B., & Doda, N. (1983). *A study of teachers' sense of efficacy* (Final report to the National Institute of Education, Executive Summary). Gainsville: University of Florida.

Assanangkornchai, S., Rerngpongpar, S., & Samangsri, N. (2010). Anxiolytic and hypnotic drug misuse in Thailand: findings from a national household survey. *Drug Alcohol Review. 29,* 101–111.

Atweh, B., Bland, D.C., Carrington, S.B., & Cavanagh, R. (2008, November). School disengagement: Its constructions, investigation and management. Paper presented at the AARE International Education Research Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia. Abstract retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/17737/.

Axup, T., & Gersch, I. (2008). The impact of challenging student behavior upon teachers' lives in a secondary school: Teachers' perceptions. *British Journal of Special Education 35*(3), 144–151.

Baba, C., & Tanaka-Matsumi, J. (2011). Positive behavior support for a child with inattentive behavior in a Japanese regular classroom. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 13*, 250–253.

Babbie, E.R. (2007). *The Basics of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Babinski, L.M., Hartsough, C.S., & Lambert, N.M. (1999). Childhood conduct problems, hyperactivity-impulsivity, and inattention as predictors of adult criminal activity. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 40,* 347–355.

Bambara, L.M., Goh, A., Kern, L., & Caskie, G. (2012). Perceived barriers and enablers to implementing individualized positive behavior interventions and supports in school settings. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 14,* 228–240.

Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. In Edwin A. Locke (Ed.). *The Blackwell Handbook of Principles of Organisational Behavior* (pp. 120–136). Malden, MA: Oxford University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control* (pp. 212–258). New York: Freeman. Retrieved from: *http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/banchapter6.html*

Banko, K.M., Cameron, J., & Pierce, W.D. (2001). Pervasive negative effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: The myth continues. *Behavior Analyst 24*, 1–44.

Barkley, R.A., Fischer, M., Smallish, L., & Fletcher, K. (2004). Young adult follow-up of hyperactive children: Antisocial activities and drug use. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 45,* 195–211.

Barkeley, R.A., DuPaul, G.J., & McMurray, M.B. (1990). A comprehensive evaluation of attention deficit disorder with and without hyperactivity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 58*, 775–789.

Barnhill, G.P. (2005). Functional behavioral assessment in schools. *Intervention in School and Clinic 40*(3), 131–43. Retrieved from: *http://www.neiu.edu/~gmoreno1/Special_Education__Courses_with_Dr._Moreno/Publications_files/Moreno_2011.pdf*

Barton, L.E., Brulle, A.R., & Repp, A.C. (1987). Effects of differential scheduling of time-out to reduce maladaptive responding. *Exceptional Children 53*(4), 351–356.

Beaman, R., & Wheldall, K. (2000). Teachers' use of approval and disapproval in the classroom. *Educational Psychology 20,* 431–446.

Benazzi, L., Horner, R., & Good, R. (2006). Effects of behavior support team composition on the technical adequacy and contextual fit of behavior support plans (Electronic version). *The Journal of Special Education 40*(3), 160–170. Retrieved from: *http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2008/2008husetc.pdf*

Bender, W.N., Vail, C.O., & Scott, K. (1995). Teachers' attitudes toward increased mainstreaming: Implementing effective instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities 28*(2), 87–94.

Bender, W.N., & Smith, J.K. (1990). Classroom behaviour of children and adolescents with learning disabilities: A meta analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities 23*, 298–305.

Bhatnagar, N., & Das, A. (2013). Nearly two decades after the implementation of Persons with Disabilities Act: Concerns of Indian teachers to implement inclusive education. *International Journal of Special Education* 28, (2) 1–12.

Blankenship, C. (1988). Structuring the classroom for success. *Australian Journal of Special Education 12*, 25–30.

Blasé, J. (1986). A qualitative analysis of sources of teacher stress: Consequences for performance. *American Educational Research Journal 23* (1), 13–40.

Bond, L., Butler, H., & Thomas, L. et al., (2007). Social and school connectedness in early secondary school as predictors of late teenage substance use, mental health and academic outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Health 40*(4), 357. e9 -18.

Boone, Von Brock, M., & Ellior, S.N. (1987). Influence of treatment effectiveness information on the acceptability of classroom interventions. *Journal of School Psychology 25*(2), 131–144. doi: 10.1016/0022-4405(87)90022-7.

Bowers, L., Van, D.M., Nijman, H., Hamilton, B., Noorthorn, E., Stewart, D., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2010). The practice of seclusion and time-out on English acute psychiatric wards: The city-128 study. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing 24*(4), 275–286.

Braaten, S., Simpson, R., Rosell, J., & Reilly, T. (1988). Using punishment with exceptional children: A dilemma for educators. *Teaching Exceptional Children 20*(2), 79–81.

Bradshaw, C.P., Koth, C.W., Thorntorn, L.A., & Leaf, P.J. (2009). Altering school climate through Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support: Findings from a

group-randomized effectiveness trial. *Prevention Science 10*, 100–115. Retrieved from: *http://www.nasponline.org/publications/spr/pdf/spr383bradshaw.pdf*

Bradley, D.F., Pauley, J.A., & Pauley, J.F. (2005). Effective classroom management: Six keys to success. Rowman & Littlefield Education. Retrieved from: *http://www.academicleadership.org/article/The_influence_of_assertive_classroom_management_strategy_use_on_student-teacher_pedagogical_skills*.

Burden, P.R. (2003). *Classroom management: Creating a successful learning community* (2nd ed). New York: Wiley. Retrieved from: *http://www.academicleadership.org/pdf/ALJ_ISSN1533-7812_8_2_418.pdf*

Burns, J., & Hickie, I. (2002). Depression in young people: A national school-based initiative for prevention, early intervention and pathways for care. *Australasian Psychiatry 10*(2), 134–138.

Byrne, D., & Clore, G.L. (1973) A reinforcement model of evaluative processes. *Personality: An International Journal 1,* 103–28.

Caldwell, B.J. (1998). Strategic leadership resources management and effective school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration 36*(5), 445–461.

Cameron, J., Banko, K., & Pierce, W. (2001). Pervasive negative effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: The myth continues. *Behavior Analyst 24*, 1–44.

Campbell, S.B. (1990). *Behavior problems in preschool children*. New York: Guilford Press.

Cangelosi, J. S. (2004). *Classroom management strategies: Gaining and maintaining students' cooperation* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1993). *Behaviour Management in the Middle School Classroom: A Teacher's Guide to Meeting the Special Challenges of Each Individual*. Bristol: Behaviour Management.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1992). *Assertive Discipline: Positive Discipline for Today's Classrooms*. Santa Monica: Lee Canter Associates.

Canter, L. (1976). *Assertive discipline: A take-charge approach for today's educator*. Seal Beach: Canter and Associates.

Carr, E.G., Dunlap, G., Horner, R.H., Koegel, R.L., Turnbull, A.P., & Sailor, W. (2002). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*. 4, 4-16.

Carter, M., Clayton, M.J., & Stephenson, J. (2007). "Students with Severe Challenging Behaviour in Regular Classrooms: Support and Impacts." *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling 18* (2), 141–159.

Chafouleas, S., Hagermoser L., Jaffery, R., & Fallon, L. (2012). An evaluation of a classwide intervention package involving self-management and a group contingency on classroom behaviour of middle school students. *Journal of Behavioural Education, 21*(1), 34–57.

Chalk, K., & Bizo, L. (2004). Specific praise improves on-task behaviour and numeracy enjoyment: A study of year four pupils engaged in the numeracy hour. *Educational Psychology in Practice 20,* 335–351.

Charles, C.M. (1996). *Building classroom discipline: From models to practice* (4th edition). New York: Longman, Inc.

Charles, C.M. (2008). *Building classroom discipline* (9th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Charles, C.M., & Senter, G .W. (2005). *Elementary classroom management* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Chitiyo, M., & Wheeler, J.J. (2009). Challenges faced by school teachers in implementing positive behavior support in their school systems. *Remedial and Special Education 20*, 58–63.

Christensen, L., Young, K., & Marchant, M. (2004). The effects of peer-mediated positive behaviour support program on socially appropriate classroom behaviour. *Education and Treatment of Children 27*(3), 199–234.

Chudgar, A., & Sankar, V. (2008). The relationship between teacher gender and student achievement: Evidence from five Indian states. *Compare 38*(5), 627–642.

Classroom Token Economy: Antecedent Interventions, Classroom Interventions for Children with Attention Deficit Disorder. Retrieved from: *http://members.tripod.com/PoPsMin/classtokenecon.html*.

Clayton, M.J., & Stephenson, et al. (2008). "Students with Severe Challenging Behaviour in Regular Classrooms: Support and Impacts." *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling 18*(2), 141–159.

Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., Vigdor, J.L., & Wheeler, J. (2006). High Poverty Schools and the Distribution of Principals and Teachers. Sanford Institute Working Paper.

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology 28,* 693–710.

Coates, R.D. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities 22*, 532–536.

Cohen-Cole, L. (2002). Restraint and seclusion: Iatrogenic trauma comes out of the closet. *National Assistance Center Networks*, Summer/Fall, 5–6.

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences* (Rev. Ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1995). Research Methods in Education. London: Routledge.

Colvin, G. (2004). *Managing the cycle of acting-out behavior in the classroom*. Eugene, OR: Behavior Associates.

Colvin, G., Sugai, G., & Patching, W. (1993). Precorrection: An instructional strategy for managing predictable behavior problems. *Intervention 28,* 143–150.

Conroy, M.A., Clark, D., Fox, J.J., & Gable, R.A. (2000). Building competencies in FBA: Are we headed in the right direction? *Preventing School Failure 44,* 169–173.

Conway, R. (2005). Students with emotional and behavioral disorders: An Australian perspective. *Preventing School Failure 50,* 15–20. Retrieved from: *http://www.newcastle.edu.au/Resources/Research%20Centres/SORTI/Journals/AJEDP/Vol%2010/V10o'neill.Stephenson.pdf*

Conway, R. (2002). Behaviour in and out of the classroom. In Ashman, A.F. & Elkins, J. (Eds.). *Educating Children with Diverse Abilities*. (pp.172-236) Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Conway, R. N. F. (2006). Students with emotional and behavioural disorders: An Australian perspective. *Preventing School Failure*, 50, 15-20.

Cooke, B. (1995). A quality classroom: Quality teaching tools that facilitate student success. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the NISOD International Conference on Teaching Excellence (Austin, TX, May 23). Available at: *http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Classroom_Management_Theories_and_Theories/William_Glasser.*

Cornish, L., & Garner, J. (2008). *Promoting Student Learning.* Australia: Pearson.

Costenbader, V. & Markso, S. (1997). School suspension: A study with secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology 36*(1), 59–82.

Cotton, K. (2001). Schoolwide and classroom discipline. School Improvement Research Series. Retrieved from: *http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/5/cu9.html*

Council for Exceptional Children (2009). *Bright Futures for Exceptional Learners. An Action Agenda to achieve Quality Conditions for Teaching and Learning*. Reston. VA: CEC.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Available at: *http://www.personal.psu.edu/users/w/x/wxh139/grounded.htm*

Crone, D., Hawken, L., & Horner (2010). *Responding to problem behaviour in schools. The Behaviour Education Program* (2nd Edition). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Crone, D.A., & Horner, R.H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools: Functional behavioral assessment.* New York: Guilford Press.

Cuenin, L.H., & Harris, K.R. (1986). Planning, implementing, and evaluating time-out interventions with exceptional students. *Teaching Exceptional Children 18*, 272–276.

Daksinganadhikorn, P. (1973). *Buddhism* (2nd edn, revised). Bangkok: World Fellowship of Buddhists.

Davis, J.E., & Jordan, W.J. (1994). The effects of school context, structure, and experiences on African American males in middle and high schools. *Journal of Negro Education 63*, 570–587.

Deci, E.L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R.M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin 125*, 627–668.

Deci, E.L., & Cascio, W.F. (1972). Changes in intrinsic motivation as a function of negative feedback and threats. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Dempsey, I., & Arthur-Kelly, M. (2007). *Maximising learning outcomes in diverse classrooms*. Melbourne: Thomson Learning.

Department for Education (1994a). Pupil Behaviour and Discipline (Circular 8/94). London: DfE.

Department of Health (2008). Clean, safe care: reducing infections and saving lives. London: Department of Health.

De Vaus, D.A. (2002). *Surveys in Social Research* (5th edition). Crows Nest, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

DeVoe, J.F., Peter, K., Kaufman, P., Miller, A., Noonan, M., Snyder, T.D., & Baum, K. (2004). Indicators of school crime and safety: 2004 (U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, NCES 2005-002/NCJ 205290). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

DeVries, R., & Zan, B. (1994). *Moral classrooms, moral children: Creating a constructivist atmosphere in early education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

De Zubicaray, G., & Clair, A. (1998). An evaluation of differential reinforcement of other behavior, differential reinforcement of incompatible behavior, and restitution for the management of aggressive behaviors. *Behavioral Interventions 13*(3), 157–168.

Dillman, A. (2000). The Role of Behavioral Survey Methodologists in National Statistical Agencies. *International Statistical Review 68*(2), 199–220.

DiLorenzo, T.M., & Ollendick, T.H. (1986). Behaviour modification: Punishment. In R.P. Barrett (Ed.). *Severe behaviour disorders in the mentally retarded: Non drug approaches to treatment*. (pp. 27-60) New York: Plenum Press.

Ding, M., Li, Y., Li, X., & Kulm, G. (2008). Chinese teachers' perceptions of students' classroom misbehavior. *Educational Psychology 28*(3), 305–324.

Dinkmeyer, D., McKay, G.D., & Dinkmeyer, D. Jr. (1989). *Parenting Young Children: Helpful strategies based on systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) for Parents of Children Under Six.* Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Division for Early Childhood (1999). Concept paper on the identification of and intervention with challenging behaviours. Available at: *http://www.dec-sped.org*

Dodge, K.A. (1993). The future of research on the treatment of conduct disorder. *Development and Psychopathology 5*, 311–319.

Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., & Pettit, G.S. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science 250*, 1678–1683.

Doyle, W. (1989). Classroom management techniques. In Oliver C. Moles (Ed.), Strategies to reduce students misbehaviour (pp. 31–62). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement,.

Draguns, J.G. (1973). Comparison of psychopathology across cultures: Findings, directions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 4*, 9–47.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B.B., & Pepper, F.C. (1982). Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins. Available at: *http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Classroom_Management_Theories_and_Theories/Rudolf_Dreikurs*

Dunham, J. (1984). *Stress in Teaching*. London: Croom-Helm. Available at: *http://blog.naver.Com/PostView.nhn?blogId=teentopia&logNo=10016731893&redirect=Dlog&widgetTypeCall=true.*

Dunlap, G., Ostryn, C., & Fox, L. (2011). Preventing the use of Restraint and Seclusion with Young Children: The Role of Effective, Positive Practices. *Young Children 13*, 48–52.

Dunlap, G., Blair, K., Umbreit, J., & Jung, G. (2007). Promoting inclusion and peer participation through assessment-based intervention. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 27(3), 134–147.

Dunlap, G., Fox, L., Hemmeter, M.L., Joseph, G.E., & Strain, P.S. (2003). The teaching pyramid: A model for supporting social competence and preventing challenging behaviour in young children. *Young Children* (July), 48–52.

Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Knoster, T., Fox, L., Anderson, J., & Albin, R. W. (2000). Essential elements of inservice training in positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 2*, 22–32.

Durrant, E. (2010). *Positive Discipline for Teaching and Classroom Management: Guideline for Teachers and Educational Administrators*. Bangkok: Hodder. Agricultural Credit Cooperative of Thailand Limited. Educational System in Thailand. Available at: *http://www.thaifarang.com/education/system.html*

Edwards, C., & Watts, V. (2008). Classroom discipline and management. Milton: John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd. Available at: *http://humanism.wikispaces.com/Humanism+and+Non-directive+intervention+Theory*

Egyed, C.J., & Short, R.J. (2006). Teacher self-efficacy, burnout, experience and decision to refer a disruptive student. *School Psychology International 27*(4), 462–474.

Ekstrom, R.B., Goertz, M.E., Pollack, J.M., & Rock, D.A (1986). Who drops out and why? Findings from a national study. *Teachers College Record 87*, 356–373.

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C., & Gallop, A.M. (1996). The third Phi Delta Kappa poll of attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan 78*, 244–250.

Elkins, J. & Izard, J. (1992). *Student behaviour problems: context, initiatives and programs*. Hawthorn, Vic: ACER.

Elton Report (1989). Discipline in Schools. Available at: *http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/elton/elton17.html.*

Emerson, E. (1995). *Challenging Behavior Analysis and Intervention in People with Learning Difficulties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: *http://apt.rcpsych.org/content/7/2/109.full*.

Emerson, E., Moss, S.C., & Kiernan, C.K. (1999). The relationship between challenging behaviour and psychiatric disorders in people with severe intellectual disabilities. In N. Bouras (Ed.). *Psychiatric and Behavioural Disorders in Mental Retardation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: *http://www.thecbf.org.uk/chall-behaviour/health-chall.htm*

Ervin, R.A., Kern, L., Clarke, S., Dunlap, G., & Friman, P.C. (2000). Evaluating assessment-based intervention strategies with ADHD and comorbid disorders within the natural classroom context. *Journal of Behavioural Disorders 25,* 344–358. Retrieved from: *http://www.ccbd.net/sites/default/files/BD2032-03-158.pdf*

Evans, J., Harder, A., Thomas, J., & Benefield, P. (2003). Support for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD) in mainstream primary classrooms: A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions. In Research evidence in education library. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.

Ewing, C.P. (2000). Sensible zero tolerance protects students. Harvard Education Letter. Retrieved July 21, 2004, from: *http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/2000-jf/zero.shtml*

Fantuzzo, J.W., Rohrbeck, C.A., Hightower, A.D., & Work, W.C. (1991). Teachers' Use and Children's Preferences of Rewards in Elelmentary School. *Psychology in the Schools 28*(2), 175–181. EJ 430 936.

Farmer, C.A., & Aman, M.G. (2009). Development of the children's scale of hostility and aggression: Reactive/Proactive (C-SHARP). Research in Developmental Disabilities 30, 1155–1167. Available at: *http://dcautismparents.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/ABA_12.9261527.pdf*.

Farmer, G.L. (1999). Disciplinary Practices and Perceptions of School Safety. *Journal of Social Services Review 26*(1), 1–38.

Finch, A.J., Nelson, W.M., & Ott, E.S. (1993). *Cognitive-behavioral procedures with children and adolescents: A practical guide*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Firestone, P. (1976). The effects and side effects of timeout on an aggressive nursery school child. *Journal of Behavior Therapy 7*(1), 79–81.

Flannery, K.B., & Sugai, G. (2010). School-wide PBIS implementation in high schools: Current practice and future directions. OSEP Technical Assistance Centre on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. *http://pbis.org/school/high_school_pbis.aspx*

Fleming, L. (1994). Assertive Discipline: An Evaluation of the Short-term Effects on Whole-school Policy and Classroom Practice. University of East London: Department of Psychology. Retrieved from: *http://blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=teentopia&logNo=10016731893&redirect=Dlog&widgetTypeCall=true*

Foderaro, L.W. (2002). Violence Is a Symptom of Youth Centre's Struggles. New York Times, February 15. Available at: *http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.htm/?res=9A05E4DF153FF936A25751CA09649C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all*

Fowler, F.J. (2002). *Survey research methods*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA:.

Frankland, H.C., Edmonson, H., & Turnbull, A.P. (2001). Positive behavioral support: Family, school, and community partnerships. *Beyond Behavior 10*(4), 7–9.

Fraser, M.W., Nash, J.K., Galinsky, M.J., & Darwin, K.E. (2001). *Making choices: Social problem-solving skills for children.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Gardiner, H.W. & Suttipan, C.S. (1977). Parental tolerance of aggression: Perceptions of preadolescents in Thailand. *Psychologia 20*, 28–32.

Gardiner, H.W. (1968). Expression of anger among Thais: Some preliminary findings. *Psychologia 11*, 221–228.

Gary, P. (2001). Student suspensions: The influence on students and their parents. *Australian Journal of Education 45*, 323–340.

Geving, A.M. (2007). Identifying the types of student and teacher behavior associated with teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education 23*, 624–640.

George, H.P., Harrower, J.K., & Knoster, T. (2003). School-wide prevention and early intervention: A process for establishing a system of school-wide behavior support. *Preventing School Failure 47*, 170–176.

Gershoff, E.T. (2008). *Report on physical punishment in the United States: What research tells us about its effects on children*. Columbus, OH: Center for Effective Discipline.

Gilmore, L., Campbell, J., & Cuskelly, M. (2003). Developmental expectations, personality stereotypes, and attitudes towards inclusive education: Community and teacher views of Down syndrome. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education 50*(1), 65–76. Retrieved from: *http://eprints.qut.edu.au/4307/1/4307.pdf*

Glasberg, B., Martins, M., & Harris, S.L. (2006). Stress and coping among family members of individuals with autism. In G. Baron, G. Groden, J. Groden, & L. Lipsett (Eds.), *Stress and Coping in Autism* (pp. 227–301). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Glasser, W. (1998*) Choice Theory in the Classroom. A new psychology of personal freedom.* New York: Harper Collins. Available from: http://www.youngminds.org.uk/training_services/young_minds_in schools/sen/perspectives on behaviour.

Gottfredson, D.G., Karweit, N.L., & Gottfredson, G.D. (1989). *Reducing disorderly behavior in middle schools.* Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, John Hopkins University.

Green, C.L., Walker, J.M.T., Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Sandler, H.M (2008). Parents' motivations for involvement in children's education: An empirical test of a theoretical model of parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology 99*, 532–544.

Gresham, F.M., Watson, T.S., & Skinner, C.H. (2001). Functional behavioral assessment: Principles, procedures and future directions. *School Psychology Review 30*(2), 156–72. Retrieved from: *http://www.neiu.edu/~gmoreno1/Special_Education__Courses_with_Dr._Moreno/Publications_files/Moreno_2011.pdf*.

Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 69*, 517–531.

Hallinger, P., Chantarapanya, P., Sriboonma, U., & Kantamara, P. (1999). The Challenge of Educational Reform in Thailand: Jing Jai, Jing Jung, Nae Norrn. In T. Townsend and Y.C. Cheng (Eds.). Educational change and development in the Asia-Pacific region: Challenges for the future. (pp. 207-226) Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitsinger.

Hansen, S.D., & Lignugaris-Kraft, B. (2005). Effects of a dependent group contingency on the verbal interactions of middle school students with emotional disturbance. *Behaviour Disorders 30*, 170–184.

Harackiewicz, J.M. (1979). The effects of reward contingency and performance feedback on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37*, 1352–1363.

Harris, J. (1996). Physical restraint procedures for managing challenging behaviours presented by mentally retarded adults and children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities 17*, 2, 99–134.

Harris, J., Allen, D., Cornick, M., Jefferson, A., & Mills, R. (1996). Physical Interventions a Policy Framework. Kidderminster. British Institute of Learning Disabilities (BILD). Retrieved from: *http://www.thecbf.org.uk/chall-behaviour/physic-inter.htm*

Harris, J., Cook, M., & Upton, G. (1996). *Pupils with severe learning disabilities who present challenging behaviour.* Kidderminster, Worcs: BILD.

Harris, K.R. (1985). Definitional, parametric, and procedural considerations in time-out interventions and research. *Exceptional Children 51(*4), 279–288.

Harris, P.L., & Nunez, M. (1996). Understanding of permission rules by pre-school children. Child Development 67, 1572-1591. Retrieved from: *http://www.psych.ucsb.edu/research/cdl/publications/PDFs/German_Nichols_2003.pdf.*

Hayes, P., & Noonan, P. (2008). Best practice or better practice: Challenging the paradigm of teacher professional development. *The Australian Educational Leader 30*(2), 19–24. Retrieved from: *http://search.informit.com.au.ezproxy.une.edu.au/fullText;res=AEIPT;dn=170681*

Hayward, A. (2002). Good practice guidelines for learning support units. United Kingdom: Department for Education and Skills. Retrieved from: *https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Learning-Support-Units.pdf*

Hawkins, R.P., Peterson, R.F., Schweid, E., & Bijou, S.W. (1966). Behavior therapy in the home: Amelioration of problem parent–child relations with the parent in a therapeutic role. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 4*(1), 99–107.

Heaviside, S., Rowand, C., Williams, C., & Farris, E. (1998). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools: 1996–97* (NCES 98-030). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Centre for Education Statistics.

Heckaman, K., Conroy, M., Fox, J., & Chait, A. (2000). Functional assessment-based intervention research on students with or at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders in school settings. *Behavioral Disorders 25*, 196–210.

Hemphill, S.A., Toumbourou, J.W., Smith, R., Kendall, G., Rowland, B., Freiberg, K., & Williams, J. (2010). Are rates of school suspension higher in socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods? An Australian study. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia 21*(1), 12–18.

Hemphill, S., & Hargreaves, J. (2009). The impact of school suspensions: A student wellbeing issue. ACHPER Healthy Lifestyles Journal 56 (3/4), 5–11

Herrera, M., & Little, E. (2005). Behavior problems across home and kindergarten in an Australian sample. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology 5*, 77–90.

Hester, M., Westmarland, N., Pearce, J., & Williamson, E. (2008). Early Evaluation of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004, Ministry of Justice Research Series 14/08.

Hoepfl, M.C. (1997, Fall). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology 9*, 12–39.

Horner, R.H., Carr, E.G., Strain, P.S., Todd, A.W., & Reed, H.K. (2002). Problem behavior interventions for young children with autism: A research synthesis. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders 32* (5), 423–446.

Horner, R.H., & Sugai, G., & Horner, H.F.(2000). A school wide approach to student discipline. *The School Administrator 2*(57), 20–23.

Howard, S. & Johnson, B.(2002). Resilient teachers: Resisting stress and burnout. Proceeedings of Australian Association for Research in Education Conference. Retrieved from: *http://www.aare.edu.au/08pap/moo08423.pdf*

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (2008). *Educational administration: theory, research, and practice.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Hyman, I.A., Stefkovich, J.A., & Taich, S. (2002). Paddling and pro-paddling polemics: Refuting nineteenth century pedagogy. *Journal of Law and Education 3*(1), 74–84.

Iemsupasith, S. (2000). *Theories and Techniques in Behavior Modification*. (4th ed.). Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Publishing.

Ingersoll, R.M., & Smith, T.M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership 60*(8), 30–33.

Irish National Teachers Organisation (2002). *Discipline in the Primary School*. Dublin: INTO.

Irish National Teachers Organisation (2000). *Early Years Learning*. Dublin: INTO

Jefferies, R., Hollowell, M. & Powell, T. (2004). Urban American Indian students in a non-punitive alternative high school. *American Secondary Education 32*(2), 63–78.

Jumsai, M.L. (1980). *Understanding Thai Buddhism*. Bangkok: Chalermnit Press.

Kaiser, B., & Rasminsky J.S. (1999). *Early Childhood Program*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Child Care Federation.

Kaiser, B., & Rasminsky, J.S. (2007). Challenging behavior in young children: Understanding, preventing, and responding effectively (2nd ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. Retrieved from: *http://www.ksre.k-state.edu/library/fanlf2/mf28442.pdf*

Kalish, H.I. (1981). *From Behavioral Science to Behavioral Modification*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Available at: *http://markettorrent.com/topic/9647?page=21*.

Kane, D. (1985). *Doing your own Research*. Great Britain: Marion Boyars Publishers.

Kannikar, P., Prapin, V., & Usa, S. (2007). International Institute for Educational Planning, 2007. Available at: *http://unesdoc.Unesco.org/images/0015/001501/150157e.pdf*.

Kanut, T. (2009). *Classroom Management: Happiness Classroom*. Bangkok: Phetkhasem offset.

Kazdin, A.E. (1980). Acceptability of time out from reinforcement procedures for disruptive child behavior. *Behavior Therapy 11*(3), 329–344.

Kazdin, A. (1993). Adolescent mental health: Prevention and treatment programs. *American Psychologist 48*, 127–141.

Klass, C.S., Guskin, K.A., & Thomas, M. (1995). The early childhood program: Promoting children's development through and within relationships. *Zero to Three 16*, 9–17.

Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by Rewards: the Troubled with Gold Stars, Incentive Plans, A's, Praise, and Other Bribes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kowalski, R.M. (2003*). Complaining, teasing, and other annoying behaviors.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kurcinka, M.S. (1998). *Raising your spirited child*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Kurcinka, M., & Sheedy, (1992). Raising your spirited child: A guide for parents whose child is more intense, sensitive, perceptive, persistent, energetic. New York: Harper-Collins.

Kuyini, A.B., & Desai, I. (2007). Principals' and teachers' attitudes and knowledge of inclusive education as predictors of effective teaching practices in Ghana. *Journal of Research in Special Needs Education* 7(2), 104–113. Available at: *http://www.ejbss.com/Data/Sites/1/septemberissue/ejbss-12-1151-effectiveteachingpractices.pdf*

Kuyini A.B. & Desai, I. (2008). Providing instruction to students with special needs in inclusive classrooms in Ghana: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Wholeschooling, 4*(1), 22–38.

Lane, K.L., & Beebe-Frankenberger, M. (2005). *School-based intervention: the tool you need to succeed.* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Lane, K.L., & Beebe-Frankenberger, M. (2004). *School-based interventions: The tools You need to succeed.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Lane, K.L., & Carter, E.W. (2006). Supporting transition-age youth with and at risk for emotional and behavioural disorders at the secondary level: A need for further inquiry. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioural Disorders 14*(2), 66–70.

Lane, K.L., Gresham, F.M., & O'Shaugnessy, T.E. (2002). Serving students with or at-risk for emotional and behavioral disorders: Future challenges. *Education and Treatments of Children 25* (4), 507–521.

Laitsch, D. (2006). Student Behaviors and Teacher Use of Approval versus Disapproval. *Research Brief 4*(3), 27 March.

Lassen, S.R., Steele, M.M., & 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.

Lazear, E. (2001). Educational Production. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 777–803.

Lee, R., McComas, J.J., & Jawor, J. (2002). The effects of differential and lag reinforcement schedules on varied verbal responding by individuals with autism. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis 35,* 391–402.

Lehr, C.A., Sinclair, M.F., & Christenson, S.L. (2004). Addressing Student Engagement and Turancy Prevention During the Elementary Years: A Replication Study of the Check and Connect Model. *Journal of Education for students Placed At Risk 9*(3), 279–301.

Lepper, M.R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R.E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 28*, 129–137.

Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers' support for inclusive forms of classroom management. *International Journal of Inclusive Education 3*, 269–285.

Lewis,T.J. (1997). Teaching students with behavioral difficulties. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. Available at: *http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/student_conduct/appendices.pdf*

Liamputtong, P. (2010). *Research methods in health: foundations for evidence based practice.* Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Little, E. (2005). Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Problem Behaviours. *Educational Psychology 25*(4), 369–377.

Little, M., & Robinson, S. (1997). Renovating and refurbishing the field experience structures for novice teachers, *Journal of Learning Disabilities 30,* 433–441.

Lo, Y., & Cartledge, G. (2004). Total class peer-tutoring and interdependent group oriented contingency: Improving the academic and task related behaviours of fourth-grade urban students. *Education & Treatment of Children 27*(3), 235–262.

López, J.M., Santiago, M.J., Godás, A., Castro, C., Villardefrancos, E., & Ponte, D. (2008). An integrative approach to burnout in secondary school teachers: Examining the role of student disruptive behavior and disciplinary issues. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy 8*(2), 85–96.

Loukas, A., Roalson, L.A. & Herrera, D.E. (2010). School connectedness buffers the effects of negative family relations and poor effortful control on early adolescent conduct problems. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 20, 13-22.

Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Dally, K. & Clement, N. (2009). *Project to test and measure the impact of values education on student effects and school ambience.* Final Report for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) by The University of Newcastle. Canberra: DEEWR. Retrieved from: *http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Project_to_Test_and Measure_the_Impact_of_Values_Education.pdf*

Maag, J.W. (2001). Rewards by punishment: Reflections of the disuse of positive reinforcement in schools. *Exceptional Children 67*(20), 173–186).

Maag, J.W., & Katsiyannis, A. (2006). Behavioral intervention plans: Legal and practical considerations for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders 31, 348–362. Retrieved from: *http://www.newcastle.edu.au/Resources/Research%20Centres/SORTI/Journals/AJEDP/ Vol%2010/V10_o'neill_stephenson.pdf*

Male, D.B., & May, D.S. (1997a). Stress, burnout and workload in teachers of children with severe learning difficulties. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities 25*, 117–21.

Male, D.B., & May, D.S. (1997b). Stress, burnout and workload in teachers of children with special educational needs. *British Journal of Special Education 24*(3), 133–40.

Marsella, A.J. (1979). Cross-cultural studies of mental disorders. In Marsella, A.J., Tharp, R.G., & Cibrowski, T.J. (Eds.), Perspectives, a cross- cultural psychological. (pp. 233-257). New York: Academic Press.

Martin, G., & Pear, J. (2007). *Behavior modification: What it is and how to do it* (8th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Martin, G., & Pear, J. (2003). Behavior Modification: What It Is and How To Do It (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Martin, K. A., Moritz, S. E., & Hall, C. R (1999). An applied model of mental imagery use in sport: a literature review and applied model. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 245-268.

Martin, W. (1988). Control theory: Applications to middle-level school environments. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Massey, T., Boroughs, M., & Armstrong, K. (2007). School Violence Interventions in the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative. *Journal of School Violence, 6*(2), 57–74.

Mastropieri, M.A., Scruggs, T.E., Mohler, L., Branek, M., Boon, R., Spencer, V., & Talbott, E. (2001). Can middle school students with serious reading difficulties help each other learn anything? Learning Disabilities Research & Practice 66, 18–27. *http://scholars.indstate.edu/bitstream/10484/3857/1/Investigation%20of%20Instructional%20Reading%20Strategies%20Professional%20Development%20and%20Training-Neal%20Brown%20III.pdf*

Matson, J.L., & Boisjoli, J.A. (2007). Multiple versus single maintaining factors of challenging behaviours as assessed by the QABF for adults with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability 32*, 39–44.

Matson, J.L., & Nebel-Schwalm, M. (2007). Assessing challenging behaviours in children autism spectrum disorders: A review. *Research in Developmental Disabilities 28*, 567–579.

Mattison, R.E., Hooper, S.R., & Glassberg, L.A. (2002). Three-year course of learning disorders in special education students classified as behavioral disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 41*, 1454–1461.

Mayberry, M., & Stockard, J. (1992). Effective Educational Environment (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 350 674).

Mayer, G.R. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 28*(4), 467–478.

Mayer, G.R., & Sulzer-Azaroff, B. (2002).Interventions for Vandalism. In Stoner, G., Shinn, M.R., & Walker, H.M. (Eds.). *Interventions for achievement and behaviour problems* (monograph). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

McCarty C.A., Weisz, J.R., Wanitromanee, K., Eastman, K.L., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W., & Band, E.B. (1999). Culture, coping, and context: Primary and Secondary control among Thai and American youth. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 40,* 809–818.

McCormack, A. (1997). Classroom management problems, strategies and influences in physical education. *European Physical Education Review 3,* 102–115.

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,* 158–170.

McGee, J., Menolascino, F.J., Hobbs, D.C., & Menousek, P.E. (1987). *Gentle teaching: A non-aversive approach to helping persons with mental retardation.* New York: Human Sciences Press. Retrieved from: *http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1279770/pdf/jaba00018-0118.pdf*

McGuirk, P.M., & O'Neill, P. (2005). Using Questionnaires in Qualitative Human Geography. In: Hay, I. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography* (pp. 147-162). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

McInerney, D.M., & McInerney, V. (1998). *Educational Psychology: Constructed Learning* (2nd Edition). Australia: Prentice Hall. *http://educ-reality.com/behaviour-management-theories/.*

Metzler, C.W., Biglan, A., Rusby, J.C., & Sprague, J.R. (2001). Evaluation of a comprehensive behaviour management program to improve school-wide positive behaviour support. *Education & Treatment of Children 24*, 448–449.

Meyer, J. (1997). Early Steps in Research. Research Methods Tutorial. Available at: *http://www.camden.rutgers.edu/dept.pages/sociology/early.html*

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, A., Ferguson, E., & Byrne, I. (2000). Pupils' casual attributions for difficult classroom behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 70*(1), 85–96.

Miller, A.J., & Kratochwill, T.R. (1979). Reduction of frequent stomachache complaints by time-out. *Behavior Therapy 10*(2), 211–218. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7894(79)80038-6

Miller, D.N., George, M.P., & Fogt, J.B. (2005). Establishing and sustaining research-based practices at Centennial School: A descriptive case study of systemic change. *Psychology in Schools 42*(5), 553–567.

Miltenberger, G.R. (2008). *Behavior Modification: Principles and Procedures* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Miltenberger, R.G. (2004). *Behavior modification: Principles and procedures* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Ministry of Education. (1989). Teachers' stress in Victoria. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education (1997b). *The Experience from the Basic and Occupational Education and Training Programme.* Bangkok, Thailand: Thailand Ministry of Education.

Mooney, M., Dobia, B., Power, A., Watson, K., Barker, K., Yeung, A.S., Denham, A., McCloughan, G., & Schofield, J. (2008, November). Why positive behaviour for learning: The how's and why's of translating a US model for local sustainable education. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, Australia. Abstract retrieved from: *http://www.aare.edu.au/08pap/moo08423.pdf*

Moore, P., Robertson, R., Maggin, D., Oliver, R., & Wehby, J. (2010). Using teacher praise and opportunities to respond to promote appropriate student behaviour. *Preventing School Failure 54*(3), 172–178.

Morris, R., & Howard, A. (2003). Designing and Effective In-school Suspension Program. *The Clearing House 76*(3), 156–159.

Moyer, J.R., & Dardig, J.C. (1978). Practical task analysis for special educators. *Teaching Exceptional Children 11(*1), 16–18.

Muscott, H., Mann, E., & LeBrun, M. (2008). Positive Behavioral interventions and supports in New Hampshire: Effects of large-scale implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support on student discipline and academic achievement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 10*(3), 190–205.

Narikiyo, T.A., & Kameoka, V.A. (1992). Attributions of mental illness and judgments about help seeking among Japanese-American and white American students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology 39*, 363–369.

Netzel, D.M., & Eber, L. (2003). Shifting from reactive to proactive discipline in an urban school district: A change in focus through PBIS implementation. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 5*, 71–79.

Newman, B., Tuntigina, L., Ryan, C.S., & Reinecke, D.R. (1997). Self-management of a DRO procedure by three students with autism. *Behavioral Intervention 12*, 149–156.

Nickerson, A.B., & Spears, W.H. (2007). Influences on authoritarian and educational/ therapeutic approaches to school violence prevention. *Journal of School Violence 6,* 3–31.

Office of Education Commission. (2007). *Report on the Situation of Thai Education 2006/2007: Problem Solving and Holistic Education Reform*.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2009a). *Supporting student system: Principles, concept and direction of implementation*. Bangkok.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2009b). *A work manual for government teachers.* Bangkok: The Agricultural Co-operative Federation of Thailand Printing.

Office of the National Education Council (ONEC) (2004). *Education in Thailand 2004.* Bangkok: Amarin.

Office of the National Education Commission (1999a). Education in Thailand 1999. Bangkok: Amarin.

Office of The National Education Commission, (1999b). National Education Act B.E. 2542 (1999). Bangkok: Prig Wan.

Office of the Private Education Commission (OPEC). (2005). Data on the number of private schools, students, and teachers in academic year 2004.

O'Hagan, F., & Edmunds, G. (1982). Pupils' attitude towards teachers' strategies for controlling disruptive behaviour. *British Journal of Education Psychology 52*, 331–340.

O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2010) The use of Functional Behavioural Assessment for students with challenging behaviours: Current patterns and experience of Australian practitioners. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology 10*, 65–82. Retrieved from: *http://www.newcastle.edu.au/Resources/Research%20Centres/SORTI/Journals/AJEDP/Vol%2010/V10_o'neill_stephenson.pdf*

Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London: Continuum.

Patterson, G.R., DeBaryshe, B.D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behaviour. *American Psychologist 44*, 329–35.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pavlov, I.P. (1927). Conditioned reflexes: An investigation of the physiological activity of the cerebral cortex. Translated and Edited by G.V. Anrep. London: Oxford University Press. Available at*: http://www.learning-theories.com/classical-conditioning-pavlov.html*

Perkins, J., & Leadbetter, D. (2002). An evaluation of aggression management training in a special education setting. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties 7*, 19–34.

Phillips, H.P. (1965). *Thai peasant personality: The patterning of interpersonal behaviour in the village of Bang Chan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Phumpatrakom, P. (1986). *Effects of positive reinforcement on reducing disruptive behaviors in the mathematics classroom of Prathom Suksa Six students: A study of generalization across behaviors, settings and retention of behaviors*. Bangkok: Graduate School, Department of Psychology, Chulalongkorn University.

Piazza, C.C., Moes, D.R., & Fisher, W.W. (1996). Differential reinforcement of alternative behavior and demand fading in the treatment of escape-maintained and destructive behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 29*, 569–572.

Pierce, W.D., Cameron, J., Banko, K.M., & So, S. (2003). Positive effects of rewards and performance standards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Records 53*, 561–579.

Pitaksirikul, J. (1989). *Effects of Assertiveness Training Program on Self-Esteem of Mathayom Suksa Three Students.* Bangkok: Graduate School, Department of Psychology, Chulalongkorn University.

Porter, L., (2007). *Behaviour in Schools.* Open University Press. Available at: *http://www.youngminds.org.uk/training_services/young_minds_in_schools/sen/perspectives_on_behaviour.*

Public Agenda. (2004). Teaching interrupted: Do discipline policies in today's public schools foster the common good? Retrieved from: *http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/teaching_interrupted.pdf*

Pumwaree, S. (1986). *Effects of differential reinforcement of low rates (DRL) on reducing disruptive behaviors of Mathayom Suksa One Students*. Bangkok: Graduate School, Department of Psychology, Chulalongkorn University.

Rademacher, J.A., Cllahan, K., & Pederson-Seelye, V.A. (1998). How do your classroom rules measure up? Guidelines for developing an effective rule management routine. *Intervention in School and Clinic* (May), 284–289.

Ray, D., Blanco, P., Sullivian, J., & Holliman, R. (2009). An exploratory study of child-centered play therapy with aggressive children. *International Journal of Play Therapy 18*, 162–175. Available at*: http://research.unt.edu/research-profiles/new-directions-play-therapy-research.*

Reid, J.B., & Eddy, J.M. (2002). Preventative efforts during elementary school years: Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT) project. In Reid, J.B., Patterson, G.R., Snyder, J. (Eds.), *Antisocial behaviour in children and adolescent: A development analysis and model for intervention* (pp. 219–233). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association,.

Reinke, W.M., Palmer, T., & Merrell, K. (2008). The classroom check-up: A classwide teacher consultation model for increasing praise and decreasing disruptive behavior. *School Psychology Review, 37*(3), 315–332.

Richmond, C.R. (2002). Searching for balance: A collective case study of ten secondary teachers' behaviour management language. PhD thesis, University of New England, Armidale.

Ritchie, J., & Pohl, C. (1995). Rules of thumb workshop. *The Early Childhood Educator 10*, 11–12.

Rock, M.L. (2000). Effective crises management planning: Creating a collaborative framework. *Education and Treatment of Children 23*, 246–264.

Rortvedt, A.K., & Miltenberger, R.G. (1994). Analysis of a high-probability instructional sequence and time-out in the treatment of child noncompliance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 27*(2), 327–330.

Ross, P., Little, E, & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and relationship with teacher stress and student behavior. *Educational Psychology 28*(6), 693–710.

Ryan, J.B., Peterson, R.L., & Rozalski, M. (2007). State policies concerning the use of seclusion time-out in schools. *Education and Treatment of Children 30*(3), 215–239.

Ryan, R.M., Mims, V., & Koestner, R. (1983). Relation of reward contingency and interpersonal context to intrinsic motivation: A review and test using cognitive evaluation thory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 45*, 736–750.

Sachs, D.A. (1973). The efficacy of time-out procedures in a variety of behavior problems. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry 4*(3), 237–242.

Safran, S., & Safran, J. (1985). Classroom context and teachers' perceptions of problem behaviours. *Journal of Educational psychology 77*, 20–28.

Samangsri, N., Assanangkornchai, S., Pattanasattayawong, U., & Mukthong, A. (2010). Substance use among high-school students in southern Thailand. *International Journal of Alcohol and Drugs Research 86*(2-3), 167–174.

Sangsingkeo, P. (1969). Buddhism and some effects on the rearing of children in Thailand. In W. Caudill & Lin, T.Y. (Eds)., *Mental health research in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 286–295). Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (2nd ed.), Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sarantakos, S. (2007). *A toolkit for quantitative data analysis*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scheuermann, B.K., & Hall, J.A. (2008). *Positive behavioral supports for the classroom.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Pretence Hall.

Schön, D.A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change 27*(6), 27–34. Retrieved from: *http://www.mendeley.com/research/knowinginaction-new-scholarship-requires-new-epistemology-1/.*

Scott, T.M., Nelson, C.M., & Zabala, J. (2003). Functional behaviour assessment training in public schools: Facilitating systemic change. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 5* (4), 216–224. Retrieved from: *http://www.neiu.edu/~gmoreno1/Special_Education__Courses_with_Dr._Moreno/Publications_files/Moreno_2011.pdf.*

Self-Brown, R., & Matthews, S. (2003). Effects of classroom structure on student achievement goal orientation. *The Journal of Education Research 97*(2), 106–111.

Seligman, M.P. (1972). Learned Helplessness. *Annual Review of Medicine 23,* 407–412.

Selma, R.L., Jacquette, D., & Lavin, D. R. (1980). Interpersonal awareness in children: Toward an integration of developmental and clinical child psychology. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 47*, 264–274.

Shabani, D.B., & Fisher, W.W. (2006). Stimulus fading and differential reinforcement for the treatment of needle phobia in a youth with autism. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 39,* 449–452.

Shabani, D.B., Katz, R.C., Wilder, D.A., Beauchamp, K., Taylor, C.R., & Fischer, K.J. (2002). Increasing social initiations in children with autism: Effects of a tactile prompt. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 35,* 79–83.

Sharma, U., & Desai, I. (2002). Measuring concerns about integrated education in India. *The Asia-Pacific Journal on Disabilities 5*(1), 2–14.

Shen, J., Zhang, N., Zhang, C., Caldarella, P., Richardson, M.J., & Shatzer, R.H. (2009). Chinese elementary school teachers' perceptions of students' classroom behavior problems. *Educational Psychology 29*(2), 187–201.

Shochet, I.M., Dadds, M.R., Ham, D., & Montague, R. (2006). School connectedness is an underemphasized parameter in adolescent mental health. Results of a community prediction study. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology 35*, 170–179.

Shonkoff, J.P., & Marshall, P.C. (2000). The biology of developmental vulnerability. In J.P. Shonkoff & S.J. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (2nd ed.), (pp. 35–53). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shumate, E.D., & Wills, H.P. (2010). Classroom-based functional analysis and intervention for disruptive and off-task behaviors. *Education and Treatment of Children 33*(1), 23–48.

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D. & Sugai, G. (2006). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for Research to Practice. *Education and Treatment of Children 31*(3), 351–380.

Skiba, R.J., & Rausch, M.K. (2006). Zero tolerance, suspension, and expulsion. Questions of equity and effectiveness. In C.M. Evertson & C.S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp.1063–1089). Mahwah, N.J: Erlbaum. Retrieved from*: http://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance.pdf.*

Skiba, R.J., & Peterson, R.L. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children 66*(3), 335–347.

Skiba, R.J., & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of zero-tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(5), 372–382.

Skinner, E., & Greene, T. (2008). Perceived control, coping, and engagement. In T.L. Good (Ed.), *21st century education: A reference handbook*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. Retrieved from: *http://www.SAGEereference.com.ezproxy.une.edu.au/education/Article_n13.html*.

Skinner, B.F. (1984). The operational analysis of psychological terms". *Behavioral and brain sciences 7*(4), 547–81.

Skinner, B.F. (1974). Beyond Freedom and Dignity. *http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behavior_modification.*

Smith, B.J. & Fox, L. (2003). Systems of service delivery: A synthesis of evidence relevant to young children at risk for or who have challenging behavior. *www.challengingbehavior.org.*

Snyder, J., & Stoolmiller, M. (2002). Reinforcement and coercion mechanisms in the development of antisocial behavior: Peer processes. In J.R. Reid, G.R. Patterson & J. Snyder (Eds.). *Antisocial behavior: Prevention, intervention and basic research.* Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association Press.

Solomon, D., Watson, M., Battistich, V., Scaps, E., & Delucchi, K. (1992). Creating a caring community: Educational practices that promote children's prosocial development. In Oser, F.K., Dick, A., & Patry, J.L. (Eds.), *Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis.* (pp. 383–396). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Souza, E.M. (2000). Step Nine: Holding students accountable. *Principal Leadership 1*(1), 34–39. Retrieved from: *http://pages.uoregon.edu/ttobin/alt_tic.pdf*

Stephenson, J., Martin, A.J., & Linfoot, K. (2000). Behaviors of concern to teachers in the early years of school. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education 47*, 225–235.

Sterling-Turner, H., & Watson, T.S. (1999). Consultant's guide for the use of time-out in the preschool and elementary classroom. *Psychology in the Schools 36*(2), 135–148.

Stormont, M., Covington, S., & Lewis, T.J. (2007). Teacher implementation of precorrection and praise statements in Head Start classrooms as a component of a program-wide system of positive behaviour support. *Journal of Behaviour Education 16*, 280–290.

"Students in Formal Schools System by Jurisdiction in Bangkok Metropolis and other Provinces: Academic Year 2005". Retrieved from:. *http://www.moe.go.th/English/nu/stat2005/Student05.pdf. Retrieved 2011-10-28.*

Sugai. G., & Horner, R.H. (1999). Discipline and behavioral support: Preferred processes and practices. *Effective School Practices 17*(4), 10–22.

Suvannathat, C. (1979). The inculcation of values in Thai children. *International Social Science Journal 31*, 477–485.

Suwanlert, S. (1974). Some personality characteristics of Thai students. In W.P. Lebra (Ed.). *Youth, socialization, and mental health in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 75–84). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii,

Thanasetkorn, P. (2009). *The impact of The 101s: A guide to Positive Discipline teacher training on teacher interaction practices, teacher–child relationship quality, school adjustment, and academic outcomes in kindergarten classrooms in Bangkok, Thailand.* Old Dominion University.

Thanasetkorn, P., & Thanasetkorn, P. (2009). The 101 ways to raise an effective child. *Siamrath*, August 3–September 17, 19.

The Nation (2003). Troubled teens can't turn to teachers. *URL:http://www.thailandlife.com/thaiyouth_95.htm*

Token Economy from WikEd. (2008). Retrieved from: *http://wik.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/Token_economy*.

Townsend, B.L. (2000). The disproportionate discipline of African American Learners: Reducing school suspensions and expulsions. *Exceptional Children 66*(3), 381–391.

Trower, P. (1982). Toward a generative model of social skills: A critique and synthesis. In Curran, J.P., Monti, P.M. (Eds). *Social skills training: A practical handbook for assessment and treatment.* (pp.399-427). New York: Guilford Press.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk, H.A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education 17*, 783–805.

Uniting Care Burnside (2011). Locked into remand: Children and young people on remand in NSW, 2011.

Verkuyten, M. (2002). Making teachers accountable for students' disruptive classroom behavior. *British Journal of Sociology of Education 23*(1), 107–122.

Victor, K.R. (2005). Identifying effective behaviour management in the early childhood classroom. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Cedarville University. Retrieved from: *http://www.academicleadership.org/article/The_influence_of_assertive_classroom_management_strategy_use_on_student-teacher_pedagogical_skills*.

Vollmer, T.R., Iwata, B.A., Zarcone, J.R., Smith, R.G., & Mazaleski, J.L. (1993). The role of attention in the treatment of attention-maintained self-injurious behavior: Noncontingent reinforcement and differential reinforcement of other behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 26*(1), 9–21.

Wahler, R.G., & Fox, J.J. (1980). Solitary toy play and time: A family treatment package for children with aggressive and oppositional behavior, *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 13*(1), 23–39.

Wald, J., & Losen, D.J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. In J.Wald & D.J. Losen (Eds.). *Deconstructing the school-to-pipeline: New directions for youth development*, (pp.9–15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, H.M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F.M. (2004). Antisocial behavior in school: Evidence-based practices, (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning,

Walker, E. Bettes, B., & Ceci, S. (1984). Teachers' assumptions regarding the severity, causes, and outcomes of behavioural problems in preschoolers: Implications for referral. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 52,* 899–902.

Walker, H.M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behaviour in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Webster-Stratton, C., & Herbert, M. (1994). *Troubled families—problem children: Working with parents: A collaborative process*. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Weisz, J.R., McCarty, C.A., Eastman, K.L., Chaiyasit, W., & Suwanlert, S. (1997). Developmental psychopathology and culture: Ten lessons from Thailand. In S.S. Luthar, J.A. Burack, D. Cicchetti, & J.R. Weisz (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (pp. 568–592). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisz, J.R., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W., Weiss, B., Achenbach, T.M., & Trevathan, D. (1988). Epidemiology of behavioural and emotional problems among Thai and American children: Teacher reports for ages 6–11. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 30*, 471–484.

Weisz, J.R., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W., Weiss, B., Walter, B.R., & Anderson, W.W. (1988). Thai and American perspectives on over and under-controlled behaviour: Exploring the threshold model among parents, teachers, and psychologists. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 56,* 601–609.

Westling, D.L. (2010). Teachers and challenging behavior: Knowledge, views ,and practices *Remedial and Special Education 30*, 48–63.

Wheldall, K., Houghton, S., & Merrett, F. (1989). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in British secondary school classrooms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 59,* 38–48.

White, L. (1982). *Teachers' perceptions of internalizing and externalizing classroom behaviour problems*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Wilks, R. (1996). Classroom management in primary schools: A review of the literature. *Behavior Change 13,* 20–32.

William Glasser Institute. (2006). *Quality schools*. Retrieved June 15, 2007 from http://www.wglasser.com/the-glasser-approach/quality-schools

Williams, G., Donley, C.R., & Keller, J.W. (2000). Teaching children with autism to ask questions about hidden objects. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis 33*, 627–630.

Wisniewski, L., & Gurguilo, R.M. (1997). Occupational stress and burnout among special educators: A review of the literature. *Journal of Special Education 31*(3), 325–346. Retrieved from: *http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/fie03612.pdf*

Wolery, M. Bailey, D. B., & Sugai, G. M. (1988). Effective teaching: principles and procedures of applied behavior analysis with exceptional students. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wolfgang, C. (2001). Teacher strategies: The many views of timeout. Journal of Early *Education and Family Review 8*(5), 18–28.

Woolfolk, E.A. (1998). *Educational Psychology* (7th ed.). Behavioural Views of Learning. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Yarborough, L., Skinner, H., Lee, J., & Lemmons, C. (2004). Decreasing transition times in a second grade classroom: Scientific support for the timely transitions game. *Journal of Applied School Psychology 20*(2), 85–107.

Yell, M. (1994). Timeout and students with behavior disorders: A legal analysis. *Education and Treatment of Children 17*(3), 293–301.

Zabel, M.K. (1986). Time out use with behaviorally disordered students. *Behavioral Disorders 12*(1), 15–21.

Ziegler, C. L. & Lederman, N. M., (1991). School Vouchers: Are Urban Students Surrendering, Rights for Choice? *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, Article 17, 19 (3), 813-831.

Zima, B.T., Bussing, R., Freeman, S., Yang, X., Belin, T.R., & Forness, S.R. (2000). Behavior problems, academic skill delays and school failure among school-aged children in foster care: Their relationship to placement characteristics. *Journal of Child and Family Studies 9*, 87–103.