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ABSTRACT

Learner discipline has become a major concern in South African schools. A society of entitlement has been bred over the past 20 years. The school is an open system that influences its environment and is being influenced by it too. The most challenging concern, at least for teachers, is to create and to maintain a form of order and structure at schools. The troublesome situation has an impact on teachers as they have to spend more time addressing challenging behaviour instead of spending that time on teaching a set curriculum and syllabus. Unfortunately, teachers report feelings of being ill-prepared to deal effectively with the challenging behaviour of learners in schools. Hence it is imperative to consider strategies to foster school discipline to manage and modify challenging behaviour in schools.

To date, most researches have shown a major paradigm shift from the punitive disciplinary measures of the past towards a rather preventive and more positive approach. It became inevitable that learner discipline should be correctional and educational – especially after the abolishment of corporal punishment in South African schools. An increase attention has started to concentrate on early identification and prevention of challenging behaviour and on strategies to resolve such behaviour at its earliest appearance. Some of the guiding determinants for this positive approach are vested in maintaining a safe, harmonious and orderly environment that is conducive to teaching and learning. The outcry is to promote and encourage discipline amongst learners.

An approach that has been termed school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support seems to address most of the challenging behaviours. Through the use of document analysis, observation and group interviews school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support was embraced. The findings further revealed that through proper planning, implementation strategies, and in-service training positive behaviour approach can be
implemented in schools as framework for school discipline in primary schools. School-wide positive behaviour intervention and support will contribute successfully in managing and modifying challenging behaviour, fostering discipline in schools, and to educate learners in the habit of accountability and responsibility for their actions without using punishment following specified rules. Doing so some of the critical and developmental outcomes of education in South Africa will be realized. Although research in this area is limited, there are encouraging signs that a co-ordinated adoption of validated practice could substantially reduce challenging behaviours and thereby enhance the social and emotional well-being of learners in today’s society.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Good school discipline is one of the most influential facets of an effective school and classroom (Oosthuizen, 2009). It impacts on the harmony experienced in the school and leads to high academic achievement. It is commonly accepted that learners perform better when they have to function in a structured and secure environment where they know what behaviour is expected of them (Oosthuizen, 2009). It is a well-known perception that the misconduct of learners is considered to be one of the most prominent factors that have a bearing on the South African education system (Oosthuizen, 2009). The lack of discipline has devastating effects on the functionality of the South African schooling system and contributes to the high failure rates and the violence and other criminal activities in the schools (Maphosa & Mammen, 2011; Lessing & De Wit, 2010).

Teachers are obliged to maintain discipline at school by virtue of their profession and in accordance with their legal role (in loco parentis), being given the right to maintain authority and the obligation to exercise caring supervision over learners (Oosthuizen, Rossouw & De Wet, 2004). There are two sides to this legal obligation of teachers: in loco parentis implies the obligation to exercise caring supervision (the duty of care) and the duty to maintain order (Maithufi, 1997, pp. 260-261). The expectation is that our schools teach the learners the social skills that will make them contributing members within our society. It is also the generally accepted expectation that schools will ensure the safety of all our students.
learners by establishing an environment with sufficient social order to allow and encourage academic achievement (Walker Shinn, 2002 as reported in Horner, Todd, Lewis-Palmer, Irvin, Sugai & Boland, 2004). These expectations are being challenged in many South African schools (Zulu, Urbani, Van der Merwe & Van der Walt, 2004; Aziza, 2001), and, in particular, in the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth, where I am the principal of a primary school.

Most teachers, parents and management teams in South Africa are becoming extremely frustrated with the impact of learner behaviour on teaching and learning (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000). The general perception of the South African community at large is that learner behaviour is out of control. Thomson (2002) reports a general breakdown in discipline in South African public schools. The current lack of discipline in South African schools has led to the continuation of unsuccessful learning and teaching (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000). Mokhele (2006) alleges that teachers spend a disproportionate percentage of their time on dealing with the misconduct of learners. Some teachers feel overwhelmed and undermined by poor learner engagement. The new policies that have replaced the old system based on corporal punishment and control have proven to be ineffective and have little impact on learner behaviour (Skiba & Peterson, 2003). Many teachers are dissatisfied and disillusioned with the alternative methods of punishment, believing that they are ineffective and inadequate – in short, a waste of time (Wilson, 2002).

The Northern areas in Port Elizabeth are known for violence and gangsterism in the community, which spills over as disruptive behaviour in the schools of the community (Smith, 2012). Many of these learners bring their baggage of dysfunction into the classroom, rendering discipline an all-consuming task that overshadows and threatens academic learning (Gootman, 2001). As a teacher with 23 years of teaching experience at a primary
of the impact that the challenging behaviour of the learners has on the functioning of the school and of the complexity of maintaining good discipline at a school.

In an education system that is still struggling to create a culture of teaching and learning, ill-disciplined behaviour can cancel all well-intended efforts to restore or create this culture (Andrews & Taylor, 1998). When the culture of teaching and learning fails, learning and teaching become difficult and frustrating both to the teachers and to the learners. Teachers often complain that they have to spend so much time to manage challenging behaviour that they do not have enough time for teaching and learning. They are struggling to facilitate a positive environment that is conducive to the involvement of all the learners in their classes (Engelbrecht, Oswald & Forlin, 2006).

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Historically, school discipline was implemented in a way to exercise control over the behaviour of learners, and to enforce compliance. Punitive strategies such as a reprimand, loss of privileges, corporal punishment, expulsions, suspensions, detentions and administrative transfers were used to address inappropriate behavior (Lane, Kalberg & Menzies, 2009). The reaction to disruptive behaviour was based on strict rules and regulations rather than on values (Xaba, 2013; Cryan, 1995). The main focus of the past discipline practice was on attempts to fix problems (Scott, 2001).

Corporal punishment was an integral part of school discipline in South Africa prior to 1994 (Morrell, 2001). Punishment is the undesirable or discomforting effect resulting from misbehaviour (Savage, 1999) and has as its underlying assumption that if children are made to suffer for wrong, they will not repeat their inappropriate behaviour (Department of Education (DoE), 2000a). Although punishment can be effective in stopping unwanted
behaviour, it also has several undesirable side effects (Savage, 1999). Corporal punishment was often practised to excess, leading to resistance by learners and to the repetitive breaking of rules (Tshabangu, 2008). Another aspect of the focus on punishment is that it is largely reactive. Teachers wait until misbehaviour occurs before taking action. The use of corporal punishment in the management of school discipline also tends to escalate the levels of anger in both the learners and the teachers, to a point where lashing out verbally or physically actually brings satisfaction (Knott-Craig, 2007).

A criticism to the punitive approach, also known as the dogmatic approach, was that it did not pay enough attention to the consequences of actions (Telep, 2009). Disciplines of this type were seen as a restriction to the autonomy of learners (Ferreira, Jacobs, Manning & de Wet, 2009). It may also hinder the development of the self-esteem and self-identity of learners. Behaviour support in schools only targeted learners who engaged in high-intensity problem behaviours. Typically, resources would have been allocated to identifying the offending learners; providing an assessment and presenting a diagnosis aiming at remediating the behavioural challenges by punishing the learners.

The advent of democracy in 1994 resulted in a paradigm shift in the manner in which discipline is dealt with at schools in South Africa (Van Staden & Alston, 2000) away from corporal punishment and rigid, authoritarian discipline policies (Naong, 2007). Since 1994, the focus has shifted to the human rights of all South African citizens and this led to some legislation having a direct bearing on school discipline and strategies for dealing with misbehaviour. The South African Constitution lays the platform for the education system, highlighting the value of human rights and dignity (RSA, 1996a). According to Section 12(1) of the Constitution, no person shall be subjected to torture of any kind, nor shall any person be treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading way. The Constitution further
ensures the right of every child to basic education as captured in The Bill of Rights, contained in Chapter Two of the Constitution (RSA, 1996a). While Section 29 of the Bill of Rights, encompassed in the South African Constitution specifies the right of the individual to education, Sections 12 and 24 are very clear about everyone’s right to be free of all forms of violence in a safe environment. Section 28(d) stipulates that every child has the right to be protected from maltreatment, neglect or abuse (RSA, 1996a). One of the goals of discipline is, therefore, to provide a safe environment both for learners and for teachers.

The South African Constitution furthermore declares that schools have a duty to care for its learners and that the best interests of the learners should be protected (RSA, 1996a). Schools and teachers are seen as representatives of the state and as responsible to report and intervene whenever they become aware of the rights of children being violated (Prinsloo, 2005). The caring duty of schools has no boundaries, meaning that the ill-behaved as well as the well-mannered learner should be cared for. Joubert, De Waal and Rossouw (2004) warn that in their efforts to protect the rights of a learner who misbehaves, teachers and educational officials often ignore the rights of the learner who behaves. As a result, ill-discipline affects the right to basic education of both ill-behaved and well-mannered learners. Rogers (2007) maintains that while learners displaying disruptive behaviour have a right to education in mainstream schools, that right has to be balanced against the right of their peers to learn without persistent interruptions and displays of unsafe and aggressive behaviour. The right of the well-behaved individual to quality education places an obligation on schools to provide all the learners in the school with the opportunity to learn in an environment characterised by good discipline. It is, therefore, the duty of the schools to ensure that the collective interest of the group outweigh those of the few individual misbehaving learners. After all, it is not only the delinquent learner who has a fundamental right to education, but also the learner who is well-disciplined (Oosthuizen, et al., 2004). There needs to be a clear
understanding of the infringement on, or damage to, the rights of another person. In considering this, it is also important to consider the welfare of teachers working with such learners. The South African Democratic Teachers’ Union (SADTU) in 2009 called on the DoE to consider danger-pay for teachers teaching at high risk schools. Chaplain (2003) explains that learners who act on their difficulties, aggression or violence can be frightening to schools, which makes it difficult to build positive teacher-learner relationships.

The South African Schools Act (SASA) (Act No 84 of 1996, Section 8) describes the process and structure regarding discipline in public schools (RSA, 1996b). The SASA stipulates that the school governing body (SGB) is responsible for adopting a code of conduct for learners by involving all the stakeholders of the school (Volschenk, 2007; RSA, 1996b). This code of conduct should be aimed at establishing a disciplined environment which enhances teaching and learning. The code of conduct must embrace the values, ethos and mission of the school and should not merely comprise rules and regulations (DoE, 2002). The purpose of the disciplinary guidelines for the school should be to promote exemplary conduct, positive discipline and self-discipline (Boshoff & Morkel, 2003), bearing in mind that learners learn by observation and experience (Joubert, et al., 2004). The intention of the code of conduct is, therefore, intended to be a positive and inspirational document. Furthermore, the SASA, paragraph 10, stipulates that no person may administer corporal punishment at a school to a learner (RSA, 1996b). A new era has arrived for South African schools. The Act; however, is not very explicit on the disciplinary strategies that teachers could adopt to handle misbehaving learners (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010).

As corporal punishment was banned, a national project on discipline in South African schools was undertaken resulting in a document published by the Department of Education called “Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (ATCP): The learner experience” (DoE, 2002).
Disciplinary strategies that emphasise effective communication, respect and positive educational exchanges between teachers and learners can be defined as alternatives to corporal punishment (Chisholm, 2007). The objectives of the ATCP are to develop and construct ways of instilling discipline amongst learners; to assist learners to move towards a more peaceful and tolerant society; to instil self-discipline; to encourage learners in realizing their academic potential; and most of all, to become a mature and independent thinking adult (Tungata, 2006). Chisholm (2007) further recommends that preferred disciplinary measures such as verbal warnings, detention, demerits, community work and small menial physical tasks are implemented. But, I have to agree with Rademeyer (2001) that few of these actions seem to have an effect on the behaviour of the learners.

The ATCP document was met with resistance amongst teachers, parents, cultural and religious groups, partly because the consultation process was undermined (Du Preez & Roux, 2010). It was felt that these methods of discipline are less successful to those learners whose behaviour is at risk (Felix, 2011). These learners seem to have grown immune to reasoning, discussions or extra additional learning tasks or even to trips to the principal’s office. Moyo, Khewn, and Bayaga, (2014) made it clear that there is still no remarkable change in the behaviour of learners since the implementation of the ATCP, concluding that the ATCP is ineffective, inadequate and a waste of time. The comments by Moyo and colleagues focus the attention on the nature of the paradigm shift needed after the abolishment of corporal punishment. Teachers who used to rely on reactive measures to address disruptive behaviour now have to develop alternative proactive measures to pre-empt disruptive behaviour.

The question arose: Are there any alternatives available that would be relevant to a primary school in the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth?
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The changes experienced in the disciplinary environment in schools, combined with the lack of guidance provided by the Department of Education to teachers on the issue of discipline, resulted in a situation where teachers in South Africa experience widespread behavioural challenges from the learners (Landsberg, Kruger & Nel, 2005). The current educational dispensation has brought along a tendency of undisciplined learner behaviour and an aversion on the part of the learners to the acceptance of authority. Teachers claim that violence in schools has increased since the abolition of corporal punishment (Knott-Craig, 2007). The classrooms have become more distressful and unbearable, as teachers admit that they cannot manage the classroom situation effectively and efficiently as in the past. Over time, some of the old rules were questioned, challenged and rejected with a subtle disintegration of the social rules and class division (Wright, 2005). Since the 1990s it has also become acceptable for parents to speak to teachers in a disrespectful way, when they feel that their children have been treated unfairly.

Similarly, my school experienced an increase in the display of challenging behaviour by some learners at the school. The most frequently observed challenging behaviours observed are learners moving around in classrooms, swearing, throwing wet papers around, sleeping in the classrooms, fighting and teasing – all while the teacher is busy teaching. Verbal abuse of teachers and fellow learners are mushrooming. These behaviours of some learners influence the right and expectation of the majority of the learners to learn in a safe environment.

Added to the challenges described above is the observation that most of the learners who display challenging behaviour are also struggling to meet academic expectations and, as such, need more attention. An environment packed with chaos, violence and unruly
behaviour is not conducive to teaching and learning. This emphasises the role and duty of the teachers in ensuring a safe environment where every learner has the potential to perform academically. Sadly, some of the learners who are struggling at school do not improve when leaving school. They display a continuous struggle within their interpersonal relationships too and frequently contribute to the high levels of violence and ill-discipline observed in the broader society (Kauffman & Brigham, 2009), perpetuating the cycle of violence in the community at large.

There is an urgent need to deal effectively with behavioral issues in innovative ways and to guide our learners to independence, maturity and being responsive citizens within and around their community, the society and South Africa as a whole. It is, therefore, in the interest of the school community that the challenging behaviour displayed by learners is addressed as effectively as possible. Few of the disciplinary actions taken under the current disciplinary system seem to have an effect on the behaviour of the learners (Rademeyer, 2001). There exists an urgent need to deal innovatively with challenging behaviour displayed by learners in a non-violent and pro-active way (Marais & Meier, 2010). If the entire school can be empowered to break the cycle of disruptive and challenging behaviour, the benefits can spill over to the surrounding community. Furthermore, a contemporary perspective on school discipline has shifted towards investing in positive behaviour prevention as well as towards individualized interventions (Walker, 1996 as reported in Horner, et al., 2004).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the usefulness of a pro-active theoretical framework, namely the Positive Behaviour Intervention and Support (PBIS) framework, as the basis for developing an alternative means of managing discipline in a Northern area primary school in Port Elizabeth. This study focuses on the implementation of a code of
conduct at a primary school that has the PBIS theoretical framework as basis. It also focuses on the perceptions of teachers regarding the management of discipline as a result of implementing the code of conduct.

To investigate the usefulness of the Positive Behaviour Intervention and Support framework to a South African context, and, in particular, to a primary school located in the Northern Areas of Port Elizabeth, the following research question has been formulated:

What opportunities could the use of Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support principles provide the teachers of a primary school to manage challenging behaviour displayed by some of the learners?

In line with the problem statement, the following sub-questions were formulated.

- How did the primary school implement the School Wide Positive Behaviour Intervention and Support framework to address the discipline at the school?

- How did the patterns of challenging behaviour displayed by the learners at the identified primary school change after the implementation of the school wide positive behaviour intervention framework?

- What are the perceptions of the teachers around the effect of the chosen framework on the discipline at the school over the period under investigation?

- What lessons can be learned from the intervention with the aim at providing guidelines for managing discipline at a primary school?

1.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THIS STUDY

Positive behaviour intervention support (PBIS) is an applied science which seeks to
improve a person’s quality of life and to minimize challenging behavior (Carr et al., 2002). Positive behavior intervention support uses educational methods and systems change methods to help achieve these goals. The foundation of PBIS can be traced to applied behavior analysis (U. S. Department of Education, 2010; Wasilewski, Gifford, & Bonneau, 2008) as it relates to learner behaviour. In a school that implements PBIS, behavior expectations and consequences are explicitly defined by an administrative team. However, a team is also responsible for establishing guidelines for a reward system for students who behave appropriately. According to Philip Jackson (1990), a learner’s core function in school is to do more than master the academic curriculum. He or she must also be able to master the hidden curriculum of schools. Learners should be able to conform to the dominant beliefs and social practices that those in authority constructed within schools.

Jackson (1990) noted that a school’s reward system can be linked with a learner’s success in both the academic and hidden curriculum. A learner who complies with school values and follows classroom procedures is often considered a ‘model’ learner and rewarded accordingly, even if he has not mastered all of the academic content. Similarly, a learner who fails to comply with institutional expectations can usually expect disciplinary action. In an effort to shape and control learner behaviour, PBIS prevent, correct and rewards learner behaviour based on prescribed rules and expectations created by those in authority in collaboration with all stakeholders. Positive behaviour intervention support is a data driven, decision making approach. This approach seeks to establish primary (school-wide), secondary (classroom) and tertiary (individual) support for all learners in all areas of their lives be it family, health, personal, recreational or social.

1.5 OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were formulated to enable the researcher to answer the
research questions:

- To explore the range of challenging behaviours displayed by the some learners as reflected by ‘incidents book’ of the school where all disruptive incidents are recorded, prior to the implementation of the new mission and vision for the school that incorporate the PBIS principles.

- To implement a school wide disciplinary intervention (captured in the school mission and vision statement) based on positive behaviour principles in the comprehensive school.

- To determine the changes (if any) observed in the nature and frequency of challenging behaviour displayed by some of the learners in the school.

- To determine the lessons that can be learned from the positive behaviour intervention for disciplinary actions at a comprehensive school.

- To formulate viable guidelines for primary schools towards the adoption of measures that foster more proactive and self-regulated disciplinary approaches.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study set out to investigate the effectiveness of an alternative approach that can be used to address the void left after the abandoning of corporal punishment in South African schools (RSA, 1996b). It will make a contribution to national debates on school discipline in public schools by providing insights into an alternative, proactive approach to discipline at a primary school, situated in an area known for its violence and other criminal activities. The results of the study may also bring about changes in the approach and strategies in maintaining discipline at South African primary schools. Successfully addressing the
disciplinary aspect of the school system could enable schools to realise the expectation that schools should operate in an environment with sufficient social order that allow and encourage academic achievement by all learners.

The study may further provide insights into a strategy that may break the cycle of violence in the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth by focussing specifically on the development of the social skills of primary school learners.

1.7 CLARIFICATION OF TERMINOLOGY

The concepts below are of importance in the context of this study and would need further clarification.

1.7.1 School Discipline

Skiba and Peterson (2003), as well as Du Plessis and Loock (2007), associate discipline with the notion of bringing learners in line with accepted norms of decency or complying with a code of behaviour often known as school rules. The term may also be applied to the punishment that is the consequence of the transgression of the code of behaviour. These rules may, for example, define the expected standards of clothing, social-behaviour and work ethics. Taking a more positive stance, Joubert, et al. (2004) argue that discipline is about positive behaviour management aimed at promoting appropriate behaviour and developing self-discipline and self-control in learners. Effective discipline assists learners to control their challenging behaviour and to act according to the expectations regarding which behaviour is right and wrong, not because they fear punishment (Telep, 2009).

Discipline, in the context of education, is therefore “designed to maintain a form of order that will promote learning objectives and, providing a teacher with a classroom
atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning” (Ndofirepi, Makaye & Ndofirepi, 2012, p. 84). It involves the maintenance of order in a group; keeping the members of a group focused on a goal; preserving individuals from disturbing or harming each other (Ndofirepi, et al., 2012). In summary, discipline can be taken as a teaching and learning process with two distinct aims. The first aim is to create an orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning - thus enabling learners to develop holistically. The second aim of this teaching and learning process is to teach learners to behave in a socially acceptable manner and to attain self-control, which will ultimately result in respect for the rights and needs of others.

School discipline refers to the regulation of children and the maintenance of order (rules) in schools. These rules may, for example, define the expected standards of clothing, timekeeping, social behaviour and work ethics. In the context of this study, the term ‘discipline’ therefore refers to ‘school discipline’ and is used interchangeably.

1.7.2 Positive behaviour intervention

Positive behaviour intervention is a system which adopts a proactive, context-driven approach in order to define, teach and support challenging behaviour (Gordon & Browne, 2004). The positive behaviour intervention is an integration of valued outcomes, behavioural science, empirically validated procedures and systems change used to enhance the quality of academic performance and to prevent challenging behaviour. In other words, the intervention is a way of teaching behavioural expectations and to reward learners for following these expectations. The focus of the intervention is, therefore, on the behaviour of the individual and the context in which the behaviour of said individual is observed (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

Positive behaviour intervention is built on three principles: prevention (intervening at the development of challenging behaviour in reducing the intensity of the behavioural
problem that occurs); sound theoretical and evidence-based practice; and systems implementation. These aspects will be further discussed in Chapter Two.

1.7.3 Northern areas

The term ‘Northern areas’ refers to the residential suburbs in the northern areas of Port Elizabeth, South Africa. In the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth you will find people from different income levels, therefore the socio-economic conditions of people living in the Northern areas are varied. Crime is a serious problem and the anti-social phenomenon of gangsterism has become a feature of life in these under-resourced areas (George & Hendricks, 2003).

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

The research plan of how the intended study will be conducted (the research design) (Mouton, 2001) is discussed in the sections to follow. As stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to investigate the usefulness of a pro-active theoretical framework (the Positive Behaviour Intervention and Support framework) as the basis for developing a positive alternative means of managing discipline in a Northern area primary school in Port Elizabeth.

The study is located in the interpretive paradigm with multiple realities through which sense is made of the world. In this study I aim to construct the reality of the participating school in the implementation of a school mission and vision that build on the principles of the PBIS framework by analysing the behaviour patterns reported on during the period of implementation (2011 – 2014), combined with group interviews with the selected teachers in order to collect and report on their reality regarding discipline at the school over this period of time. The most important role of the researcher is that of interpreter
A qualitative approach will be suitable for the purpose of this research as it involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to world. As a qualitative researcher, I was motivated by the flexibility of a qualitative approach to allow the in-depth inquiry of the phenomenon in its natural setting; to make sense of, as well as to interpret, the phenomenon in terms of meaning and understandings constructed by people (Denzin, 2005). A qualitative method affords the researcher the opportunity to explore the phenomenon in context using various data sources (Baxter & Jack, 2008).

1.8.1 Research methodology

This research employed a case study as methodology. A case study is a qualitative approach in which the researchers explore a ‘bounded system’ (Creswell, 1998) or case over time by means of detailed, in-depth data collection (Ragin & Becker, 1992). According to Yin (2003), a case study is a research strategy that answers how and why questions; accommodates situations when the researcher has minimal control over the events; and requires a focus on phenomena that occur in a real-life context. Case study research is well suited to understand schools as socially constructed organisations. Yin (1994, p. xv) maintains that case study research is the most appropriate research approach for “appreciating the complexity of organisational phenomena” (discipline, in the case of this study). A case study would enable me to conduct the study in such a manner that would reflect the complexity of discipline in a school context. A case study design is useful when the researcher must take into account the contextual conditions of the phenomenon being...
studied and when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not easily distinguished (Amerson, 2011).

Because the case study methodology allows for the prior development of theoretical propositions to direct the data collection and analysis (Yin, 2003), it is useful in supporting and expanding on previously developed theories. In this study the usefulness of the existing SWPBS (Raffaele, Mendez & Knoff, 2003) theoretical framework is examined in the particular context of a primary school situated in a particular community, the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth. The theory of SWPBS is applied with the aim either to support the applicability of the theoretical framework in this particular context, or to expand on the theory based on the understandings gained in the context of this particular primary school. The rationale for my choice of case study is that my research methodology is therefore supported by my research paradigm (the interpretive paradigm) and my theoretical framework.

1.8.2 Context of study

The study was conducted at a primary school within the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth. The Northern areas of Port Elizabeth are known for its violent communities and gangsterism, resulting in a high prevalence of challenging and disruptive behaviour by learners from the communities (Smith, 2012). The management and maintenance of discipline at the primary school where the study took place were considered ineffective to address the discipline issues at the school. The learners attending the school are between the ages of 7 – 14 years of age and come from a diverse cultural background. Roughly thirty percent of the learners are considered coloured; sixty percent African and ten percent can be considered to be from other cultural backgrounds. Not all the learners are from the surrounding communities. Most of the learners have to travel daily between 20 and 40 km
1.8.3 Research design

The choice regarding the specific case study design was guided by the purpose of the study (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The purpose of this research was to determine the usefulness of the PBIS theoretical framework, if implemented school-wide, in addressing the disruptive behavioural patterns observed in a primary school within the Port Elizabeth District. A single, multi-method interpretive case study design (Yin, 2003; Merriam, 1998) was consequently chosen as design to achieve this purpose.

1.8.4 Data collection and analysis

The use of multiple data sources is a hallmark of case study research as it enables the researcher to cover a broader range of issues and to develop converging lines of inquiry by the process of triangulation (Yin, 2003). The data sources used in this study include documentation (incident books), group interviews and self-administered questionnaires.

Data were needed to document the disruptive behavioural patterns of the learners over the period just before and during the implementation of the theoretical framework in order to guide the management of the discipline at the school (ranging from 2011 to 2014) in order to determine any changes in the behavioural patterns. Incident books were chosen to provide the needed data. Insights were also needed from the teachers to determine their perceptions around the usefulness (or not) of the PBIS framework and the new disciplinary measures implemented to address disruptive behaviour at the school. This resulted in the choice of conducting group interviews with the teachers at the end of the study, asking the teachers to reflect on their experiences with disruptive behaviour in the school over the past three years. This constitutes collecting retrospective data, which is well suited for case study research (Kazdin, 2003). The Effective Behaviour Support survey, developed by Sugai, Horner, and
Todd, (2000), was administered to obtain a snap shot of the SWPBIS systems put in place by the school, but also to assess the areas in need for future growth.

1.9 LIMITATIONS

Some elements of the study can be regarded as limitations to the study. The study is limited to one primary school situated in the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth where the researcher is the principal. As the relationship between the principal and the teachers at the school may jeopardise the honesty of the responses of the teachers during the group interviews, the interviews were conducted by the supervisor. Furthermore, only teachers were included as participants in the study. The findings can therefore not be generalised to all schools in Port Elizabeth or South Africa.

1.10 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research will comply with the code of ethics of the NMMU and the Faculty of Education. Permission to conduct the research will be obtained from the Eastern Cape Department of Education, as well as from the Faculty of Education. Staff members, support staff, administrative staff, the secretary and parents will be selected as participants in the study. Consent will be obtained from staff members, support staff, administrative staff, the secretary and parents for their participation in the positive behaviour support and intervention, as well as for participating in the group interviews. Any of the participants will be free to withdraw from the study at any point in time without any penalisation whatsoever. The anonymity of the school and the participants will be valued.

1.11 OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS

This study is divided into five chapters. The first part of Chapter Two discusses the concept of school discipline followed by a review of the literature around challenging
behaviour. The second part of the chapter introduces the theoretical framework proposed for addressing the disruptive behaviour of learners, namely school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support (SWPBS).

Chapter Three describes the research design of the study, namely a single descriptive case study. The discussion contains, amongst other things, a discussion on the paradigmatic stance taken in the research, the philosophical assumptions underpinning the study and how the study will adhere to the principles of a case study research design. The chapter also discusses the data collected and generated, as well as the analytical strategies chosen to analyse the data, followed by a discussion on the ethical and quality aspects addressed in the research.

Chapter Four presents the results of document analysis and the group interviews, followed by a discussion of the results in the light of the theoretical framework and the research questions stated in Chapter One.

Chapter Five concludes the research process by answering the research questions, as well as providing recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most prominent factors influencing the learning environment in South African schools is the challenging, disruptive behaviour of learners in general (Oosthuizen, Wolhuter & Du Toit, 2003). It is widely acknowledged that discipline is essential for creating a positive school climate conducive to good academic performance. According to Masitsa (2007), numerous schools, however, experience increasing incidents of poor discipline that impacts negatively on academic performance, while some of these incidents even have a life-threatening character. In an education system that is still struggling to create a culture of teaching and learning, ill-disciplined behaviour cancels all well-intended efforts to restore or create this culture. This chapter will discuss school discipline and challenging behaviour, after which there will be a discussion of the theoretical framework for the study: school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support.

2.2 SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

School discipline is interpreted differently by teachers. The phenomenon of discipline refers to an appropriate behaviour and, as such, to a commitment to uphold certain convictions and norms of decency (Masitsa, 2007). Mugabe and Maposa (2007) refer to discipline as an educative order with the aim of trying to reach appropriate standards and following rules for engaging in a valued activity like education.
Skiba and Peterson (2003), as well as Du Plessis and Loock (2007), associate discipline with the notion of bringing learners in line with accepted norms of decency or complying with a code of behaviour often known as school rules. These rules may, for example, define the expected standards of clothing, social behaviour and work ethics. In this perspective of discipline, the submission to rules is an instrument for achieving the desired goal. Another perspective is to argue that the rules should be respected in order to promote the order necessary for attaining the desired goal.

The term discipline may also be applied to the punishment that is the consequence of transgression of the code of behaviour. When adults administer punishment they are said to be ‘disciplining’ the child. The third perspective views discipline as treatment that corrects or punishes the child when the rules or conditions are contravened (Van der Walt & Oosthuizen, 2007), that is “… the means of rectifying errors and meting out appropriate punishment for wrongdoers” (Rich, 1982). Punishment, in this sense, serves to force an individual to resist or to remove certain unwanted cognitive or affective behaviours in order to become ‘disciplined’ (Van Wyk, 2000).

Taking a more positive stance, Joubert, et al., (2004) argue that discipline is about positive behaviour management aimed at promoting appropriate behaviour and at developing self-discipline and self-control in learners. Effective discipline assists learners to control their challenging behaviour and to act according to the expectations regarding which behaviour is right and which is wrong, not because they fear punishment (Telep, 2009). Discipline, in such a positive sense, refers to learning, regulated scholarship, guidance and orderliness (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000). Discipline, from this perspective, makes quality an integral part of an effective educational endeavour in which parents and educators give assistance to a child who seeks help. The child is supported and guided
towards the degree of self-guidance which is necessary for successful learning; and to achieve adequate self-actualization and a responsible and happy adulthood (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000).

Discipline, in the context of education, is therefore “designed to maintain a form of order that will promote learning objectives and, provides a teacher with a classroom atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning” (Ndofirepi, Makaye & Ndofirepi, 2012, p. 84). It involves the maintenance of order in a group; keeping the members of a group focused on a goal; preserving individuals from disturbing or harming each other; and is believed to be possible largely through the threat of punishment (Ndofirepi, et al., 2012).

2.2.1 Different approaches to enforce school discipline

Two main approaches to school discipline and of relevance to the context of this study can be identified: a retributive or punitive approach; and a preventative approach.

2.2.1.1 Retributive or punitive disciplinary approach

Retributive or punitive disciplinary approaches refer to disciplinary measures taken to address the misconduct after the misconduct has occurred. Punitive disciplinary measures can be described as those measures adopted by a school or a teacher to punish or curb the misconduct of the learner (Oosthuizen et al., 2003). The punitive approach to discipline focuses on causing discomfort or pain to prevent the offense from happening again (e.g. corporal punishment) and is not aimed at the development of educational values (Cryan, 1995). Historically, school discipline was managed by focusing on inappropriate behaviour through the implementation of punitive strategies which included reprimand, loss of privileges, caning, expulsions, suspensions, detentions and administrative transfers (Lane, Kalberg & Menzies, 2009). Results were often achieved through fear and oppression; for
example, the whole class would be kept behind because of a few learners who misbehaved (Wright, 1998). The punishment serves as warning to other disruptive learners who are inclined to commit similar wrongs (Jennings & Baker, 2002; Connally, Dowd, Christe, Nelson & Tobias, 1995). Punitive measures may not always achieve the intended objectives. A criticism of the punitive approach to discipline was that it did not pay enough attention to the consequences of actions (Parker, 2002). In addition, Lessing and Dreyer (2007) are of the opinion that negative disciplinary measures may lead to rebelliousness and negativity that could inhibit the development of responsibility in learners and the disruption of the learning process.

2.2.1.2 Preventative or co-operative disciplinary approach

Preventative measures to dealing with learner indiscipline are more proactive than reactive measures that may not repair the damage caused (Scharle & Szabo, 2000). Co-operative discipline is a theory of discipline that offers corrective, supportive and most importantly, preventative strategies towards the management of discipline (Canter & Canter, 2001). The goal of co-operative discipline is to inspire learners to make smart choices and to develop positive behaviour (Canter, 2007), in a collaborative effort on the part of the learners, teachers, school administration and parents (Mtsweni, 2008). This approach led to a perspective on discipline where the management of discipline is seen to be a process of constantly emphasising positive behaviour and that the action needs to maintain the dignity of both teachers and learners (Curwin, Mendler & Mendler, 2008). Positive discipline is associated with disciplinary methods that do not damage, but that rather build the self-esteem of learners, by enabling said learners to learn the various skills involved in assuming responsibility for what happens to them; taking the initiative to solve problems; and successfully relating to others (Oosthuizen et al., 2003).
Du Plessis and Loock (2007) report research that indicates the reasons for the benefits of positive disciplinary strategies for learners:

- Opportunities are being afforded to forge relationships with caring adults, thus preventing disciplinary problems;
- Fair, corrective discipline that includes relationship-building activities that reduce the likelihood of further problems;
- The implementation of strategies that effectively maintain appropriate social behaviour, thus making schools safer; and
- The use of positive solutions to address learner needs, environmental conditions, teacher interactions, and matching learners with the curriculum.


**The motivation of children:** A strong belief is needed that the majority of learners want to learn and are capable of good behaviour. Teachers should use a variety of strategies to foster the motivation of learners to achieve both academically and socially. Porter (2004) identifies two tasks that would increase learner motivation: firstly, make learners willing to put effort into learning, and secondly, teachers should structure their teaching so that it is easier for learners to learn. Le Roux (2005) focuses on the provision of praise to learners for work done, or the rewarding of outstanding academic and sporting achievements as a way to motivate and encourage the learners.

**Rewards, not punishment:** Good behaviour depends on establishing a clear framework of rules, boundaries, routines, rewards for good behaviour and corrective sanctions. Learners are more likely to behave in an orderly fashion if the expectations concerning their behaviour
are made clear. Leaman (2005) proposes that learners who have made an effort to contain their own behaviour should be praised and even included in class awards or certificates. Positive home-school relationships could be built by sharing some of the positives with the parents of the learners (Young, 2008).

**Shared rule-making:** Rules are far more effective if teachers and learners work together to agree on them. The inclusion of the voices of the learners in the identification of the biggest behavioural problems of the school would empower the learners, making them feel part of the school community, and will most likely leave them with the view that the rules of the school are fair and legitimate, which is another crucial factor in preventing misbehaviour (Harper et al., 2005).

**Adult behaviour:** The behaviour of a teacher is the most important determining factor in learner behaviour. Soneson (2005) maintains that ‘good’ discipline – which must ultimately be self-discipline- depends on the modelling and explaining of positive behaviour by adults. Learners will not respond in a constructive way if teachers act aggressively or ineffectually.

**Promoting equity and respect:** The view that rights are a reciprocal process is very important in the promotion of positive discipline in schools (Harper et al., 2005). The acknowledgement and value of differences between different groups, as well as the realisation of the damaging impact of discrimination and prejudice, will most likely lead to less violence and bullying either by teachers or by learners towards each other (Harper et al., 2005). Rogers (2004) also maintains that teachers should show respect for their learners by treating them in a polite and courteous manner, and not by resorting to making unfair and hurtful comments based on sarcasm or on belittling the learner.
A planned, whole-school approach: Teachers will have a more consistent approach to discipline if there is collective agreement on how to teach and manage behaviour (Porter, 2007).

2.2.1.3 Contemporary perspective of school discipline

In summary, the contemporary perspective of school discipline evident in literature seems to have the following three elements: Discipline is seen as a learning process driven by values embedded in sound teacher-learner relationships.

**Discipline as a learning process:** Effective discipline is seen to assist learners to control their challenging behaviour as part of a learning process in which they strive to act according to the expectations regarding right and wrong behaviour, and not because they fear punishment (Telep, 2009). Hewitt (2008) argues that the purpose of discipline is to acquire knowledge; to comprehend challenges, and then, as the learners understand the challenges, the solution and choices mushroom. Through this approach, Hewitt sees discipline as a process towards self-actualisation.

Glasser (2009) advocates the application of choice and consequence theory, to bring learners to an awareness of their responsibility to make their own decisions about learning and behaviour in or outside classrooms. Choice theory also calls on classroom management strategy, which focuses on stopping inappropriate behaviour and the modification of that behaviour without punishment. Choice theory further emphasizes assertive discipline. Assertive discipline aims to teach learners to accept the consequences of their action. Responsibility and accountability are actually what assertive discipline is all about (Bechuke & Debeila, 2012).
Discipline through classroom environment: Behaviour is functionally related to the teaching environment (Lewis, 2012). The single biggest factor affecting academic growth in any population is the effectiveness of the individual classroom (Sanders, 1999, reported in Lewis, 2012). The quality of interpersonal relationships between learners and teachers, and the physical environment are at the heart of managing any behaviour (Sullivan & Keeney, 2008; Chaplain, 2003). Discipline therefore requires academic and social behaviour prevention efforts (Lewis, 2012).

Discipline as a value-driven tool: Nieuwenhuis, Beckmann and Prinsloo (2007) observe that schools play a crucial role in perpetuating societal values and this can only be done if learners are taught to be responsible for their own behaviours. Most of our schools today also experience disrespect, gangsterism, and dishonesty, which cause the demise of our value system. Yu (2004) calls it an attempt on our ‘common sense’. Oosthuizen (2006) argues that a school will become a better place if the values of discipline, mutual respect, self-control, honesty, friendliness, and altruism, to mention but a few, can be lived out effectively. Teacher-learner relationships appear to be an integral feature in the management of discipline in schools (Mokhele, 2006) as they have the potential to create environments in the classrooms that are conducive to learning, which determines whether or not the learner benefits from the teaching-learning situation (Mokhele, 2006). Teacher-learner relationships should be characterised by a caring, positive school climate that is manifest in listening, critical questioning, openness and a feeling of being cared for (Mtsweni, 2008).
The role of the school in the establishment of an effective ‘host’ environment

Society has a growing expectation of schools to establish socially acceptable and efficient interventions to ensure a safe, productive and predictable learning environment where pro-social behaviour is promoted (Sugai, et al, 2000). Schools are seen as important environments in which “learners, family, educators and community members have opportunities to learn, teach and grow” and, as such, have “the potential to provide positive adult and peer role models, multiple and regular opportunities to experience academic and social success, and social exchanges that foster enduring peer and adult relationships” (Sugai, et al., 1999). Schools, therefore, need to provide learners with an environment that develops and supports learning and academic achievement.

It is evident that the responsibility for effective school discipline is placed on the school management team of a particular school. Sugai, et al. (1999) argue for schools to create an effective ‘host environment’ with policies (proactive disciplinary books), structures (behavioural support teams), and routines (opportunities for students to learn expected behaviour, staff development, and data-based decision-making) in place that promote the identification, adoption, implementation and monitoring of research-validated practice. Effective school policies promote good behaviour (Gray, Miller, & Noakes, 1994) by providing clear and defensible guidelines for behaviour (Charlton & David, 1993) expressing the aim of fostering a well-disciplined environment in which learners can learn, is (Porter, 2000).

Schools should design policies to equip teachers with some practical competencies that would enable them to respond to current social and educational problems (Leickness, 2005). By designing policies that are proactive in order to prevent dangerous and disruptive behaviour; providing support for learners who display challenging behaviour; conducting
staff development on managing learner behaviour; and encouraging family and community involvement, schools are enabled to provide an environment that is safe and conducive to learning (Sugai & Horner, 1999). It is furthermore reported that proactive schools often enforce rules fairly, unambiguously, with a clear rewards and recognition system for compliance (Smith, 2010).

In the South African context, each school is required to develop a Code of Conduct (as prescribed by Section 8 (2) of the South African Schools Act) (RSA, 1996b) aimed at establishing a disciplined (represented by learners who display characteristics such as obedience, excellence, self-control and responsibility) and purposeful school environment (all activities within the school environment are in accord with the vision of the school) dedicated to the improvement and maintenance of the quality of the learning process. The Code of Conduct of a school is not a set of rules and measures for punishment, but is the framework of the school for the establishment of a culture of positive behaviour within which learners should conduct themselves. The South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996b) stipulates that a Code of Conduct should contain a preamble (a statement of the values for which the school strives); general aims, which are the objectives of the Code of Conduct; a statement of the rights and responsibilities of all the role players; the general school rules and regulations; the incentives for good behaviour; the infringements (a description of unacceptable behaviour and the disciplinary steps to be taken in case of misconduct); and the proceedings for the management of misconduct. The Code of Conduct, although essentially a preventative measure, also has a punitive aspect as it describes the punitive steps to be taken by the school in cases of misconduct (Oosthuizen, et al., 2003).

Many a time, however, schools lack the knowledge to identify, adopt and sustain policies, practices and systems to meet the needs of most of the learners effectively and
efficiently (Sugai, et al., 2000). Another concern has been identified as the inability of some schools to create and sustain a contextual fit of the procedures, practices and features of the school environment (Crone & Horner, 2003). There is little chance of success if attention has not been paid to the values, routines, and resources associated with disciplinary policies.

2.2.3 The role of teachers in managing discipline in schools

Effective teaching minimises disciplinary problems. Masitsa (2007) recommends that teachers should promote good learner behaviour by teaching effectively and consistently, as this will create schools where academic performance is the norm and disciplinary problems are the exception. Masitsa further recommends that teachers should rely less on punishment. Mestry et al., (2007) argue that teachers should work as a team and apply disciplinary measures consistently so that learners will understand and stick to rules; while Steward (2006) states that it is necessary for teachers to ensure that they do not discipline any learner unfairly. Knott-Craig (2007) argues that it is the role of teachers to build a relationship with each learner with the focus of keeping the communication channels open. The establishment of a classroom climate based on mutual respect, in which learners feel safe and affirmed, will develop the ability of learners to practice self-discipline (Van Wyk, 2001). Teachers are seen as incubators of self-discipline in learners under their charge and should therefore be consistent role models of socially acceptable behaviour (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000). Teachers should lead their learners through the process of modelling (Oosthuizen et al., 2003) and, as such, they should be aware of and able to control their own behaviour (Wolhuter & Steyn, 2003). Learners should see the values they are being taught demonstrated in the lives and attitudes of their teachers.
2.3 CHALLENGING LEARNER BEHAVIOUR AND DISCIPLINE

Many descriptions of disciplinary problems are found in literature. The concepts challenging and disruptive behaviour will be taken as being equivalent terms in this study. Similarly, concepts such as misconduct and misbehaviour are treated under the label of challenging behaviour in the context of this study. In order to address the challenging behaviour displayed by the learners, it is necessary to define and describe the various types of challenging behaviour.

2.3.1 Defining challenging behaviour

There is no single, precise definition of the concept challenging behaviour because learners can exhibit inappropriate behaviours in a variety of ways (Macciomei & Ruben, 1999, reported by Felix, 2011). Challenging behaviour can be taken as behaviour that normally interferes with the development and success of a child (Mcfarland, 2008). Millei (2005) argues that the challenging behaviour of a learner can manifest as a lack of interest in a discussed topic or lack of understanding of certain tasks. Challenging behaviour can also be the detrimental effect that the behaviour of one learner has on the behaviour of other learners (Derrington, 2008). Gordon and Browne (2004, reported in Marais & Meier, 2010) consider challenging behaviour as merely disruptive behaviour (Gordon & Browne, 2004), while Mabeba and Prinsloo (2000) argue that challenging behaviour is attributable to disciplinary problems in schools, which affect the fundamental rights of the learner to feel safe and to be treated with respect in the learning environment. Klass, Guskin and Thomas (1995), as well as Barker, Yeung, Dobia and Mooney (2009) argue that challenging behaviour impedes on learning. Disciplinary problems are described as ‘disruptive behaviour’ that significantly affects fundamental rights to feel safe, to be treated with respect and to learn (Joubert, et al. 2004). Challenging behaviour has also a negative impact on the efficacy and well-being of learners.
and teachers (Barker, et al., 2009). It puts the learner at risk for later social problems and for possible school failure (Klass, Guskin & Thomas, 1995).

In this study challenging behaviour will be considered as the actions of an individual learner or group of learners who are uncooperative in a classroom, preventing themselves and other learners from academic progress (Parkinson, 2009) and who display behaviour that interferes with their learning, development and success, as well as the learning, development and success of their classmates (Klass, et al., 1995).

Challenging behaviour is argued not only to impede learning (Barker, Yeung, Dobia & Mooney, 2009; Klass, et al., 1995), but it also has a negative impact on the efficacy and well-being of learners and teachers (Barker, et al., 2009).

2.3.2 Classification of challenging behaviour

Of importance to consider when classifying challenging behaviour would be the intensity and frequency of the disruptive behaviour (Pierangelo & Giuliani, 2000, reported in Felix, 2011). Kaiser and Rasminsky (2013) classified challenging behaviour as threatening, provocative or negatively stimulated behaviour (Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2013). It can also include the exhibition of hostility and aggression towards other people, defiance to adult authority and the violation of social norms (Walker, Ramsey & Gresham, 2004). This hostility and aggression are with the intention to do harm, be it physical, emotional, or for revenge and retaliation (Smith, 1995). Threatening, provocative and negatively stimulated behaviour prevent learners from gaining the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values, which they need to become successful (Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2013). Manifestations of challenging behaviour can be mutually interactive and cannot really be separated or distinguished (Wearmouth, Glynn, & Berryman, 2005). Cameron (1998) divided challenging behaviour into five categories that could be useful for this study, namely:
• Aggressive behaviour (e.g. hitting, pulling hair, kicking, using abusive language).
  Any behaviour that causes intentional harm, pain or injury to another person, 
  classified as either instrumental aggression (one learner attacking another person), 
  or hostile aggression manifested as hitting, pulling hair, kicking, using abusive 
  language, etc. (Keenan, 2009);
• Physically disruptive behaviour (e.g. smashing, damaging or defacing objects, 
  throwing objects, physically annoying other learners);
• Socially disruptive behaviour (e.g. screaming, running away, exhibiting temper 
  tantrums);
• Authority-challenging behaviour (e.g. refusing to carry out requests, exhibiting 
  defiant verbal and non-verbal behaviour, using pejorative language);
• Self-disruptive behaviour (e.g. daydreaming, reading under the desk).

2.3.3 Possible factors influencing challenging behaviour

The causes of this rising tide of challenging behaviour of learners are manifold 
(Ndamani, 2008). Lewis, Romi, Qui and Katz (2005) identified a number of factors that 
cause disruptive or challenging classroom misbehaviour, namely family, school and 
communal life. Lessing and Mahabeer (2007) used a finer grid to identify some of the 
biggest contributors to the challenging behaviours of learners as being socio-economic 
environment, lack of parental involvement, weakened parenting skills, family configuration, 
the educational level of parents and the culture of the community. Additional contributing 
factors are the current focus by parents and the community on rights rather than responsibilities 
(Chisholm, 2007), in addition to the inadequate respect of society towards the professionalism of 
teachers (Derrington, 2008). In terms of scholastic factors, large classes and high learner ratios 
which result in educators being unable to attend to the individual learning needs of learners
and to practise outcomes–based education adequately, contribute to disruptive behaviour by learners (Millei, 2005). Furthermore, when learning content is not embedded in the context and level of the culture and life world of learners then the learners will distance themselves from the tasks of learning. Consequently, such learners will display various forms of unacceptable behaviour (Landsberg et al., 2005).

The lack of confidence of the teacher pertaining to his/her classroom management skills can also be detrimental to the ability of the teacher to be an effective educator (Brouwers & Tomi, 2000), which further contributes to disruptive behaviour. Teachers who manage a classroom poorly and who operate in an unstructured learning environment are waiting on problems to start. An unstructured learning environment poses challenges to learners and teachers alike. The main outcomes of the above-mentioned factors are that teachers do not facilitate the overall goal of providing meaningful, rigorous learning experiences for all learners (Lane, Menzies, Bruhn, & Crnobori, 2011).

Another aspect that contributes to disciplinary problems at South African schools is the insufficient training on alternative methods of maintaining discipline in schools. Teachers are not equipped with alternative methods to corporal punishment (Le Roux, 2005; Soneson, 2005). The ability of teachers to control learners and to enforce security and safety in schools is of the utmost importance for effective school discipline (Fishbaugh, Schroth & Berkely, 2001).

2.4 POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT (PBIS) AS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ADDRESSING DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS

Keeping in mind that the SA constitution requires schools to provide a safe teaching and learning environment for all teachers and learners (RSA, 1996a), and that discipline is argued to be a value-driven learning process that happens through classroom environments,
there is a need in South African schools for a school-wide, scientifically-based behavioural intervention and support framework to prevent, rather than to remedy, the development of problem behaviours displayed by some learners. One such prevention model is the positive behaviour support (PBS) approach.

The term PBS emerged in the mid-1980s in reference to behaviour management by means of non-aversive practices. The concept broadened to encompass a shift from behaviour management to one of support, encompassing principles of behaviourism, and the concept of applied behaviour analysis as well as the process of conducting functional behavioural assessments to guide positive interventions (Dunlap, Kincaid, Horner, Knoster & Bradshaw, 2014). The correct use of PBS decreases the need for intrusive or adverse interventions (Bambara & Knoster, 2009). PBS became established as a useful way to communicate about an approach characterized by (a) an emphasis on instructional procedures and an avoidance of interventions that involved pain or stigmatization, (b) a continued emphasis on supporting observable and measureable behaviour, and (c) an insistence that all interventions be based on an understanding of and respect for the life circumstances, preferences, and goals of a person (Horner et al., 1990).

Over time, connections emerged between PBS, with its focus on the behaviour of individuals, and on the complementary research being conducted in classrooms and schools addressing systemic aspects related to helping learners with behavioural concerns (Dunlap, Kincaid, Horner, Knoster, & Bradshaw, 2014). This led to the coining of the term positive behaviour interventions and supports (PBIS). PBIS came to refer to the application of PBS strategies within school contexts (Dunlap et al., 2014). Carr et al., (2002) see PBIS as an empirically validated, function-based approach that uses educational and systematic methods to enhance the quality of life and to minimise problem behaviour in general. Horner
et al. (2009) explain PBIS as an operational framework with a comprehensive and systematic approach for ensuring and establishing a social culture as well as intensive behaviour support needed to establish and improve the academic and behavioural success of all learners.

It aims to implement a workable, sustainable and positive approach to managing individual behaviour (Barker, Yeung, Dobia, & Mooney, 2009) by promoting a positive school climate, resultantly reducing learner behavioural problems (Bradshaw, Koth, Bevans, Ialongo & Leaf, 2008). It involves the changing of situations and events experienced by individuals with problem behaviour in order to reduce the likelihood that problem behaviour will recur, and to increase the social and personal quality of their lives (Carr, et al., 1999). As PBIS intervention techniques focus on the contexts in which behaviours occur, developing interventions that address the function of the problem behaviours and that replace inappropriate behaviours with appropriate communication (Haring & De Vault, 1996), it is proactive in managing challenging behaviour in that it emphasizes the readjustment of environment, the teaching of replacement behaviour, and the manipulation of consequences to reduce targeted behaviours (Wheeler & Richey, 2005, reported in Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009). Emphasis is placed on the following three areas: prevention of problem behavior; development of pro-social skills and the use of data-based problem solving for the prevention of and responding to challenging behaviour concerns. PBIS, therefore, differs from the traditional and punitive behavioural management strategies in that it focuses on conditions, circumstances, systems and variables impacting on the learners from both an individual and a school-wide approach (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler & Feinberg, 2005) instead of just looking at learners (Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009) when addressing discipline. The concept school-wide positive behaviour interventions and support (SWPBS) has come to indicate a focus on implementing PBIS strategies with integrity and consistently across all settings in schools.
2.4.1 School-wide positive behaviour interventions and support (SWPBS)

The term school-wide positive behaviour interventions and support (SWPBS) has come to represent a systems approach to addressing discipline through creating a positive and proactive school environment that addresses the behavioural needs of the whole school using research-based school-wide, classroom and individualized interventions (Dunlap, Goodman, Mc Evoy & Paris, 2010), emphasizing the central and formal role of schools as providers of positive behavioural interventions (Dunlap et al., 2014; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Horner, Sugai, Todd & Lewis-Palmer, 2005). The purpose of SWPBS is to establish a school climate in which appropriate behaviour is the norm (Barker, Yeung, Dobia & Mooney, 2009).

This framework subscribes to an instructional approach to behaviour management and support by utilising direct instructions, small group instructions, and co-operative learning in teaching as well as rewarding behaviour that is appropriate in social and academic settings. SWPBS allows all staff, teaching and non-teaching, to establish expectations specifying them exactly in different locations, be they at assembly on Mondays, in the toilets, or in and around the school nutritional programme milieu. Even the learners have the opportunity to practise and to receive reinforcement and adherence to the expectations (Walker & Severson, 1992). SWPBS has the capability to target an individual learner or an entire school by focusing on several aspects, including changing environmental variables such as task demands, curriculum and individualised reinforcement (Cohn, 2001) utilizing. By adopting a system approach SWPBS, schools create a positive and proactive environment that addresses the behavioural needs of the whole school (Sugai et al., 2000).

This model includes proactive components which are aimed at prevention (primary prevention), as well as reactive components aimed at remedial teaching (secondary and
tertiary prevention programs) (Kauffman & Landrum, 2009). As SWPBS focuses on the development of social competence, with particular emphasis on universal intervention (Marchant et al., 2009), challenging behaviour can be prevented by teachers through a variety of strategies and amid a broad range of contexts (Kauffman, 1999). SWPBS is therefore, a multi-layered method that acts to reduce the number of problem behaviours in a school setting, and improves the overall climate of the school (Lassen, Steele & Sailor, 2006). The guiding principles of SWPBS are, in summary, a focus on the prevention of behavioural problems; continuous behavioural support for all learners; real application in natural school settings; consistent improvement based on collected data; and systematic organisational change (Carr, et al., 2002; Sugai et al., 2000).

SWPBS organizes the smallest number of behavioural interventions with the greatest demonstrated effectiveness and applicability within five general school-based areas, namely:

- **School-wide**: all learners, family and staff members across the school settings (e.g. formal teaching, desired expectations and data-based decision-making).

- **Classroom**: integration of behaviour management and academic instruction (e.g. teaching and reinforcement of classroom routines, active supervision, academic engagement and success).

- **Non-classroom**: non-instructional contexts (active supervision, teaching of setting specific routines). Sport discipline is one of the discipline strategies employed within the context of the whole school framework to develop a core set of values. Sport discipline makes a positive contribution towards discipline if the
coach and learners share the same set of norms and standards with regard to behaviour (Oosthuizen, & Coetzer, 2010).

- **Family**: community and parental involvement in support of learner achievement (e.g. positive communications, home practise and reinforcement).

- **Individual learner**: specialized behaviour and academic support for learners whose behaviours are not responsive to interventions (e.g. targeting social skills and self-management instruction) (Dunlap, et al., 2000).

### 2.4.2 Benefits of SWPBS

Challenging behaviour can be prevented by teachers through a variety of strategies and amid a range of contexts (Kauffman, 1999). In order to avoid a piecemeal approach to the application of positive behaviour interventions, SWPBS provides a framework within which schools select evidence-based interventions that match the needs of their school; implement the intervention with fidelity over time; and use data on the interventions to guide decision-making around the intervention (Anderson & Borgmeier, 2010). It is important to notice that SWPBS is an approach that is flexible enough to be tailored to the needs of an individual school, instead of being a canned program. Research suggests that the contextualisation of the interventions is useful for ensuring the durability of the interventions.

Data suggest that when SWPBS is implemented in schools, discipline problems are typically reduced (Caldarella, Shatzer, Gray, Young & Young, 2011; Bohanon et al., 2006). The adoption of a SWPBS approach can increase the likelihood of learners being able to develop the needed social competence to function effectively in a school environment (Marchant, Anderson, Caldarella, Fisher, Young & Young, 2009). Further benefits reported
include the establishment of a healthy learning environment as a result of improved teacher-learner relationships (Warren et al., 2006; Turnbull et al., 2002). In the long run, the teachers reported that they spend less time on discipline and, as such, more time is available to expose learners to more positive learning activities (Lassen et al., 2006). The correct implementation of SWPBS has been reported to lead to improved academic achievement, enhanced social competence and safe teaching and learning environments, ultimately enhancing the quality of life for teachers, learners and family (Bohanon, et al., 2006).

In short, SWPBS is a process of changing the climate of a school to prevent problem behaviours by (1) teaching desirable behaviours to all learners; (2) positively recognising these appropriate behaviours; (3) increasing positive versus negative feedback for learners; and (4) helping learners to learn behaviours that support achievement in school and meaningful options for their futures (South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center, n.d.). Discipline is, therefore, viewed as a value-driven tool assisting the learners to learn the appropriate social and academic behaviour in the natural setting where this learning takes place (the classroom environment).

2.4.3 Levels of interventions and support in SWPBS

SWPBS is a three-tiered or -level model of prevention and intervention within which a continuum of evidence-based interventions, namely primary or universal interventions and supports (Tier I), secondary or targeted interventions and supports (Tier II), and tertiary or individualized interventions and supports (Tier III) can be implemented, with increasingly intensive support offered in each of the tiers (Lane, Menzies, Kalberg & Oakes, 2013) (see Figure 2.1). The model focuses on the behaviour of the individual and the context in which the behaviour of the individual is observed (Sugai & Horner, 2002). A triangle is used to illustrate that Tier I supports are in place for all learners and that successively fewer learners
will require additional, increasingly intensive levels of intervention (Anderson & Borgmeier, 2010) (see Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1: A graphic representation of the continuum of School Based Instructional and Positive Behaviour Support tiers (Sugai & Horner, 2002; Sugai et al., 2000)

The first tier serves as the foundation upon which the other two tiers are built. In the first tier a universal system of support (also known as primary support) is offered to every learner in a school, based on preventative practices which emphasise teaching and reinforce expected learner behaviours (see Figure 2.1). Primary prevention underscores defining, teaching, monitoring, and rewarding behavioural expectations for all learners across non-classroom and classroom settings (Turnbull et al., 2002). Therefore, by virtue of attending school, all learners receive and experience primary prevention assistance. Learners are supposed to experience the school set-up as socially predictable, consistent, safe and positive (Barret, Bradshaw & Lewis – Palmer, 2008). The goal of primary prevention or support is to lay the rules and foundation to establish a social culture where learners respect and support
appropriate behaviour from each other and allow maximized opportunities for teaching and learning to all (Tobin, Sugai, Colvin, 2000). Examples of basic rules that could be applicable are: to be respectful (Barker, Yeung, Dobia & Mooney, 2009), to be responsible and to be safe (Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2009). Typical support and practices appropriate for use in Tier I include reminders/redirection, detention, conferencing with a learner to provide corrective feedback, re-teaching behavioural expectations, loss of privileges, and working with the learner to choose an appropriate way to apologise and make amends to those harmed or offended.

Learners who do not respond positively to the universal support offered in Tier I, or who are in need of specific attention, will slot into the targeted Tier II intervention program. Learners who receive Tier II support are more likely to exhibit behaviours that are more disruptive to teaching and learning (specifically peer learning), but not yet behaviours that are dangerous to themselves or to fellow learners (Anderson & Borgmeier, 2010). A continuation of Tier I support is followed up with more guidance and structure to assist the individual learner to meet the school-wide behavioural expectations. Secondary interventions, consequently, offer support to meet specific acquisitions (can’t do); fluency (trouble doing); or performance (not motivated to do) deficits (Elliott & Gresham, 2007) of learners. Secondary prevention is, therefore, more intensive and involves an extensive time investment, as well as an increase in adult attention and monitoring (Adelman & Taylor, 2006). Tier II support and interventions are very important within the SWPBS framework, as it represents a mechanism for systematic early intervention for learners who are at risk for poor academic and behavioural outcomes (Johnson, 2014). Examples of secondary interventions include: behavioural contracts, conflict resolution training, self-management strategies, meeting with a social worker or other mentoring adult in “check-and-connect” programmes, where the learner checks in with a concerned staff member every day, and high
quality in-school suspension, where the learner receives help with academic and behavioural issues.

Tier III involves targeted interventions to support learners classified as ‘at risk’, who require more intervention than is typically provided in Tier II. The interventions offered in the third tier involve highly individualized and intensive, functionally-based support to learners who need very specific interventions and who do not respond to either primary or secondary intervention (Sugai & Horner, 2006). At tertiary level, special teachers, school psychologists, counsellors and behaviour interventionists with specialized competencies are involved in the development of team-based and person-centred comprehensive behaviour intervention plans that focus on specific skills and changes in environmental settings (Lohrmann et al., 2010). Tertiary interventions include the use of Functional Behaviour Assessments to identify the cause, or function, of the difficult behaviour of a learner and ways to prevent it. These preventative measures include a behaviour support plan and counselling, out-of-school punishments, referral to school-based health exercises and family conferences with other community supports, such as mental health or family counselling services.

2.5 KEY IMPLEMENTATION FEATURES OF A SWPBS FRAMEWORK

The implementation of SWPB has various aspects that need to be addressed in order to ensure effective and sustained implementation.

2.5.1 Guiding principles for the implementation of SWPBS

Literature has identified a set of guiding principles for the effective implementation of SWPBS, namely commitment, collaboration, and professional development. Commitment towards implementation and sustained implementation is a challenge for
schools. To achieve adequate commitment from teachers to implement SWPBS successfully, by its very nature will pose challenges (Bohanon, et al., 2006). Full implementation of positive behaviour support, on the other hand, is reported to take years. Studies indicate that it typically took elementary and middle schools three to four years (Sugai, Horner & McIntosh, 2008) and high schools an estimated five to eight years (Flannery, Sugai & Anderson, 2009; Bohanon, et al., 2006).

Collaboration is crucial to the effective implementation of SWPBS. Collaboration amongst teachers, parents and learners will maximise the likelihood of positive outcomes from using a positive behaviour approach to address the discipline issues in the school (McCurdy et al., 2003). All procedures associated with this implementation need to be conducted with high levels of fidelity to obtain adequate results. Collaboration builds consistency in the implementation and application of the strategies, while developing an appreciation of personal and cultural differences. Collaboration about the progress of learners should happen on a weekly basis. Pool et al., (2010) emphasized the importance of using teacher-focused outcomes to develop the system-wide plan to create teacher buy-in, as well as provide consistency in following and analysing the results. Teachers must work together to reach consensus on acceptable behaviours; how instruction will be carried out in the school; and what reinforcements will be issued for positive behaviours and consequences for negative behaviours.

Professional development of the staff involved should be localized, continuous, embedded and team-driven (Sugai & Horner, 2009). Ongoing teacher training is needed to address barriers faced during the implementation strategies of SWPBS (Bambara, Nonnemacher & Kern, 2009). Training is needed to update teachers on modifications to the framework. Suggestions should be provided and continued positive successes from the use
of the framework should be demonstrated. Typical teacher training tends to focus on presentations of behavioural interventions, classroom management and school wide discipline policies (Sugai & Horner, 2006).

### 2.5.2 Essential elements of SWPBS systems

Generally, SWPBS emphasises four elements, namely: data for decision-making; measurable outcomes supported and evaluated by the above-mentioned data; practices with evidence-driven outcomes which are achievable; and lastly, the systems that support the implementation of practices. Sugai and Horner (2006) proposed that, in order to develop an effective school-wide positive behaviour management system, several components need to be in place: (a) a planning team representing all facets of the school, (b) defined expectations for learner behaviour, (c) direct instruction of expectations to learners, (d) procedures for reinforcing appropriate behaviours and discouraging inappropriate behaviours, and (e) a process for evaluating outcomes. To implement primary tier interventions, schools need to (a) identify meaningful outcomes, (b) establish and invest in school-wide systems, (c) select and implement contextually appropriate, evidence-based practices, and (d) collect and make use of data to make decisions. In a SWPBS system, office disciplinary referrals (ODRs) serve as the primary behavioural data source. The SWPBS system further provides the context for schools to analyse their disciplinary practices through either monthly or quarterly reviews of its behavioural data. The ODRs provide the following: the learner’s name, gender, age, and ethnicity; the referring teacher, problem behaviour, date, time and location of incident; motivation for the behaviour as perceived by the teacher; and disciplinary action taken by the administrator (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

Anderson and Borgmeier (2010) identified essential features for Tier II interventions to include “(a) explicit instruction of skills (e.g., pro-social skills, academic skills), (b)
structured prompts for appropriate behaviour, (c) opportunities for the learner to practice new skills in the natural setting, and (d) frequent feedback to the student. In addition, many Tier II interventions might include a mechanism for fading support when appropriate and a means for communicating regularly with a learner’s parents”.

2.6 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter emphasized the essentials of proactive classroom management, which are encompassed in the following: a positive classroom climate, creating a physical room arrangement that facilitates instruction; provides clear, consistent reinforcement of behavioural expectations; determines the procedures and routine for swift transitions; maximizes instructional time and manages paperwork effectively.

Various aspects related to school discipline were discussed in this chapter. The chapter started with a discussion around school discipline, followed by a discussion on challenging behaviour displayed by learners. The chapter concludes with an illumination of the theoretical framework on which the study is based, namely school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support (SWPBS). The next chapter will discuss how the single, descriptive case study was conducted in an ethical, reliable manner, leading to trustworthy findings.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the implementation of a positive behavioural intervention and support approach to discipline in a primary school. The study aims to elicit the perspective of teachers from a specific primary school about the usefulness of a positive behaviour intervention and support model to deal with learners who display challenging behaviour. In order to do justice to the research question as stated in Chapter One, this chapter will describe the philosophical underpinnings of the study, followed by the justification for the use of a case study methodology including a detailed discussion of the data collection and analysis that was followed to answer the research questions. Lastly, the actions taken to ensure research rigour and ethical research practices will be discussed.

3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF THE RESEARCH

Paradigms are frameworks and guidelines that provide a set of assumptions about the nature of reality, epitomized through ontology (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The relationship between the researcher and what can be known can be studied through epistemology, while the beliefs of the researcher about the world is studied through ontology. The methodology assists the researcher to define the practical way in which he goes about doing the research (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). As such, the strength of a paradigm is that it allows action to take place. Its weakness, however, is that the reasons for action are hidden in the
unquestioned assumptions underpinning the paradigm (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These assumptions determine what questions that the researcher asks and how these questions are answered (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). Since the philosophical underpinnings of a study act as a lens that change the shape of what is seen, it is important to place a study into its theoretical context.

The purpose of this study is to establish the usefulness of the PBIS theoretical framework to address disruptive behaviour displayed by learners at a primary school in Port Elizabeth from the point of view of the teachers and, as such, the study is located in the interpretive paradigm. The reality of addressing disruptive behaviour displayed by primary school learners is thus created and based on the subjective experiences by people of their world characterised by a subjective epistemology (Grix, 2010) and multiple ways of knowing. In short, reality is constructed in the minds of individuals (the teachers in the context of the study) (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). These truths derived from the subjective experiences of people are real and must be taken into consideration. The interpretive perspective, therefore, acknowledges multiple truths and multiple realities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The subjective nature of this qualitative research allows the researcher to seek understanding and insights into human experiences and to apply meaning to human phenomena (Hasselkus, 2003). The reality experienced by people can therefore be discovered by interacting with them and listening to them (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999), with the aim to discover how the participants in the study understand the phenomenon investigated in the study (Babbie, 1998). As argued by Stake (1995), the most important role of the researcher is that of interpreter, envisioning the role as the builder of a clearer view of the phenomenon under study through explanations and descriptions by providing an integrated interpretation of the situation and the context.
As argued earlier, reality is considered subjective differing from person to person (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The view of the researcher of reality is therefore considered to affect the study; as do the perspectives of those interpreting and reading it. The study, therefore, subscribes to a relativist ontological position. The research is not seen as being value-free, as a researcher cannot create an objective distance from the topic of inquiry (Patton, 1990).

3.2.1 Research approach

Owing to the nature of the research question formulated in Chapter One and the philosophical underpinnings of the study explained in the previous section, a qualitative approach was followed in the study. Qualitative research leans toward the dynamics of the procedural elements of living and requires from the researcher to question the way we experience the world with the aim to know the world in which we live (Van Manen, 1990). A qualitative approach to the research offers us possibilities of plausible insights that bring us more in direct contact with the world (Van Manen, 1990). Furthermore, the knowledge that evolves from qualitative research often challenges our assumption about our world and opens our eyes to new ways of seeing that which is already familiar to us (Hasselkus, 2003). Another advantage offered by approaching the research from a qualitative perspective is the flexibility that it affords the researcher to investigate the chosen research phenomenon in its natural setting; to make sense of, as well as to interpret, the phenomenon in terms of meaning and understandings constructed by people (Denzin, 2005). As such, a variety of data sources are used (Baxter & Jack, 2008).
3.3 CASE STUDY

A case study was chosen as methodology to answer the research questions formulated in Chapter One. A case study is an approach in which the researchers explore a bounded system (Creswell, 1998) or case over time by means of detailed, in-depth data collection (Ragin & Becker, 1992). According to Yin (2003), a case study is suited to answer how and why questions; it accommodates situations when the researcher has minimal control over the events; and it requires a focus on phenomena that occur in a real-life context (for example, schools as socially constructed organisations). Yin (2003, p. xv) maintains that case study research is the most appropriate research approach for “appreciating the complexity of organisational phenomena”. Case study designs are thus useful when the contextual conditions of the phenomenon being studied (school discipline) have to be taken into account and when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not easily distinguished (Amerson, 2011). As such, a case study enabled me to conduct the study in such a manner that the complexity of school discipline is sufficiently reflected.

Because the case study methodology allows for the prior development of theoretical propositions to direct the data collection and analysis (Yin, 2003), it is useful in supporting and expanding on previously developed theories. In this study the usefulness of the existing SWPBIS theoretical framework (Raffaele, Mendez & Knoff, 2003) is examined in the particular context of a primary school situated in a particular community, the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth. The theory of SWPBS is applied with the aim either to support the applicability of the theoretical framework in this particular context, or to expand the theory based on the understandings gained in the context of this particular primary school. The rationale for the choice of case study as my research methodology is therefore supported by my research paradigm (the interpretive paradigm) and by my theoretical framework.
3.3.1 Role of the researcher

As I am the principal at the school where the intervention was implemented, I played a central role in the research process. I used personal knowledge and my experiences as principal to negotiate access to the school site (see permission letter from DoE to conduct the research – Appendix A); to formulate the research questions; and to define and name the categories of data to make sense of it (Saldana, 2009). I could therefore be considered to be the primary instrument in the data collection and consequent analysis of data (Merriam, 1998), resulting in taking on the role of a subjective insider (Unluer, 2012).

3.3.2 Setting the case boundaries

The boundary placed on the case was time and activity (Stake, 1995), to ensure that the study remains reasonable in scope. The intervention (adopting the PBIS framework as basis for addressing the disruptive behaviour of primary school learners) was implemented in 2012 at the school where I am the principal. This ensured that I had reasonable access to the data required to answer the research question. It can therefore be concluded that the research question posed in Chapter One is best answered using a qualitative case study.

Having identified case study research as methodology, as well as defining the case and its boundaries, leads me to the next decision, namely the consideration of the type of case study conducted.

3.3.3 Research design

The choice regarding the specific case study design was guided by the purpose of the study (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The purpose of this research was to determine the usefulness of the PBIS theoretical framework, if implemented school-wide, in addressing the disruptive behavioural patterns observed in a primary school within the Port Elizabeth
District. To achieve this purpose a single, multi-method interpretive case study (Merriam, 1998) was consequently chosen as design for the study. A single case study has been chosen as the research design for this study, since the study focused on an individual school in which the PBIS has been implemented. Merriam (1998) describes an interpretive case study as a study that illustrates the complexities of the situation and presents information from a wide variety of sources and viewpoints in a variety of ways. Similarly, Yin (2003) describes an interpretive case study as a case study used to describe an intervention or phenomenon in the real-life context in which it occurred. In line with the requirements of an interpretive case study, where a theoretical framework influences the research (as is the case in this study where the usefulness of the PBIS framework in addressing school discipline is investigated), the interpretive framework was used to organise the case study (Yin, 2003). The theoretical framework (PBIS) helped to focus attention on the type of data generated. The theoretical framework also led to the development of an interpretive framework for organising the case study (as will be explained in the next paragraphs).

3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND GENERATION

Taking the research questions as starting point for the decisions regarding the type of data required, data were generated to document the disruptive behavioural patterns of the learners over the period just before and during the implementation of the theoretical framework (ranging from 2012 to 2014). Incident book entries were chosen to provide the data needed to describe the disruptive behavioural patterns of the learners. The incident books served as a yardstick in order to compare behaviours of the previous two years in terms of any change in number and types of incidents recorded with the two years after the intervention was implemented.
Insights were also needed from the teachers to determine their perceptions around the usefulness (or not) of the PBIS framework and the new disciplinary measures implemented to address disruptive behaviour at the school. Group interviews and a questionnaire were used to generate data regarding the perspectives of the teachers with regard to the management of discipline by the school. Asking the teachers to reflect on their experiences with disruptive behaviour in the school over the three years constitutes the collecting of retrospective data, which suits case study research well (Kazdin, 2003). The Effective Behaviour Support (EBS) survey (Sugai, et al., 2000) was administered to the teachers with the aim of assessing and planning the behaviour support systems in the school. The survey measures the integrity of the interventions implemented at school and classroom levels.

The use of multiple data sources is a hallmark of case study research as it enables the researcher to cover a broader range of issues and to develop converging lines of inquiry by the process of triangulation (Yin, 2003). Furthermore, documents, archival records and interviews have been identified as useful sources of evidence in exemplary or descriptive case studies (Yin, 2003).

3.4.1 Incident books as documentary data source

Using Scott’s (1990, reported by Bryman, 2012) classification of documents, the incident books can be classified as primary official documents. They are considered to be official documents since they are produced as part of the official every day functioning of the school. They are, however, considered to be private documents since they are not available in the public domain. The incident books are recordings of the disruptive behaviour of learners as observed or experienced by the teachers of the school. Each grade has its own book, which is kept safe in the respective classrooms. Any teacher in the school can make a
recording in the book (even the sport coaches can record challenging behaviour), but the recording is done in an official capacity and according to certain norms, for example, the name of the learner, the grade of the learner, the name of the teacher and a description of the offending or challenging behaviour displayed by the learner need all to be documented.

A discussion of the context in which incident books were produced and their implied readership will follow since documents (the incident books, in this case) are considered to be texts written with a particular purpose in mind and not as simply reflecting reality (Atkins & Coffey, 2011, as reported by Bryman, 2012). The incident book provides the school disciplinary committee, the principal, the individual teachers and the parents with an overall impression of the behaviour displayed by a specific learner - be it on the school ground, in the corridors, in the toilet or during assembly. The incident book is also a gauging mechanism to follow the progress of any learner. The information provided in the incident book is used to decide on the most appropriate corrective measures to follow regarding the disruptive behaviour displayed by the individual learner or by a group of learners. Figure 3.1 provides a page from an incident book to illustrate the entries required from the teachers when entering the incident in the incident book. The name displayed on the incident card is a pseudonym.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Disciplinary Transgression and Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-04-06</td>
<td>Grade 1 offence: Disruptive in class. (Kept in repeatedly for 6 mins at break - taken to the principal on 03/02 - no change in bad behaviour.) [Jaw]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-02</td>
<td>Grade 2 offence: Disruptive and defiant in class. Kept out of class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-09</td>
<td>Grade 1 offence: Disruptive, not doing the work in class, defient and disrespectful behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11-09    | Mihlali was removed from my class and was spoken to by Mr. Benz. Letter sent home. (Mihlali threw it away.) [Jaw]
| 17-02    | Grade 1 offence: Disruptive / not working - 2nd break DT                                               |
| 13-02    | Grade 2 offence: Defiance / rude - Letter sent to parents. Phone call made and discussed.                  |
| 20-02    | Mihlali hit a girl (Hlonolo) on the back with his fists. His behaviour has become very aggressive - took him to Mr. Benz. [Jaw]
| 21-02    | Leaving school grounds without permission - 3rd break DT.                                               |
| 27-02    | Repeated Grade 1 & 2 OFFENCES - Detention 04.03                                                         |
| 08-03    | Mihlali checked Ohludle - She was hurt and cried a lot. Grade 2 offence - Break Detention 20 mins.         |
| 11-03    | Cutting in of the parents.                                                                                |
| 11-03    | Mihlali threw a boy during break and then punched him in his face.                                       |
| 19-03    | Disruptive behaviour in class. This is going to negatively affect Mihlali's progress.                     |

Figure 3.1: Scanned example of an actual entry in the incident book
The incident books satisfy the three criteria proposed by Scott (1990) to assess the quality of any document used as data source. The incident books are considered authentic as they are produced by the teachers and can be considered to provide the perspectives of teachers of the disruptive behaviour of learners. The incident books are, furthermore, credible documents in that no moderation of their content was done in the nature of the recordings captured in the documents. The incident books can be considered to be representative of the perspectives of teachers on the nature and extent of the challenging behaviour displayed by all the learners in the school as they are written to convey the impressions of teachers regarding the disruptive or challenging behaviours displayed by the learners. The incident books can, therefore, be considered to be relevant to answer the research question set out in Chapter One, as the evidence is clear and comprehensive.

The incident books spanning the period 2012 to 2014 were analysed to establish the patterns of disruptive behaviour recorded over this period and whether there were any changes observed in the patterns of behaviour.

3.4.2 Group interviews

Two sets of group interviews were conducted with the participating teachers after the behaviour intervention approach has been implemented for three years, with the specific purpose to determine the change in the types of disruptive behaviours and the success (or not) of the attempts to address the behaviour as a result of the implementation of some of the principles of PBIS framework in the discipline structure of the school (Frey & Fontana, 1991).

Group interviews capitalise on communication between research participants. People are encouraged to talk to one another, to ask questions, to exchange anecdotes and to comment on the experiences and points of view of each other (Kayrooz & Trevitt, 2005).
The focus of group interviews is to uncover, articulate and illuminate meaning from the data collected from the participants (Onwuegbuzie, Dickinson, Leech & Zoran, 2009). It is, furthermore, quick and convenient to collect data simultaneously from several people (Kitzinger, 1995). The semi-structured group interviews implemented were flexible enough to focus on what the interviewees viewed as important in explaining and understanding the discipline and behaviour of the learners at the school (Bryman, 2012). A further advantage of the interviews was that they facilitated longitudinal research (Bryman, 2012) by asking the interviewees to reflect on the past four years and on their experience of the discipline and the behaviour of the learners over this period of time.

3.4.2.1 Selection of participants

Two groups of teachers were invited to participate in the group interviews: one group consisted of the teachers who taught Grades 1 to 3; the second interview group consisted of teachers who taught Grades 4 to 7. The decision to separate the different grades was made on the assumption that the nature of disruptive behaviour displayed by Foundation Phase learners would differ from those displayed by Intermediate and Senior Phase learners. The group interviews were audio recorded and were thereafter transcribed fairly roughly. There is no indication of overlapping words, interruptions, new beginnings, or the length of pauses. Vocal aspirations and prolonged syllables were also not transcribed.

3.4.3 Effective Behaviour Support (EBS) survey

The Effective Behaviour Support Survey (Version 2.0) developed by Sugai, Horner and Todd (2003), was administered to the participating teachers to evaluate the progress of the school concerning the implementation of SWPBS. The survey measures the theoretical construct behind Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) and consists of three major sources: applied behaviour analysis (which includes teaching acceptable norms of social behaviour),
the normalisation/inclusion movement (essentially protecting the rights of people with disabilities, allowing them a full share of accessible means) and person-centred values (including person-centred planning, self-determination and wraparound – involving the entire family and support system) (Sugai, et al., 2000).

The survey consists of four sub-sections each with its own set of questions. The first section focuses on school-wide systems (fifteen questions), followed by a section focuses on non-classroom setting systems (nine questions), classroom systems (eleven questions) and finally the individual learner systems (eight questions). Each sub-section requires the respondent to assess the features of each system as being either ‘in place’, ‘partially in place’ or ‘not in place’ based on the current status of each feature (CS) of the SWPBS program implemented in the school; as well as indicating the priority for improvement (PI) as either being ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’ (see Appendix D). The CS factors indicated the rating by the teachers of the presence of positive behaviour supports in their school, while the PI factors indicated the staff priority for improving positive behaviour supports in their school.

A study done by Laxton (2006) established that the EBS assesses the current status and priority for the improvement of the four behaviour support systems with excellent internal consistency (reliability). The external validity of the EBS was also found to be significant (Laxton, 2006).

For this study, the participating teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire at the end of the data collection period (October 2015) (Sugai, et al., 2000). The results of the survey were used to evaluate the level of effective behaviour support that the school is offering. The survey was adapted to suit the South African and context and that of the school by changing the terminology from ‘student’ to ‘learner’ before the survey was implemented at a school. The survey was done independently, and it took the participants about 20 to 30
minutes to complete. The responses to the questions were based on the personal experience of the participants at the school where the study was conducted. The questionnaires were personally delivered to the 17 participating teachers and one counsellor (\( N = 18 \)) with the request to complete the questionnaire anonymously and voluntarily. The completed questionnaires were collected anonymously. The questionnaire was divided into three sections namely, requesting the current status on the left hand side; the questions structured in the middle of the page; with the priority level of improvement for each feature in each of the four systems of effective behaviour support on the right-hand side (See Appendix D).

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The aim of data analysis is to treat the evidence fairly and, as such, producing compelling analytical conclusions (Creswell, 1997). The analytic techniques utilised in the study ranged from tracing changes over time using directive content analysis to thematic analysis (finding patterns and building an explanation of these patterns). Although there is no consensus for the analysis of qualitative data, most authors follow a common process. The material is reduced by classifying it into themes or dimensions using the process of coding (Creswell, 1997) or the naming and categorizing of sub-titles, through the examination of data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The themes that emerge from the coding process provide the researcher with an interpretation of the experience in the light of the own views of the participant or views expressed in literature (Creswell, 1997). In the sub-sections to follow, the specific techniques followed to analyse the documents and the group interviews used to collect and generate data, will be discussed.

3.5.1 Content analysis of the documents

Content analysis was employed to analyse the incident books from 2012 to 2014. The definition for content analysis provided by Hsieh and Shannon, (2005, p. 1278) is used
in this study, namely that content analysis is a data analysis technique used for “the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns”, with the goal “to provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study” (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992, p. 314). The specific content analysis strategy applied in this study is that of directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Directed content analysis differs from conventional content analysis in that categories are identified in literature a priori and then used to analyse the text data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), instead of a more ethnographic approach where the categories or themes emerge from the data (Bryman, 2014). The coding of directed content analysis is guided by a more structured approach than that employed for conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) since the initial coding scheme is developed using existing theory and prior research from literature (Mayring, 2000) instead of deriving the categories or themes from the text (as is the case with conventional content analysis). With directed content analysis, the researcher uses existing theory or prior research to develop the coding scheme prior to beginning to analyse the data in what Mayring (2000) calls a deductive application of categories.

In a coding scheme data is organised into categories (Poole & Folger, 1981) or patterns or themes representing similar meanings that are directly expressed or are derived from the text (Weber, 1990). A good coding scheme is consequently central to the trustworthiness of any research using content analysis as data analysis technique (Folger, Hewes & Poole, 1984).

The initial coding scheme for this study contained two main categories, namely external and internal challenging behaviours. These categories were described by various codes representing the two main categories. Operational definitions were developed for each
category (see Appendix B). These categories were used to analyse the incident books of 2012. For example, external behaviour has been divided into nine categories, namely non-compliance, abscondment, temper tantrums, self-injurious, passive challenging behaviour, threaten behaviour, destruction to property, social inappropriate behaviour and aggressive behaviour that physically harm others. Each category was sub-divided into further sub-categories. Internalizing challenging behaviour, namely depression and anxiety are two common coexisting syndromes observed in individuals with autism spectrum disorder (Meyer, Mundy, Van Hecke & Durocher, 2006). A decision was taken to discard the category as this behaviour leans more to an indebt psychological knowledge, which is outside the immediate parameters of a school teacher. Secondly it is frequently observed in school–aged and older youngsters with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), which not the appropriate for the purpose of study. Though the externalized challenging behaviour is observable by the class teacher it is too broad.

Any text that could not be categorised with the initial coding scheme was given a new code. A different type of layout regarding challenging behaviour was chosen, namely: non-verbal, verbal, physical behaviour (Durkin, 2013) as it speaks more to the teacher–learner situation. I concur with Arthur (1995), that as much as 90% of communication is done without words; gesture, facial expressions and posture provide information about a person’s emotions and relationships with others. The three categories were each sub-divided into sub-categories; e.g. non-verbal has three sub-categories, verbal behaviour has five sub-categories and physical behaviour has nine sub-categories. Only fighting as physical behaviour was sub divided in ten units (See Adendum B).

As the analysis proceeded, additional codes were developed and some of the initial operational definition was revised and refined. The final coding scheme (see Appendix B)
and Tables 3.1 – 3.4 for the associated operational definitions was then used to re-code all the incident books from 2011 to 2014 to ensure that the same coding scheme was applied to all the data. The results of the document analysis are reported in Chapter Four.

3.5.1.1 The coding scheme

Based on a review of the literature, the challenging behaviours of learners were coded according to three main categories namely, non-verbal, verbal, and physical behaviour. These three main categories were sub-divided into smaller sub-categories, as discussed in the sections to follow. The first known category is non-verbal behaviour, which is divided into three sub categories namely being withdrawn and extremely passive, invading of the teacher’s space and intimidating body posture.

Table 3.1: Codes describing the non-verbal challenging behaviour category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code describing the category</th>
<th>Operational description of code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>The learner is withdrawn and extremely passive. The lack of social interaction by learners (Rubin, Coplan &amp; Bowker, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invading space</td>
<td>The learner invades the teacher’s personal space by standing too close either to the teacher in person or to the desk of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body posture</td>
<td>The learner displays an intimidating body posture that looks unapproachable, or gives off energy that says something completely opposite to the way that the individual is known. To assume a certain attitude or behave in a certain way, with the purpose to make an impression or gain an advantage (American Heritage Dictionary, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second category, verbally challenging behaviour, contains five codes namely, swearing, shouting and screaming, crying, seeking attention, and offensive behaviour (see Table 3.2).
Table 3.2: Codes describing the verbally challenging behaviour category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code describing the category</th>
<th>Operational description of code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shouting and screaming</td>
<td>To speak noisily or unrestrainedly and to utter a loud, piercing cry, especially of pain, fear, anger, or excitement. It can be defined as when someone is throwing a tantrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying</td>
<td>To bring (oneself) to a specified state by weeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking attention</td>
<td>Repetitive questions/statements It is a communication process which focuses on getting attention from teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive speech</td>
<td>Students questioning or arguing with a teacher or another academic in authority and passing derogatory remarks. When learners are whispering in their mother tongue language, different to the language of learning and teaching (LOLT). It is an unprotected category of speech, consisting of so-called &quot;fighting words,&quot; that is, words which are likely to make the person to whom they are addressed commit an act of violence (Silver, Stein, Surman &amp; Thompson, 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third category of challenging behaviour is physically challenging behaviour, which consists of nine codes namely, fighting, stealing, disruptive behaviour, smoking, inappropriate sexual behaviour, abscondment, non-compliance, interference with property and urinating in public (Table 3.3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code describing the category</th>
<th>Operational description of code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>To attempt harm or gain power over an adversary by blows or weapons. The different attempts within the term fighting to gain physical power will henceforth be discussed to get a clear understanding as to how physical behaviour unfolds at the school inquest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>Taking the belongings of others without asking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive behaviour</td>
<td>Constantly talking without end and wandering in and around classrooms without a definite destination or purpose (Logsdon, Teri, McCurry, Gibbons, Kukull &amp; Larson, 1998). Excessive need to go to the bathroom. Learners have a tendency not to listen to instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>The inhalation of the smoke of burning tobacco encased in cigarettes, pipes, and cigars (Lerman &amp; Berrettini, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate sexual behaviour</td>
<td>Developmentally inappropriate or intrusive sexual acts that typically coercion or distress (Kellogg, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscondment</td>
<td>Leaving a building or structure without permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Not doing educational activities that are expected. Refusal to hand in tasks and projects to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with property</td>
<td>A person commits the offense of interference with government property when he destroys, damages or defaces government property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating in public</td>
<td>Strong urges to pass water in public open space (Wein, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only fighting as a category of physical behaviour, was described through the following sub-categories namely; scratching, grabbing, biting, hitting, pinching, pushing, spitting, kicking, throwing objects and bullying.
Table 3.4: Codes for describing the types of behaviour identified as falling under fighting as physically challenging behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code describing the category</th>
<th>Operational description of code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scratching</td>
<td>Using the nails of the feet or hands to break the skin of another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbing</td>
<td>To take illegal possession of; seize forcibly or unscrupulously (Collins English Dictionary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biting</td>
<td>Using the teeth or gums to make contact with another person’s body or clothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitting</td>
<td>Using the hand or arm with closed or open fist to hit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinching</td>
<td>Using the fingers to squeeze another person’s skin hard enough to cause pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>When a person exerts force on someone else, in order to move them away. It can also happen when someone moves forward by using force to pass or cause a person to move aside by using the hand, elbow or shoulder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitting</td>
<td>Any instance of saliva leaving the mouth of an individual, which will land on to body parts of the next person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing objects</td>
<td>An event of throwing an item that is not designed to be thrown with enough force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Bullying is unwanted, aggressive behaviour among school aged learners that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behaviour has the potential to be repeated, over time. Bullying includes actions such as making threats, spreading rumours, attacking someone physically or verbally, and excluding someone from a group on purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.1.2 Content analysis strategy

The data was first viewed longitudinally comparing the recorded incidents over the period of 2012, 2013 to 2014 with all the different categories and sub-categories at once, across the three phases. The three phases known to primary schools are foundation phase, intermediate phase and senior phase. Secondly, the data was interpreted by tracking the behaviour patterns from one grade into the following grades in order to determine the behaviour patterns of the same cohort of learners. The research was based on a single case study as only one school was targeted to participate.

3.5.2 Thematic analysis of the group interviews

As the design and plan for a particular analysis strategy depends a lot on the purpose of the analysis, the group interviews were analysed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is useful “in capturing the complexities of meaning within a textual data set” (Guest, MacQueen & Namey, 2012, p. 11). The aim of the focus group interviews was to establish the perceptions of the teachers on the school discipline over the past three years during which time the principles of a PBIS framework were implemented in the school. Inductive thematic analysis with a descriptive and exploratory orientation was thus employed (Guest, et al., 2012).

Thematic analysis is described as the search for relevant themes that emerge from the data as being important to the research (Daly, Kellehear & Gliksman, 1997) by focusing on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data (Walrath, Dang & Nyberg, 2010). The data generated from the focus group interviews were transcribed verbatim from audio-recordings and verified to ensure their accuracy. The resultant text formed the basis for the thematic analysis. For a descriptive or exploratory study, the researcher reads and rereads the data carefully, looking for key words, trends, themes, or
ideas in the data that will help to outline the analysis, before any analysis actually takes place (Guest, et al., 2012).

Theory, however implicit, gives direction to what the researcher examines as his guidance as to what is important to study coming from existing literature and his own knowledge about the topic (Guest, et al., 2012). As such, thematic analysis requires more involvement and interpretation from the researcher as it moves “beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focus on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes” (Guest, et al., 2012, p. 10). Codes are then developed typically to represent the identified themes and are applied or linked to raw data as summary markers for later analysis. Such analyses may or may not include the following: comparing code frequencies, identifying code co-occurrence, and graphically displaying relationships between codes within the data set.

This process was conducted by following six phases of thematic analysis based on guidelines from Braun and Clarke (2006):

- Becoming familiar with the data. The process began with an immersion in the data through viewing and re-viewing the audio recordings. These generated initial analytic themes based on ideas and thoughts emerging from the data and involved searching for meanings, patterns and semantic themes by noting or marking ideas for coding relevant to the aim and purposes of the study (Boyatzis, 1998).

- Generating initial codes and allocating data to codes. The coding process continued from the initial list of interesting ideas by generating initial codes which refer to features of the data and basic elements of the instructional practice of participants (Boyatzis, 1998). This process involved organising the data by allocating it to the
codes. In this way meaningful groups of coded data were generated, drawing together responses from different participants.

- Searching for themes. Data from the initial codes were reviewed to identify themes across the data set by re-focussing the analysis at the broader level of themes rather than at codes. Tables and mind-maps were used to visualise these themes based on the information of participants. Hence, the process by which initial codes go on to form the main overarching themes and sub-themes was charted.

- Reviewing themes. Data within themes was then considered for internal homogeneity and external homogeneity including coherence. Clear and identifiable distinctions between themes were recognised and themes were reorganised as necessary. These themes from participants appeared to form a coherent pattern linking and servicing the data extracts as accounts or storytelling represented by the thematic map.

- Defining and naming themes. Following a satisfactory thematic mapping of the data leading to the final refinement of the main themes; the new overarching main themes which were generated, reflected the sub-themes and provided a relevant and consistent account, which answered the research questions.

- Producing the report. This final phase used the set of worked-out themes from the final analysis to report the outcomes of the interviews succinctly. Data extracts were used to illustrate a concise, coherent, logical account and analytic themes were interpreted to answer the research questions.
3.5.3 Analysis of EBS questionnaire

The participants had to indicate with a mark what the current status (CI) was reflected by paying attention to the following headings, namely: in place, partially in place and not in place. As indicated, the area on the right-hand side wanted information on priority for improvement (PI) on the feature and emphasized areas such as high, medium, low priority. The responses by the participants were tallied and recorded separately as either reflecting the current status, or indicating the priority for future improvement (see Appendix D2 for results). The results are reported in section 4.4.

3.6 CONSIDERING THE RIGOUR OF THE RESEARCH

In the light of positioning the research in a pragmatic paradigm, the viewpoint of Pratt (2008) was used to argue that question-driven research should be evaluated on the basis of the clarity with which the assumptions, methods, findings and research questions tie together. In addition to this call for alignment and coherence, the quality of case study research is argued to depend “less on ideas of sample, validity and reliability, and more on the conception, construction and conduct of the study” (Thomas, 2013, p. 71). As Stake (1995, p. 245) so aptly explained: “The purpose of case study research is not to represent the world, but to represent the case. … The utility of case research to practitioners and policy makers is in its extension of experience”.

This requires the researcher to address two aspects of the research process in the quest for research rigour: (i) designing the research in such a manner as to use the most appropriate procedures for answering the research questions (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009), and (ii) ensuring that the interpretations made on the basis of the obtained results are credible (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This led to a process of continual ‘thinking out loud’ about
the safeguards and contradictions in the research process (Cho & Trent, 2006). These safeguards are discussed in more detail in the sub-sections to follow.

3.6.1 Trustworthiness

The credibility and trustworthiness of the study was strengthened by paying careful attention to the documentation of the research process (Yin, 2003). In the design of this single case study, the use of multiple sources of data (Merriam, 1998), as well as the use of member-checking of the focus group transcripts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was used to enhance the trustworthiness of the data collected and generated.

3.6.2 Establishing authentic research findings

Validity in qualitative research has been defined as the establishment of authentic research findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Validity is resultantly concerned with accuracy and, as such, requires the data collection instruments, the data and the theoretical frameworks to align (Kirk & Miller, 1986). The focus group interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim and checked by the members of the focus group interviews for their accuracy. A clear chain of evidence was consequently established that allowed the researcher to reconstruct the research process from the formulation of the research questions to the final conclusion for the reader (Yin, 2003). A further technique used to ensure the internal validity or trustworthiness of the data was the use of a clear theoretical framework derived from literature as the analytical framework for the analysis of the incident books (Yin, 2003). This allowed the researcher to establish theoretical triangulation (Eisenhardt, 1989).
3.6.3 Ensuring the reliability of the research

Reliability, or the ability to act consistently, honestly, openly, to collect accurate data and to analyse the data neutrally (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, Pine, 2009), is one of the notions that contributes to the trustworthiness of research (Pine, 2009). The use of a coding scheme for the analysis of the incident books ensured the consistent, open and neutral analysis of the incident books. Both the focus group interviews were conducted by the same interviewer, using the same interview protocol establishing consistency in the collection of the interview data. The reliability and external validity of the EBS questionnaire was established by Laxton (2006).

3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

As ethics is fundamental to methodology, the ethical execution of the research was taken into consideration from the planning stage of the project to the recording of the findings (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). The ethical standards set by the Faculty of Education at the NMMU were taken into consideration and applied throughout the research process. This included obtaining ethical clearance from the NMMU Human Research Ethics department prior to the commencement of data collection (See Appendix A).

3.7.1 Negotiating access

Negotiating access to the field and the participants is important because the study could not be conducted without this access. The ease or difficulty of gaining access to the field and the participants will also determine the kind of research that is possible (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). Access to the primary school where the data was generated and collected was negotiated by requesting permission from the Eastern Cape Department of Education (see Appendix A) who granted the researcher access to collect data that spanned
from 2012 to 2014. Since the researcher is the principal at the school where this study is conducted, the teachers were thus familiar with the researcher. Further access was negotiated with the teachers at the school by inviting all of them to participate voluntarily in the focus group interviews (as described in the next sub-section).

### 3.7.2 Informed voluntary consent

Obtaining informed consent from the participants in the study is seen as part of showing respect to the participants (Pole & Morrison, 2003). Information regarding the purpose of the study and the focus group interviews was provided to the teachers as part of their invitation to participate in the focus group interviews. This allows the teachers to decide whether they would like to participate in the study. A further ethical issue that needed consideration was a concern for the level of voluntary participation by the teachers – seen in the light of the researcher being the principal at the school (Hesse-Biber & Piatelli, 2012). To overcome the potential of the power of the researcher as principal of the school influencing the openness of the responses and the voluntary participation of the teachers in the interviews, the interviews were conducted by the supervisor of the researcher. The EBS questionnaire was given to all the teachers in the school with the invitation to participate in the study by completing the questionnaire anonymously. All completed questionnaires were deposited anonymously in a sealed boxed provided for this purpose. Participation in the answering of the questionnaire was therefore voluntary.

### 3.7.3 Privacy and Confidentiality

Assurance of privacy and confidentiality is considered to be a way of reducing the fear of people and of encouraging them to take part in the research (Pole & Morrison, 2003). In this study confidentiality and privacy are expected to be assured to both the research site (the primary school where the research was conducted) and to the people involved in the
study (the participating teachers) (Walford, 2008). The study will conceal the name of the school in all the documentation used in the research report, as well as make use of pseudonyms for participants as a way of concealing the identities of teachers and the information given in that particular study site. For the protection of data, the incident books and the transcripts of the focus group interviews will be securely stored at all times.

As an insider conducting research at his place of work, the researcher sometimes came across sensitive and private cases which an outsider would not have seen. It presented valuable data, which posed dilemmas especially as the insider has free access. On the one hand, as researcher I was determined not to play down certain aspects of my findings when I discussed it, and on the other hand, as the principal of the school, I had roles and responsibilities towards the school and to my learners (Unluer, 2012).

### 3.8 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

The chapter studied the investigation and the implementation of a positive behavioural intervention and support approach to discipline in a primary school. The study aimed to elicit the perspective of teachers from a specific primary school about the usefulness of a positive behaviour intervention and support model that dealt with learners who display challenging behaviour. This chapter described the philosophical underpinnings of the study, followed by the justification for the use of a case study methodology including a detailed discussion of the data collection and analysis that followed to answer the research questions. Lastly, the actions taken to ensure research rigour and ethical research practices were discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the data generated via the analysis of documents (the incident books) and focus group interviews, as described in Chapter Three. The case study research design was used to answer the research question stated in Chapter One, namely:

*What opportunities could the use of Positive Behaviour Intervention Support principles provide the teachers of a primary school in managing challenging behaviour displayed by some learners?*

In order to ensure a more objective answer to the research question, teachers’ recordings of the challenging behaviour of learners over a period of three years (2012 – 2014) were used to answer the second sub-research question:

*How did the patterns of challenging behaviour displayed by the learners at the identified primary school change, after the implementation of the school-wide positive behaviour intervention framework?*

The document analysis was supplemented with data generated by means of two focus group interviews held with the teachers. The focus group data provided answers to the third sub-research question:
What are the perceptions of the teachers around the effect of the chosen framework on the discipline at the school over the period under investigation?

The layout of the chapter follows this logic by presenting the results of the document analysis, followed by the results of the focus group interviews. The final section of the chapter focuses on the lessons that can be learned from the implementation of a SWPBS framework to discipline at the identified primary school.

4.2 RESULTS FROM INCIDENT BOOK ANALYSIS

As explained in Chapter One, the incident book is essentially a record of the behaviour of learners as reported by the classroom teachers. The incident book served as a database for future decisions around possible interventions for a group or an individual learner concerning their behaviour and discipline. The incident book entries spanning the period 2012 to 2014 were analysed, using content analysis, to establish patterns of disruptive behaviour recorded during the above-mentioned timeframe with the aim of determining whether there were any changes in the behaviour patterns of the learners. The incident books thus served as a yardstick to compare behaviours of the learners during the timeframe as indicated, both in terms of frequency and of the nature of the recorded incidents.

How did the patterns of challenging behaviour displayed by the learners at the identified primary school change after the implementation of the school-wide positive behaviour intervention framework?

Two strategies were used to analyse the documentary data: a longitudinal approach where the data from the same grade were analysed over the three-year period (2012 – 2014); and a progression analysis where a particular group of learners (e.g. Grade 3 learners) were tracked over the three years (e.g. Grade 3 in 2012, Grade 4 in 2013 and Grade 5 in 2014) to
establish any trends in their behaviour. The longitudinal approach afforded opportunities to focus on behaviour patterns for each grade over the period of time.

Based on a review of the literature, the challenging behaviours of learners were coded according to three main categories, namely: non-verbal, verbal, and physical behaviour. These three main categories were sub-divided into smaller sub-categories, as discussed in Chapter Three. The results of the incident book analysis are reported firstly according to the three phases, followed by a discussion of the behavioural patterns observed for the three categories over the period of data collection (2012-2014).

4.2.1 Foundation Phase behavioural patterns

The office referrals recorded in the incident books were used to establish the behaviour patterns. The referrals focus on the number of incident recorded during the year and not on the number of learners in the various classes. The same learner may be involved in more than one recorded incident. The office referrals for 2012 are taken as the base-line to which the subsequent two years’ referrals (first year of implementation - 2013) are compared to establish the behaviour patterns for the whole school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the total number of ODRs recorded for the Foundation Phase as a whole, the data reveal a sharp increase in the total number of incidents recorded from 2012 to 2013. The number of ODRs for 2013 is roughly three times the number of ODRs for 2012), whereas there are twice as many referrals in 2014 than in 2012. The increase in number of ODRs can be contributed to the increase in the number of challenging physical behaviours displayed by the learners.

A further analysis of the Foundation Phase behaviour focused on distinguishing between the various grades in the phase (Grades 1, 2 & 3) to establish the behaviour patterns for each grade according to the three main categories of challenging behaviour established in Chapter Two.

The data recorded in Table 4.2 highlight the following observations regarding the specific behaviour patterns displayed by the Foundation Phase learners during the period 2012 – 2014. The data seem to suggest that the school do not seems to have disciplinary problems in Grades 1 and 2 with very few ODRs recorded for these two grades during the study period. The data reveals that physical misbehaviour was the most frequently recorded behaviour in Foundation Phase over the study period, with Grade 3s presenting the biggest challenge when compared to the number of incidents recorded for Grade 1 and 2 over the period 2012 - 2014. This trend may be as a result of the violent community in which the school is situated and to which the learners are exposed outside the gates of the school. It is therefore recommended that the school focus on relevant intervention and support strategies that would address the physical misbehaviour documented for the Grade 3 learners as the data seem to suggest that the current strategies are not effective in addressing the problem as the number of incidents increased over the period 2013 and 2014.
Table 4:2 Number of incidents recorded for individual Foundation Phase classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the behaviour patterns of the 2012 Grade 1 classes are compared to their behaviour the next year in Grade 2 and the following year in Grade 3, a similar pattern is revealed as identified earlier (Table 4.2). A total of twenty incidents were recorded for this group of learners in 2012, with seven incidents being recorded in 2013, and a whopping 165 incidents being recorded in 2014 (Grade 3). Seeing that it is the same group of learners, it is alarming that their behaviour deteriorated as such. This trend needs further investigation.
4.2.2 Intermediate Phase behavioural patterns

The category with the higher frequency of incidents recorded is the physical behaviour category with non-verbal behaviour the least recorded category (Table 4.3). An explanation may be that the Intermediate Phase learners’ developmental stage allowed them to move beyond non-verbal challenging behaviour to expressing themselves more (verbal, and physical behaviour). The non-verbal categories does not seem to be a major problem to the IP learners with a total of only 8 incidents being recorded in 2012, none in 2013, and 2 in 2014. Due to the expansion of the school, extra classes were implemented over the period 2012 – 2013, resulting in slightly biased data.

Table 4.3: Total number of incidents recorded for Intermediate Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of ODR incidents recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data recorded in Table 4.4 suggest that Grade 4 experiences an increase in the total number of incidents recorded. The influence of this transition year on the learners’ behaviour needs to be investigated further. Grade 5 incidents recorded stayed stable for the period of the study. Grade 6’s showed a decrease in the total number of recorded referrals. A comparison between the Gr 4 learners of 2012, the Grade 5 learners of 2013, and the Gr 6 learners of 2014, revealed a decrease in the number of incidents recorded.
Table 4.4: Number of incidents recorded for individual Intermediate Phase classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 4</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 5</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 6</td>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of ODRs p.a.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Senior Phase behavioural patterns

The data recorded in Table 4.5 reflect an increase in the total number of incidents in 2013, with 2012 and 2014 mirrored the same number of incidents. The most frequently recorded category of challenging behaviour is physical with NV and V almost non-existing. A shift took place in the nature of the most frequently recorded challenging behaviour. In 2012, disruptive behaviour ($n = 11$), abscondment ($n = 10$), non-compliance (3) seem to be on a decline and being less of a challenge for the Grade 7s. Abscondment ($n = 5$) and non-
compliance \((n = 9)\) received most ODRs. In 2014, disruptive behaviour was still a challenge \((n = 13)\).

**Table 4.5:** Total number of incidents recorded for Senior Phase (Grade 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of ODR incidents recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-verbal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of ODRs p.a.</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.4 Non-Verbal Behaviour across the school

The non-verbal behaviour patterns for the Foundation, Intermediate and Senior phases over the three years (2012 – 2014) were recorded in Tables 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 respectively, using the sub-categories deducted from literature and described in Appendix C. The non-verbal behaviour was sub-divided into three sub-categories, namely: the display of withdrawal symptoms, an invasion of the teacher’s space, and a defiant body posture. The number of ODRs recorded for the various classes were tabled against the non-verbal subcategories for each respective year.

The data reveals a school-wide trend and seems to suggest that there is a decline in the display of non-verbal challenging behaviour in the school as a whole. In the Foundation Phase, a total number of 9 incidents were recorded in 2012, 11 incidents in 2013 and 5 incidents in 2014 (see Table 4.6). When the sub-categories were scrutinised, the data reveal a behaviour pattern where the same group of learners from Grade 1 of 2012 displayed 3 incidents of invading the teacher’s space and none whatsoever in 2013, with only 2 incidents recorded in 2014. The sub-category, defiant body posture showed no incidents in both years.
2012 and 2013, but reflected three incidents in year 2014. The areas to look at from a Grade 1 perspective until they reached Grade 3 in 2014, were invading the teacher's space and defiant body posture.

**Table 4.6: Incidents of non-verbal behaviour recorded for Foundation Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invading space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Posture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of ODRs</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I studied the group of learners who started off in Grade 2 in 2012, where their teachers didn’t record any incidents during that year. However, the data revealed that the same group of learners turned out to be a bit challenging the following year with 11 incidents recorded in 2013 in Grade 3. What was more pleasing, according to the data was that the same group of learners who progressed to the Intermediate Phase Grade 4 in 2014, indicated no incidents of challenging behaviour. When the data for each of the classes in the Grade 1
group were scrutinised individually, the data reveal that very few incidents within the Foundation Phase were recorded over the three years when the teachers felt their private space had been invaded by the learners. Grade 2, for some reason, behaved themselves relatively well, as no incidents were recorded. The data revealed that the Grade 3s gave us reason to implement the school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support, as the researcher noticed quite a number of incidents. It may seem to be that they are getting used to their fellow classmates, or perhaps the physical and emotional development is starting to surface.

The data for the Intermediate Phase revealed a drop in the number of recorded non-verbal incidents with 5 incidents being recorded in 2012, 1 in 2013 and 1 incident in 2014 (see Table 4.7). The individual behaviour patterns revealed that the challenging behaviour of learners shifted from being predominantly displayed as withdrawing from the teaching and learning situation in 2012, to an invasion of the teacher’s private space, with 1 incident recorded each year respectively in 2013 and 2014.

When the data for each of the classes in the three grades are scrutinised individually, the data reveal that Grade 4 drew the researcher’s attention to intimidating body posture, with no incidents recorded across the duration of the research. The Grade 5 groups expanded a bit with 3 incidents of withdrawal symptoms and 1 of invading the space of the teacher. The data collected revealed 1 incident of withdrawal and none of intimidating body posture respectively in the Grade 6 groups. From a progressive perspective, learners who were in Grade 4 in 2012, Grade 5 in 2013 and Grade 6 in 2014 did not display major challenging behaviour within the category of non-verbal behaviour across the grades.
Table 4.7: Incidents of non-verbal behaviour recorded for Intermediate Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Non-verbal behaviour ODRs</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invading space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body Posture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5w</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6j</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for the Senior Phase revealed a similar behavioural pattern as that observed in the Foundation Phase with an incline in the number of recorded non-verbal challenging behaviours from 2012 to 2013 (1 incident compared to 4 recorded incidents), followed by a decline in recorded incidents in 2014 (see Table 4.8). Of significance is the observation that all the non-verbal incidents recorded in the Senior Phase were a display of withdrawal symptoms.
Table 4.8: Incidents of non-verbal behaviour recorded for Senior Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Invading space</td>
<td>Body Posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 Verbal behaviour across the school

The second challenging behaviour category coded for was verbal behaviour with its sub-categories of swearing, screaming and shouting, crying, questioning of teachers, and offensive speech. The results for the behavioural patterns for the various phases are presented in Tables 4.9, 4.10, and 4.11 and discussed in the paragraphs to follow.

The implemented year within the Foundation Phase revealed an increase in the total number of recordings from 24 in 2012, to 65 in 2013, followed by a sharp decrease to 23 incidents in 2014. The Foundation Phase had a spike of ODRs under the subcategory of screaming, with a steady increase from 12 incidents recorded in 2012 to 43 incidents recorded in 2013. This trend is followed by a decline to 16 in the number of incidents recorded in 2014. From the recordings it appears that the Grade 3 classes were more expressive in their behaviour with screaming and shouting being the two most recorded challenging behaviours. The data revealed a similar pattern as identified within non-verbal behaviour in
that the Grade 2 groups experienced a relatively quiet period. The Grades 1s and 3s showed evidence of challenging behaviours, as the Grade 3 teachers recorded the most incidents in 2013.

Table 4.9: Incidents of verbal behaviour recorded for Foundation Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swearing</td>
<td>screaming</td>
<td>crying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3l</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What appears to be alarming is the deterioration of behaviour of Grade 3 learners of 2013 with 65 incidents. A total of 27 incidents of swearing were recorded by the Grade 3 teacher throughout the period of research. The data revealed that a number of incidents of shouting and crying and offensive speech occurred from 2012 to 2014 for the Foundation Phase. Grade 3 poses the greatest challenge to behaviour in the Foundation Phase, with screaming and swearing the most recorded challenging behaviour displayed by the learners. Although a drastic decline in incidents recorded was noticeable in the final year of research,
compared to the interim period (2013), further investigation is needed on how to proactively curb these behaviours and preventing them to pose a greater challenge in the Intermediate Phase where the trend seems to prevail (see Table 4.10).

The Intermediate Phase had more recordings (a total of 25 ODRs) in the final year (2014) compared to 2013 (5 recordings) (see Table 4.10). The average recorded incidents in 2012, the year of implementation, were 17 recordings. Again, screaming and shouting drew a lot of attention in the first and final year with 10 and 11 incidents respectively. The school grew in learner enrolment numbers in the final year of research, as there was previously only one of each class per grade in Grades 4, 5 and 6 in 2012 and 2013.

Table 4.10: Incidents of verbal behaviour recorded for Intermediate Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal behaviour ODRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5w</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h</td>
<td>No grade 5 class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6j</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6m</td>
<td>No grade 6 class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the incidents of verbal behaviour ODRs for the Intermediate Phase in 2012, 2013, and 2014. The table includes categories such as swearing, screaming, crying, questions, and offensive, along with the number of incidents for each category in each year. The total number of ODRs for each grade is also provided.
Verbal ill-behaviour does not seem to be a problem for the Senior Phase learners. The teachers indicated two incidents of swearing in the Senior Phase (Table 4.11). Although offensive speech was not recorded for the Foundation Phase or the Intermediate, the Senior Phase showed an increase in recorded incidents. A possible reason for the low frequency of recorded ODRs for verbal behaviour in the Senior Phase may be the high frequency of physical misbehaviour recorded for the Senior Phase (see the next section and Table 4.13). When making decisions on what to record in an already administratively fully day, is seems plausible that they rather focus on recording the more serious physical behaviour, although the verbal behaviour might have been part of the physical incidents. Further investigation is needed for the school to make informed decisions regarding proactive instructional actions to be implemented.

Table 4.11: Incidents of verbal behaviour recorded for Senior Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal behaviour ODRs</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Phase</td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2.6 Physical behaviour across the school

The third and last category is physical behaviour displayed by learners. It is divided into nine sub-categories such as fighting, stealing, disruptive behaviour, smoking, sexual
behaviour, abscondment, non-compliance, interference with property and urinating (see Table 4.12). However, as fighting is happening a lot at the participating school, this sub-category was further subdivided into scratching, grabbing, biting, pinching, spitting, kicking, throwing of objects, and bullying.

There seem to be a small group of learners per year at the school who are very disruptive. What emerged from the data was that the physically challenging behavior displayed by the learners disrupted the learning process – posing a serious challenge to the school. The three most common physically challenging behaviour displayed by the learners were: disruptive behaviour, non-compliance and fighting. Fighting, with its specific sub-categories, is the third most challenging physical behaviour. The data further reveals an increase in the total number of recorded incidents of the sub-category disruptive behaviour.

The challenging behaviour incidents were also investigated for the three phases, namely: Foundation Phase, Intermediate Phase and Senior Phase and they will be discussed in more detail below.

The Foundation Phase started with 82 overall incidents in 2012, with an increase of 201 in 2013 and with a pleasing decline, yet worrying of 175 incidents in 2014 (Table 4.12). Non-compliance (73) and disruptive behaviour (121) tower high above all challenging behaviours across the Foundation Phase at the school of research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>1m</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscondment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive behaviour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 82            | 283 | 175 |

Table 4.12: Incidents of physical behaviour recorded in Foundation Phase
From a fighting perspective, pushing, kicking, hitting and grabbing were highlighted from 2012 – 2014 (Table 4.12). It is clear that the class teacher of the 3l class recorded more incidents compared to other teachers. No incidents were recorded under sub- categories such as scratching and spitting. There is, however, a disproportionate high frequency of ODRs recorded for Grade 3 when compared to Grades 1 and 2, with the class teacher for Grade 3l contributing the bulk of the recordings compared to other teachers in the phase. The class teacher for Grade 3l seems to be consistently recording more incidences of the period of three years that any of her colleagues. This alerts to a possibility of differences in the operationalisation of the behaviour categories and the observed behaviour of the learners, which would warrant for on-site professional development.

Hitting, kicking, grabbing, bullying and stealing were all clearly noticeable within the Foundation Phase. Urinating was very evident in the Foundation Phase, with very few to none in the Senior Phase. The next physical behaviour category referred to as non-compliance appeared most in the Intermediate Phase, followed by the Foundation Phase with the least occurrences within the Senior Phase. Stealing, which appeared most in the Foundation Phase shows clear traces of improvement across the grades and phases.

The generally challenging behaviour of incidents recorded, such as non-compliance, disruptive behaviour and hitting across the years of this research, is of great concern. Fighting, with all its sub-divisions in consideration moved from bad (34 during 2012) to worse with 48 incidents occurred in 2013 and a slight improvement, yet worrisome, with 41 in 2014. Hitting, kicking, bullying and grabbing appear to be the most challenging behaviours under the category of fighting. Incidents such as scratching, pinching, pushing and throwing objects showed pleasing results with zero to one occurrence.
As in the Foundation Phase and Intermediate Phase, the Senior Phase teachers also recorded noncompliance, abscondment and disruptive behaviour as areas of concern (see Figure 4.14). The incidents are evenly spread and are relatively low. The most pleasing results can be seen from a fighting perspective, as only bullying, pushing and kicking were recorded, but with relatively low scores. Throwing objects, spitting, pushing, pinching, biting, scratching have not been recorded. The data reveals that inappropriate sexual behaviour is increasing over the years with a marked increase amongst the Senior Phase learners.

With all the challenging behaviours displayed by learners, the experience definitely added invaluable lessons learned. The teachers have to give account of the academic side of each learner. At the end of each academic year, each learner enrolled at a school has be assessed in order for progression to occur.

In conclusion, an alarming trend is the escalation of the display of unacceptable physical behaviour recorded over the period 2012-2014. This needs further investigation to establish the social context in which these misbehaviours took place and what the school can do to prevent this type of behaviour.
Table 4.13: Incidents of physical behaviour recorded in Intermediate Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4p</td>
<td>4v</td>
<td>5w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Compliance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no of ODRs</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14: Incidents of physical behaviour recorded in Senior Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>7h</td>
<td>7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of ODRs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 RESULTS FROM GROUP INTERVIEWS

The group interviews served as a monitoring tool and a yardstick to re-assess the experiences gained from the framework since implementation in 2012. It identified and addressed the challenging behaviours of learners.

4.3.1 Biographical details of the participants

The participants teach within and across the three phases in the entire school, namely Foundation Phase, Intermediate Phase and Senior Phase. For the purpose of this study, the teachers teaching in the latter two phases were combined during the group interviews as the school only has two teachers within the Senior Phase. The combined phase is called INTERSEN. All 17 teachers at the school participated in one of two group interviews. The biographical details of the teachers are described in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Characteristics of the group participants and the number of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Foundation Phase</th>
<th>Intermediate Phase</th>
<th>Senior Phase</th>
<th>Total (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Themes that emerged from the group interview data

Based on the thematic analysis and interpretation of the collected data, the following themes emerged from the focus group interviews: purpose for implementation, discipline
prior to school-wide positive behaviour intervention and support (SWPBS), pre-requisites for implementation, incident books, benefits of SWPBS, challenges and recommendations. Figure 4.1 illustrates the themes.

Figure 4.1: Illustration of themes as emerging from group interviews

The discussion will evolve from individual themes which emerged from the coded data and interpretation group interviews regarding learners who displayed challenging
behaviours. The discussion will begin with the purpose for implementation and move clockwise, as indicated in the diagram above.

4.3.2.1 Theme 1- Purpose for implementation

Management became aware of the ever-increasing numbers of office disciplinary referrals. The impact not only indicates an increase in learner challenging behaviour, but it also had implications on other areas of school functioning, namely instructional time that was used to the minimum. As a result, the school was more ineffective and less academic, and behavioural challenges escalated. Common challenging behaviour mushroomed.

Table 4.16: Responses on the types of challenging behaviours which led to the purpose for the implementation of the SWPBS framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Representative quote(s) from the responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal behaviour</td>
<td>“{the learners were} moaning all the way back to school. ...rude behaviour”. [Johnny]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I still had trouble [even] after the disciplinary hearing”. [J C Le Roux]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal behaviour</td>
<td>“......they had attitudes and all that stuff – we were so frustrated, we actually wanted to give up on them”. [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical behaviour</td>
<td>“push the stick in the ground”. [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“She was like fighting, she’s bullying the other learners [Johnny] in grade 1, cut the teacher’s curtains and also a learner’s hair”. [March]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 Theme 2 - Discipline structure prior to SWPBS

The discipline in the past was perceived as an individual activity driven by a few concerned teachers.
“I would say at our school the discipline was very rigid, you followed the school rules, class rules. [Whenever], the learner transgresses then you will have a set of rules that will say, step 1 - write a letter, inform the parent of this child’s behavior if it’s serious, if it’s not serious, you as a class teacher you can deal with it in a manner that you can have one on one with a specific learner or maybe make use of the principal or the teachers in charge of discipline but there were steps that had to be followed in the past and if you follow those steps, sometimes it work, sometimes it doesn’t”. [Tiffany]

The traditional way of class rules stated the following “do not talk in the classroom”. [March]

4.3.2.3 Theme 3 - Pre-requisites for implementation

In order for this SWPBS framework to function successfully, a committed team effort is needed to address the challenging behaviours of learners. I concur with Feuerborn, Wallace, and Tyre, (2013) that a team should include representatives from the entire school: learners, family members and other community members in collaboration on behaviour.

“...you need to work as a team in order to really touch that [heart] of learners”. [Tiffany]

“We implemented an action by working in [cohesion] with parents”. [Hummy]

“We have programs via the GM Foundation, we have workshops for the parents to help [their children] with homework and how to really deal with the learner at home, regarding their manners”. [Tiffany]
“...you can directly teach appropriate social skills to learners and modify and/or arrange
the school context when necessary to prevent challenging behaviour to germinate”.
[Tiffany]

[teach] the basic things how a child should be in a class, at home because they say “charity
begins at home” so you need to..., everything eventually goes back to the parents and they
need to know that the child learns [at home] first. So we trying to get them informed”.
[Tiffany]

Consistency is a further very important aspect of the SWPBS framework, “...like I have a
system [with the] little gold g’s on a piece of board that use to work very well but afterwards
you also need to be very consistent”. [Parky]

4.3.2.4 Theme 4 - Role of incident book as a source of data

When asked why the incident book was so beneficial, the findings of the focus group
interviews showed that participants from all phases vehemently echoed that the incident
book served a dual purpose. It has a summative and formative purpose. The summary of the
participants to verify the usefulness of the incident book is represented in Table 4.17
Table 4.17: Responses on purpose of incident book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency count</th>
<th>Representative quote(s) from the responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“…it is helpful to us as new teachers as the incident book provide structure…” [JC Le Roux]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tool</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“teachers are able to monitor and record habitual offenders” [Hummy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…to detect learning barriers at an early stage” [Pillar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“[historical] information of any learner is available on request and helpful to retract discipline within your classroom” [Aveo]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.5 Theme 5 - Benefits of SWPBS

The data from the group indicated that one of the benefits identified by the teachers was that the new values-driven approach provides them with the necessary structure to focus their actions in the classrooms.
Table 4.18: Responses from participants during group interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Representative quote(s) from the responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>“SWPBS helps to provide structure to your [disciplinary] effort”. [JC le Roux]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“For me personally, it’s definitely more manageable”. [RunX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>“The learners become aware of the environment and situations...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…reprimand less frequently and [teachers] don’t have to yell”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>“they don’t want their names in [the incident book]” [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>“… however they congratulated the other team...”. [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest for Knowledge</td>
<td>“I actually went home for the first two, three weeks everyday thinking of who am I going to tell the mother...” [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>“… since that day the girls came to me every day...are we gonna practice?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learnt</td>
<td>“I decided to do my assembly based on what I’ve learned from them”. [Clairra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>“I’ve picked up that some of the children have grown emotionally”. [March]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>“Learners could be identified and referred for psychological tests”. [Hummy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Learners with a learning barrier can be identified earlier to be redirected”. [Tiffany]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value System</td>
<td>“[Sport], helps them to change their attitudes they learn more about comradely, honesty, trust, how to play fair and by the rules, how to show good sportsmanship”. [RunX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>“you must be very observant with learners in [your] class, you must try to learn to know the children as soon as possible”. [March]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.6  Theme 6 - Challenges and recommendations regarding the implementation of the SWPBS framework as a framework for school discipline

We need to have a school-wide discussion around our expectations concerning norms and values. This is challenging in itself as teachers came from different backgrounds. I noticed a parallel in terms of the participation of participants within the focus group interviews and also in the manner in which the different race groups recorded incidents in the incident books. The so-called white group of teachers responded repetitively in the focus group interviews, while they also recorded the observed incidents more meticulously. There seems to be a difference between the expectations held by the various cultural groups.

“[We need] to make sure the teachers are all writing, there’s no gaps, we have an honesty/amnesty, there are gaps between some of the grades, teachers don’t write as much as they should”. [Aveo].

The difference in experience and passion will always play a major role in any framework in terms of implementation, acceptance and sustaining it. The teaching experience seems to influence the type and frequency of the recordings.

“[being in the teaching for so long] I actually don’t have a problem with discipline”. [Johnny]

It is true that too many parents, teachers and even learners rush to “behaviour modification” without studying the pattern of behaviour first to see what drives it and what maintains it.
“I actually went home for the first two, three weeks everyday thinking of what am I going to tell the mother ...”. [Clairra]

“The constant looking of recognition and always wants to be rewarded. Learners want to be understood”. [Greeny]

Evidence of a lack of parental support has been gleaned from [Parky’s] assertion, expressed in her statement:

“Most of our parents are in the townships, it’s a bit difficult as transport is a concern. I think what I’m gathering here and what everyone is saying is that, we all need to be on the same page for the child to really progress”. [Parky]

Learners with multiple diagnoses often have a number of problems, but teachers are unlikely to be successful if they try to tackle too many challenging behaviours at once.

On further probing on any recommendations, participants seem to look for a more uniformed structure in terms of the incident book.

“The types of behaviour should be indicated on the page”. [Mello]

“There should be a place where parents can sign”. [Hummy]

Upon conclusion, the following sentiments were shared in the focus group:

“A person learns actually every day, gradually you learn, so I don’t think... like, you can say, it will stay like that you will always add something else at another school that will work for them, and even here as well we learn every day, so we can keep on talking for years about this, it won’t stay the same, but you feel these guidelines really work. [March]
The sentiments of [March] were reiterated with the following, SWBPS is not based on a written script or program that looks the same in each school. It is indeed a framework or system that allows schools to build on existing strengths and to work smarter, not harder, by using data, systems and practices (Freeman, Anderson & Griggs, 2009).

4.4 RESULTS FROM THE EBS QUESTIONNAIRE

The researcher issued 17 questionnaires to general education teachers and 1 to a teacher assistant. The result of it was that 11 questionnaires were returned from general education teachers and one from the teacher assistant (N=12). One person chose not to complete questions 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 under the headings of classroom systems. All other questions were duly answered respectively by the participants. In order to get a clear picture regarding how the framework was implemented and monitored, the questionnaires were categorized into four different systems, namely school-wide systems, non-classroom setting systems, classroom systems, and individual student systems (Sugai, Horner & Todd, 2000). The success of the framework was monitored by two sets of questions: current status and priority for improvement (see Appendix D1 for the survey and D2 for the raw data).

Further results of the questionnaires in terms of status reflected the following within the field of current status: school-wide systems: 78% were in place, whilst 16% indicated partially in place and 6% reflected not in place yet.
Figure 4.2: Current status of school wide systems

Our second system, current status: non classroom setting reflected: 69% were in place, whilst 27% indicated partially in place and 5% reflected not in place yet.

Figure 4.3: Current status of non-classroom setting systems

The third group of question under the heading current status: classroom systems mirrored the following: 71% were in place, whilst 27% indicated partially in place and 2% reflected not in place yet.
Figure 4.4:  Current status of classroom systems

The fourth mentioned category was, *current status: individual student system* and the results were as follows: 63% were in place, whilst 27% indicated partially in place and 10% reflected not in place yet.

Figure 4.5:  Current status of individual learners systems

The areas where priority for improvement are needed reflected as follows from the *school-wide system* perspective: 18% need high improvement, whilst 19% need medium
attention and 62% reflected a pleasing result, so very little percentage is needed for improvement.

**Figure 4.6:** Priority of improvement: in school wide systems

The second category was again non-classroom setting: *priority of improvement*, with 23% need high improvement, whilst 23% need medium attention and 54% reflected a pleasing result, indicating that a percentage of low improvement is needed.

**Figure 4.7:** Priority of improvement in non-classroom settings
The third category of systems as mentioned was *classroom systems: priority of improvement* and it reflected the following; 20% need high improvement, whilst 25% need medium attention and 55% reflected a favourable result, indicating that a percentage of low improvement is needed.

![Figure 4.8: Priority of improvement in classroom systems](image)

**Figure 4.8:** Priority of improvement in classroom systems

### 4.5 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

#### 4.5.1 Change in behavioural patterns observed after the implementation of the SWPBS framework

The second sub-question aims to establish the influence of an SWPBS framework on the behaviour patterns observed at the school by asking: How did the patterns of challenging behaviour displayed by the learners at the identified primary school change after the implementation of the school wide positive behaviour intervention framework?

According to Horner et al., (2009), measures of whether SWPBS works can consist of office discipline referrals (ODRs), perceived school safety, and academic success. Office discipline referrals (ODRs) were used as indicators to track school-wide behaviours. In this
study, the school appears to have a high base rate of referrals. The total number of ODRs seems to exhibit a trend of increasing during the first year of implementation, after which it either drops or settles down. The sheer number of ODRs is not surprising, given the developmental stage of the learners (being a primary school) and the socio-economic environment in which the learners found themselves (Northern areas school in Port Elizabeth).

The overall rate of ODRs was fairly stable across the phases, but it varied in terms of the three behavioural categories (non-verbal, verbal and physical behaviour), with physical behaviour being the “hotspot” for the school and needing the design and implementation of evidence-based intervention strategies and support by the school, taking into account the necessity to fit the strategies with the context of the various phases (Foundation, Intermediate and Senior Phase). A significant decrease was evident in the tardiness of learners, unexcused absences, and ODRs in need of the attention of a member of the Disciplinary Management Team.

An important conclusion around the use of ODRs as indicators of the success of the applicability of the SWPBS framework to address discipline, is that the ODRs may not necessarily decline within the early stages of the implementation of the program, as teachers become more aware of the need to keep a record and evidence of learner behaviour across the whole school in order to get a clearer picture of the behaviour patterns in the school as a whole.
4.5.2 Perceptions of teachers concerning the applicability of the SWPBIS framework for the maintenance and management of school discipline at the school under investigation

Most teachers considered the ‘new’ preventative disciplinary system as relevant to their context and a social fit to the context of their school. One teacher [Margo], commented to me whilst she was reflecting on the implementation of the behaviour intervention, “... it’s not what we do for our learners, but what we’ve taught them to do for themselves that make them successful human beings”.

A sense of ownership of the incident books by the teachers was observed, as teachers made recordings consistently throughout the year. Although more incidents of learner behaviour were recorded during an academic year, fewer incidents reached a serious enough level to be dealt with by the principal. It became evident that the recordings by teachers were actually done in the hope and expectation that the proactive programme would be applied to learners with potentially challenging behaviour, in order to create a safe and effective school. Two teachers, one in Grade 1 and one in Grade 6 indicated “I didn't actually experience real problems” during the specific academic years of 2012 and 2013 respectively; thus no recordings were made.

4.5.3 Reflection on lessons learned concerning the implementation of SWPBIS framework

Based on the findings of the responses of the teachers to the research questions, the following lessons were identified that may serve as guidelines to assist other schools with their decision to implement SWPBS as a framework for school discipline.
4.5.3.1 The usefulness of incident books as data sources for decision-making

Office disciplinary referrals (ODRs) are often used in studies as indicators to track school-wide behaviour and surrounding conditions when behavioural concerns occur (e.g. location, behavioural type, time of day, etc.). The use of the incident books as data sources served a three-fold purpose. Incident books as representations of ODRs in the context of this study were firstly used to evaluate the universal application of SWPBS at the primary school. The data from the incident books were used to evaluate the outcome of the prevention-oriented approach to school-discipline. Secondly, the incident books allowed the school to view discipline from a school-wide perspective instead of from an individual learner perspective. Instead of reacting to the ill-discipline of a learner with, for example, exclusion, the availability of data for all the ODRs recorded in the incident books provide the school, and the disciplinary committee, in particular, with a school-wide perspective of learner behaviour at the school on which to base their decisions on future actions. Thirdly, the incident books provided structure to the ODRs, increasing the accessibility of the data captured in the incident books for the teachers. In the past, incidents were just recorded to serve as evidence of the behaviour of an individual learner. The focused use of the ODRs enabled the school to apply the data in a more proactive, preventative manner, with a focus on universally applied, explicit instructional strategies aiming at developing the much-needed academic and pro-social skills essential for the learners to succeed academically and socially.

The use of incident books as data sources is however, not without its challenges. The findings of the study suggest that ODRs may not necessarily decline during the implementation of SWPBS, as the teachers may become more aware of the need and benefits
of keeping effective and comprehensive records of the ODRs in order to get the big picture of the behaviour in the school as a whole. Contrary to the results reported in other studies that recorded associated reductions in OPDRs with the implementation of SWPBS (Lassen, Steele & Sailor, 2006), the results of this study suggest an increase in the number of ODRs over the period 2012-2014 (the first two years of implementation), particularly referrals for physically challenging behaviour.

A further challenge with ODRs is related to the diversity present in a school community. Each school or teacher defined and applied referral procedures differently. A specific learner behaviour may therefore result in different responses in different schools. As seen from the results of this study, some teachers seldom record any incidents, whereas other teachers have disproportionally high recordings. This results in potential inconsistencies in the data and may reduce the usefulness of the data for decision-making.

The potential usefulness of ODRs, however, outweigh the concerns. Suggestions were made by the participating teachers to increase the utility of the incident books as credible indicators of school-wide behavioural performance.

- ODR recording needs to be consistent. The systematic use of the referral or recording procedure, aligned with more clearly and mutually exhaustive operationalised definitions for behavioural manifestations were required, linked to evidence-based interventions for the explicit teaching of the pro-social skills required to curb the challenging behaviour.
- The current incident book format does not facilitate the recording of the social settings of the ODRs (e.g. where the incident happened, when it happened, etc). It
also does not include the recording of behaviour incidents that took place during extra-curricular activities. By including these features, the school will be in a better position to compare behaviour patterns across the whole school and, as such, to provide more streamlined, contextually fit interventions and support to learners around their behavioural needs.

- Staff needs professional development that focuses on reaching consensus and clarity on behaviour manifestations that would be recorded, as well as instruction in when and how to write referrals, and ways to generate and utilise the reports based on ODRs.

It can be concluded that the participants in this study perceived ODRs as useful and efficient indicators of school-wide behaviour, as well as useful sources of data in determining and evaluating the types and intensities of interventions needed to establish and maintain school discipline successfully.

4.5.3.2 Potential challenges to sustained implementation of SWPBS

Some of the challenges identified by the teachers around the sustained implementation of SWPBS concerned the rewarding of positive behaviour. There is a fine line when the rewarding of positive behaviour shifts the motivation of learners from being internal to being external. More proactive, evidence-based instructional strategies are needed by the teachers to empower them to address the expectations.

Access to and support from specialised role-players when confronted with Tier 3 interventions were identified as being problematic. School psychologists and other such
experts have to work with a large number of learners and, consequently, do not always cope with the expectations to make the framework practical and socially valid.

A third challenge to sustained implementation is the lack of family involvement. This can be rectified by presenting parenting classes designed for parents of typically developing young children and other means of ensuring that parents have the knowledge and skill needed to provide the nurturing, positive care that promotes a healthy development. Staff should spend time getting to know families; welcoming parents to observe and participate in program activities; consulting parents about their children’s abilities, interests and preferences; communicating in the parents’ home language; and conducting home visits.

4.6 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

This chapter provided the results and discussed data generated from the incident books and focus group interviews. The interpretation of the incident book required the teacher participants to reflect on the different types of behaviour and the improvement within their respective classrooms as well as in and around the playgrounds and corridors. The chapter to follow will discuss the findings and conclusion.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

It is widely acknowledged that discipline is rooted in a learning situation and that it is essential for a positive school climate that is conducive to good academic performance. Interviews with South African teachers have revealed that they are experiencing difficulty in coping with disobedience, aggression, the rejection of authority and a lack of respect and responsibility manifested by learners at their schools (Van der Walt & Oosthuizen, 2007). Schools need organisational structures, rules and aims if they are to be effective since effective management of discipline does not just happen – it requires consultation, planning, commitment, as well as constant review and evaluation (Blandford, 1998).

In order to address the aspect of discipline at a primary school in the Northern areas of Port Elizabeth, a single descriptive case study was conducted to establish the utility of a SWPBS framework as a theoretical framework for the maintenance of school discipline. The case study made use of incident books with recordings of challenging behaviour, as observed and experienced by teachers. The recording of challenging behaviour was done over a period from 2012 to 2014. The case study was supported by two group interviews with the teachers of said school, and an EBS questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered to the participating teachers as data to establish the applicability of SWPBS theoretical framework as a discipline model for their school. The aim of this chapter is to discuss the results
(presented in Chapter Four) of the case study conducted, as described in Chapter Three. The findings will be presented as answering the research questions formulated in Chapter One, concluding with a reflection on the research question. The discussion of the findings will be followed by a discussion around the limitations of the research, followed by recommendations for further research.

The main research question formulated in Chapter One in order to operationalise the purpose of the study was:

*What opportunities could the use of Positive Behavioural Intervention and Support principles provide the teachers of a primary school to manage challenging behaviour displayed by some of the learners?*

When a program is applied in real-life settings (such as the application of SWPBS in the case study primary school), it is recommended to assess early on how acceptable the program will be to the relevant audience (the teachers at the school where the SWPBS program is implemented). This fit between the program and its audience is described as its social validity (Schwartz & Baer, 1991). Social validity seeks to determine the level of ‘buy-in’ of stakeholders involved in an intervention and the importance they place upon it. It is judged according to the “significance of goals, appropriateness of procedures and importance of the effects” held by those involved in the implementation (Wolf, 1978, p. 207). As social validity “plays an essential role in developing PBS interventions with contextual fit” (Filter Tincani, & Fung, 2009, p. 222), it can be argued that contextual fit is a prerequisite for social validity. The chances of success are slim if attention has not been paid to the values, routines and resources associated with interventions. Without matching
the requirements and strategies of a SWPBS plan to the unique characteristics of the teacher and the classroom, the acceptability of the intervention by the teachers responsible for the implementation is less probable. The social validity and contextual fit of SWPBS for the case study primary school will be reflected upon in the section to follow.

5.2 REFLECTION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SWPBS FRAMEWORK AT THE PRIMARY SCHOOL UNDER STUDY

To ensure that the school discipline intervention embarked upon by the primary school was socially valid and a contextual fit for the school where it was implemented, two principles identified in literature as essential to the successful implementation of SWPBS were given attention, namely commitment by staff and collaboration.

5.2.1 Committed teachers and school community

The SGB, together with the staff, became promoters of the Bill of Rights, specifically the human rights clause. Collectively, we discussed the traditional school rules (Appendix E.1) in 2012 and adapted them rather to instil a value- and expectation-driven system (Appendix E.3) for implementation in 2013. The above assisted us in reflecting on the implementation of SWPBS; observing the behaviour changes, appreciating the perceptions of teachers regarding the management of discipline at the school of research; and reflecting on lessons learnt from the adopted SWPBS framework. A brief discussion of each will follow.
5.2.2 Collaboration

Collaboration between all the role-players was identified as crucial to effective implementation (McCurdy et al., 2003). Collaboration maximises the likelihood of the intervention to have social validity and a contextual fit. It also builds consistency in the implementation and application of the strategy. Collaboration further ensures that the expectations valued by the school community are incorporated in the proactive disciplinary plan (Mc Kevitt & Braaksma, 2008). The personnel needs to know the outline of framework. They would want to know who will provide interventions; who will collect data; who will have the overall responsibility to monitor the data; and who will lead the team through the decision-making process. In terms of procedures for interpreting data, rules need to be determined to regulate when a learner is eligible to enter or exit the Tier 2 intervention program.

5.2.3 Implementation process

Literature around the effective implementation of SWPBS suggests four integrated elements that need consideration, namely: outcomes, systems, practices and data. The school identified three components to be addressed in the initial implementation phase, namely: 1) a data management system, 2) the appropriate interventions based on what is shown by the data, 3) a Tier 2 team charged with the oversight and management of the identification of the at risk learners and the accompanying focused interventions and support. As the components were mentioned, the descriptions follow below:

In terms of data management, the collection of appropriate school-wide data and the evaluation of the data were important steps. The data have been recorded in an incident book,
which is administrated and controlled by the class teacher. The books are stored as historic data around the behaviour patterns of individual learners, but also to establish school-wide behaviour trends. The rules should be clear as to when a learner should be considered for referral for more intensive intervention. In order for an effective implementation of Tier 2 as part of SWPBS, a systemic approach is needed to relay the purpose, components and key actions that will ensure success for the school and for the learners (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Procedures regarding frequency, duration and intensity were specified. Additional to personnel and procedures; communication with all the role players was identified as critical. The progress of the learners, instructional decisions, and interaction with the general education teachers need to be communicated well.

Because of time and resources it was initially challenging to establish an effective Tier 2 system. Tier 2 requires numerous steps to be implemented as a framework. The team realized that the challenge amongst the colleagues actually lies in understanding how to implement the interventions as opposed to understanding what to do.

5.2.4 Evaluation of implementation

The EBS questionnaire was used to evaluate the current implementation status of SWPBS across the four different systems, namely school-wide systems, non-classroom settings systems, classroom systems, and individual learner systems. The current status determined which of the systems are in place, partially in place and not in place. The questionnaire was also used to determine the priorities for future improvement (high, medium or low priority).
5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SWPBS

**Recommendation 1:** Cultivation of a school culture reflecting the general principles of SWPBS. Principals should focus on ways to cultivate a school culture guided by values such as self-discipline to minimize the perception of external punitive control. A school culture guided by values can be realized if the following issues are addressed: (a) capacity building of all role players (parents, teachers and learners) to ensure an understanding and sustained implementation of SWPBS; (b) reviewing and investigating of feasible and behaviour-alternative disciplinary measures; (c) community engagement on issues of discipline; (d) incorporation of DoE guidelines and lastly, (e) benchmarking with other schools, provinces or countries.

**Recommendation 2:** Intensify instruction. Maximise time spent in instruction and learning. In other words, focus on keeping the learners in class as opposed to sending them out as a reaction to their ill behaviour, while explicitly teaching both pro-social and academic skills. As a school community, the primary school decided against exclusionary disciplinary practices as it had documented undesirable consequences such as less instruction time for learners, which, in turn, leads to lower academic achievement (Algozzine, Wang & Violette, 2010). Choose to focus on a more pro-active approach to discipline while explicitly teaching both pro-social and academic skills needed by learners to achieve scholastically.

**Recommendation 3:** Establish clarity and consistency of behavioural expectations. Although SWPBS provides opportunities to identify learners with challenging behaviours, the appropriate data must first be in place. Schools need a method of obtaining valid data
concerning learner behaviour, school and classroom climate as well as the overall effectiveness of positive behaviour support intervention programmes. This could be obtained by the utilisation of ODRs as a source of information regarding behaviour patterns across the whole school, putting challenging behaviour in a social context instead of focussing solely on a punitive response to the behaviour of an individual learner (Flannery, Fenning, McGrath Kato & Bohanon, 2011).

**Recommendation 4:** Provide focused professional development by providing brief in-service opportunities; multiple opportunities for practise and structured feedback; opportunities for staff to share and develop best practices. Focus on building expertise within the school via an SWPBS team. Teachers need more strategies and interventions to address physical misbehaviour effectively.

**Recommendation 5:** The regular use of instruments such as the Effective Behaviour Support (EBS) questionnaire to support and evaluate implementation efforts provide the school community with the much-needed evidence to evaluate and guide their efforts.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There were limitations identified in the study although a conscious effort was made to do a well-planned and thorough research study. The most predominant shortcoming of the study was the limitation imposed by the size of the school. The staff cohort at the case study school were 17 teachers, with 429 learners. Another limitation was the flux in terms of established staff over the implementation period. This study was conducted with teachers who taught at the school during the period of implementation. Although the SWPBS framework advocates participation of support staff, the parental community and the
community at large, it was not possible to involve all the stakeholders given the scope of the study. Conclusions can therefore not necessarily be generalised to other contexts. Some of the information recorded is somewhat questionable for numerous reasons. The teachers may not be in a position to experience challenging behaviours displayed by learners first-hand. Owing to the capricious nature of some participants, they might decide to answer the questions partially or to fake their information.

Teachers used the incident book differently, and all may not have had common definitions of behaviour in order for them to record. The manner in which teachers manage their classrooms; their interpretation of the discipline policies; and the level of teacher tolerance all contribute to the recordings in the incident book. Another limitation is the potential for teacher bias in the documentation of challenging behaviour, as well as the variations in tolerance from different teachers towards challenging behaviour. Office referrals are also limited in that they only reflect overt or externally.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There are several recommendations for further research which have emanated from this study. One of the findings of this investigation was the relationship between teacher recording of challenging behaviour and his/her approach and attitude towards education and management. Some teachers will record each behaviour, whilst others might address the behaviour first. Variations across families and cultures in their perceptions of what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate behaviour are also important considerations in defining challenging behaviour (Division for early childhood of the council for exceptional children, 1999).
Social-emotional curricula should be designed to teach social skills and, concomitantly, to decrease the challenging behaviours of learners. The teaching materials and techniques should make provision for co-operative play and friendship skills, understanding and expressing emotions, empathy, role play and self-management skills (Joseph & Strain, 2003).

More research is needed to replicate the study in schools that differ from the case study school with respect to a range of school contextual variables (e.g. size, racial/ethnic composition, high school, socio-economic and geographical environment of the school).

5.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The wave of challenging behaviours all over the world, especially in educational institutions, poses a number of challenges to educators. The nature of challenging behaviours experienced in South African schools presents serious and harmful implications for all aspects of learner development. Hence the need to rise up against the culture of challenging behaviour in our schools. As the awareness grows, it will be increasingly urgent that a systematic, evidence-based approach be promoted and adopted by teachers, sports coaches, support staff and parents. This case study examined the appropriateness of an SWPBS approach to address school discipline at the primary school where the case study was conducted, using incident books, representing office discipline referrals to evaluate the success of the SWPBS approach, combined with group interviews with teachers from the participating school in order to establish the potential of SWPBS to address the behavioural needs of learners.
The case study presented tentative findings on the social validity of the intervention to the primary school where the intervention was implemented. The findings emphasise the essential elements of proactive instructional activities vital for successful and sustained implementation of SWPBS: creating a positive classroom climate; creating a physical arrangement that facilitates instruction to all learners; the provision of clear, consistent reinforcement of behavioural expectations; determining the procedures and routine for swift transitions and maximising instructional time; and managing paperwork effectively.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Challenging Behaviour</th>
<th>Internalizing</th>
<th>Externalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviour that physically harms others</td>
<td>Cheating, Carrying, Fighting, Bringing</td>
<td>(self-destructive, sexual, interpersonal, physical, }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially inappropriate behaviour</td>
<td>Inappropriate sexual behaviour, Gambling at school, Stealing, Shouting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening behaviour</td>
<td>Threating, Hoarding, Head banging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-injurious behaviour</td>
<td>Cutting, Hitting self, Swallowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Temper tantrums</td>
<td>Shouting, Running away, Writing on premises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Running away, Refusing to do things, Non-co-operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Admission number | Coding A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, B2, C1, C2, C3, D1, D2, D3, D4, E1, E2, E3, E4, F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, G1, G2, H1, H2, H3, H4, I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, J1, J2 | 

Appendix B: Initial coding scheme
Appendix C.1: Group interview protocol

Title of the research project: A school-wide positive behaviour intervention support approach to challenging behaviour at a primary school.

Ethics reference number: H15-EDU-ERE-012

Principle Investigator: Mr. T.P. Matthews, Principal of Adolph Schauder Primary School

Contact details: 041 3656393 (h) e-mail: matthewstp@telkomsa.net

Dear teachers, welcome to the group interview of my study. Your participation is appreciated. The purpose of this group interview is to learn from you how you experienced the school-wide positive behaviour intervention support approach. There are no wrong answers. No names will be used in the discussion and you will remain anonymous. Please put your cell phones off. The discussion will be recorded for the purposes of the study, so please only speak one at a time. If you do not understand the question, please ask me for clarification. Are there any questions before we begin?

Main interview questions:

1. How did you experience discipline prior to the implementation of school-wide positive behaviour intervention support?
2. How did the implementation of swpbis contributed to the holistic development of learners?
3. How did the incident book enhance your classroom management?
4. Are you in a position to advocate this framework to your neighbouring schools?
5. How do you think should we adapt the framework, any recommendations?
Appendix C.2: Transcript of one group interview.

Focus group #2 (Intersen Phase)

Introduction

Around about 4 years ago the researcher came with the idea that discipline is a bit of a dilemma at school. There were at that time not effective guidelines from the department of education. They just told you, that corporal punishment was abandoned, but the alternatives are not really working. We stumbled upon this School-Wide Positive Behaviour and Support framework. The word positive drew the attention of the researcher. The researcher was looking for a systemic approach to address challenging behaviour in schools. The SWPBS has been used quite extensively in America, but there’s not very much being documented in South Africa on how to implement the framework. The researcher started the bold process of doing it at his own school that’s the most difficult research that you can do, because you need to make use of your colleagues. Colleagues don’t always have a choice actually then to co-operate. We thank you to have been opened up these changes that could happen to the school and what we would like to get to this point in time.

Immediately after the introduction the following conversation followed:

What did we learn from this? So the question that we going to ask you first of all is aimed directed to the more experienced teachers. They were here at school prior to 2011, and became use to the old disciplinary system? Can you still remember? How did you feel in terms of emotions, being in charge, empowered by the discipline system? Secondly, how did you benefit from this new school-wide positive behavior intervention framework that became part of value system oppose to the disciplinary system? Give us examples, if you can think of any incidents, of how behavior changed or not. How did you feel after this and how your parents felt about it, and if are there any shortcomings you think we can still address. First of all how did you experience your prior disciplinary system, I don’t know who taught here, initially? So any examples and remember this is a free for all, this is a discussion, and there is no order, anyone that would like to start?

[Tiffany]: I would say at our school the discipline was very rigid, you followed the school rules, class rules and if the learner transgressed then you will have a set of rules that will say, step 1- write a letter to inform the parent of this child’s behavior if it’s serious, if it’s
not serious, you as a class teacher...you can deal with it in a manner that you can. You may have one- on- one with a specific learner or maybe make use of the principal. One could also ask the teachers in charge of discipline but there were steps that had to be followed. Sometimes those steps worked, sometimes it doesn’t

So now, did you like that or not the fact that you do this steps, how did you feel about this rigid system?

[Tiffany]: sometimes it didn’t help because it only come from me as a teacher and then from the parents side there wasn’t that support that was needed from there side, so you work, you need to work as a team in order to really touch that learner if there are any uses of discipline.

And now…

[Tiffany]: Well now with the more positive behaviour approach...I would say that um when a learner transgresses like in the past we use corporal punishment as well, now it’s different, the whole setup is different in that, that you can directly teach appropriate social skills to learners and modify and/or arrange the school context when necessary to prevent challenging behaviour to germinate. One could tell them where he or she transgresses. Especially in a class situation where a learner for example, you shout them, you need to just say... also by not shouting, sometimes in the past I use to do that also, shout and say be quiet and don’t do that, but now...I just tell Aphiwe, listen here “Aphiwe just tone it down”, also in a soft voice. [cause], I can scream. “tone it down a bit” and gradually, Aphiwe will start... you know just calming down and reminding them you don’t have to scream. One should you use your inner voice or inside voice, you don’t need to shout at each other and respect one another, you don’t have to disrupt your friend or the teacher. You may also ask” what is it that is bothering you, come to teacher don’t disrupt the class”. Things like that and tell them at all time, throw it back to them as well. Ask them “do you think it’s right what you doing? Maybe they disrupt, fight or bully. Constantly asking “how would you feel if somebody else would do that to you”, [obviously] but in a nice way.

anyone else?

[Margo]: Years ago the majority of the children would be referred to the principal, but now there are disciplinary committees which make the work so much lighter for the principal. So everything is not referred to the principal. So... each teacher is a disciplinary in his or her
own class. You need to take responsibility for that and also teach the children the core values of that class, things like the Vision and Mission statement, school never laid that much emphasis on vision and mission statements, prior to 2012, it’s there now and also been taught on just set to the children this is the Vision and Mission statement, this is the core values, you suppose to behave like this and that also helps a lot with the discipline so that the children know which direction our school or our class is going to.

[Humo]: I can speak about the implementation of the incident book that we use in the class. As teachers we will be able to monitor and record the habitual offenders. One can also determine a pattern of behavioral problems or any learning barriers that could cause discipline problems by using the incident book. We implemented an action by working in cahoots with parents and Mrs. Pillay is the coordinator of that program. Learners could be identified and referred for psychological testing to a psychologist. Mrs.Pillay is also working closely with Westview special school, where learners with learning barriers are accommodated and placed in practical directions. The last few years our learners were accepted at Westview due to the program and cooperation from teachers implementing the program. We are waiting for response for this year’s application. That is a positive aspect. Learners can be channeled appropriately. Learners who are detected with barriers to learning, as early as from grades 3, reward system 4 and 5 are channeled into a remedial teaching program done by Mrs. Johnson. Learning barriers are being addressed and behavioral changes and discipline are monitored to determine also the success of the program.

Okay…

[Humo]: The program is addressing the vacuum left by the department, where special classes at schools were abolished. We are currently sitting with diversity and different levels within the classroom which is a huge challenge for teachers because of the problems, so the program is working in the class. Also our learners come from their immediate environment and social structure where they find themselves having instilled a lot of violence and aggression. These learners cause endless discipline and disruption problems in the classrooms. The learners see the violence and aggression that stems from gangsterism, drug and alcohol abuse. Now this framework allows us to have started a rewarded system for good behavior, by acknowledging and showcasing good behavioral deeds at assembly. The
acknowledgement changes the attitude of learners to a more positive and less aggression. The implementation of the system provides a safe environment for the learners because they also gain confidence in the value system. Learners can see the good behavior in themselves and also in others. I’m just mentioning the part when Nadine was a very aggressive learner and we, one morning at assembly Mr. Matthews awarded her with a prize and you could see the difference in behavior in Nadine. She’s not so aggressive anymore. There’s also a Pick n Pay Hero Award system. It is run by the Life skills, Mrs. Avgerinos. The learners receive certificates for a hero deed or for good behavior.

Okay, who defines the Hero deed or have a description?

[Aveo]: uhm, I do the basic categories, usually sports, academic and also like a behavior. I usually send a circular around to the teachers they nominate what went on in class and then, usually I just pick the one that stands out the most. So it can be sports or behavior or academics.

Okay so it’s the full spectrum of what idea, wonderful.

How do you feel about, the two things I’ve picked up? You’ve got an incident book that sort of guidelines the problems. You also use it for placements and so forth to make decisions. Lastly you got the reward system. Let us just for two minutes come back to the incident book. How do you find that, is it functioning well, what are the benefits? I know what was said, but I just want sort of confirmation. If you could add something for us, another choice of words, sometimes helps?

[Runx]: Um like, I’m not from the old system, I don’t know how the old system worked, but the incident books... it helped. The learners are aware of the incident book. Point number one, so they know when you pull out that book, their names are gonna go in there, then they start to worry, so that definitely works because to a certain extent. One can place them in a certain area, where they know this is what will happen if I do this, it goes in the incident book, its serious, sometimes it’s something small, so you can handle it in class. It only goes in the incident book if it’s really, really now... and they know that is the part where it’s very dangerous you don’t want your name in the incident book, so uhm it works. The learners definitely uhm the discipline has definitively improved. Since the incident book is out uhm... and Mr. Bens around its better, cause he checks the incident book regularly so it works.
If he checks it, what happening with it, uhm… he checks it, he sees where the, how do I say, rough kids names, the serious situations then he calls them, then he intervenes from there, so he’s doing the following up on that so it’s away from you. You got two interesting tools, the one is the external motivator, I don’t want my name in the incident book, and on the other side you have internal motivator, which is the reward system. How do you find that working is it working for the school? Would you like to put emphasis on one more than the other, would you think you find putting more emphasis on the incident book then there is on the hero reward system?

[Aveo]: The hero reward system should be done more than once a month. The incident book works, it works very well, and not just for the kids the parents as well, because the parents get more aggressive with us. They say there is nothing wrong with their children, we can take the incident book and say listen, this is the problem I had. We can go back to the previous grades and go back to that teacher and look at the incident book. It helps with that as well.

[Tiffany]: Regarding the incident book…, consulting the parents can lead to positive behaviour; the parent knows how one child is bullying the other one. Parents can talk to the children too. They could maybe tell them that bullying is wrong… you know. One learn something new and change can then be noticed in class. If the parent is not informed the learner might not change. One can shout… you can do whatever and that child will bully again. Teachers need to keep parents informed, regularly. The incident book is a way for them to see the reality.

[Margo]: Years ago there wasn’t incident books and now there are, beside the point you can keep track of what the children are doing.

I think it’s very important cause years ago we only sent letters and the children never gave some of that letters to the parents and the parents just, or as they received the letters they gave an excuse that they didn’t receive the letters but the incident book, you have proof and proof is very important. Especially to cover the teacher and the learner and the principal as well because that book it’s not in your class it goes back down to the office as well so then the principal is aware of what’s happening in your class.
That’s definitely serving as evidence; it serves as evidence yes as per discussion yes. What I’m also picking up so two things, so the Pick n Pay Hero award program or the reward system. What we have is working, but must be beefed up a little bit giving prominence to balance the fact that internal external situation can be balanced a bit more, I also hear there’s three parties in this whole endeavor. It is the school, if I understand you correctly, together with the child and the parents. So uhm what would you like to say in terms of parent education, do you think it’s been done enough, you have a few pointers for us, how to get this parents in this tri-ad a little bit more involved or educated or play a better role.

[Tiffany]: We have programs via the GM Foundation, we have workshops for the parents to help with homework and how to really deal with the learner at home, regarding their manners, the basic things how a child should be in a class, at home because they say “charity begins at home” so you need to, everything eventually goes back to the parents and they need to know that the child learns their first so we trying to get them informed and involved.

How’s the participation in these workshops? Who’s in charge of the workshops? [Polo]: It’s me, there’s quite, normally about 20 parents that show up. Most of our parents are in the townships, it’s a bit difficult as transport is a concern. I think what I’m gathering here and what everyone is saying is that, we all need to be on the same page for the child to really progress. The parent can’t not know and you know and once the child goes home and has a different behavior and sometimes the parent so shocked and here it’s a different child.

I’m saying the incident book is good and because we can show them, but look at the behavior, it’s not the same at home, but many teachers from grade 3-5 so I think that’s good.

And the learners, how do you perceive them to feel about this whole new system. [Aveo]: Uhm I’ve got one or two examples where children misbehaved and with the reward system you seem to get to a positive behavior, any other objectives? I think it depends on the child because when, like you do the positive reward system in class... like... In my class personally some of the children like Selisa, I gave him a duty to do, cause I know he’s a difficult child. As soon as you come into the class you open the windows, but that went to his head. Instead of behaving better, he got worse, because he thought you know, my teacher’s pet, now all of a sudden, so I think it depends on the child not just on us. Like Nadine will improve and show their behavior, there are a few that kind of ... I don’t know,
loose it, so you need to know your child, you need to know which child use the reward system to better behavior.

[Pololo]: One should be a little bit more tough and sometimes they do take advantage, like I have a system where like a little gold g’s on a piece of cotton that use to work very well but afterwards you also need to be very consistent, cause some, how they got lost, some of them just got of hand again and I ask them, where’s my g’s but I noticed that the kids will be very good just for that “g” and then after they got the “g” they back to normal, so that’s why I think you need to use both. You need to use the reward one and the tough one together for them to really work, that’s valuable.

We swing the pendulum sometimes so away from the positive we lose track of everyone’s benefit. Yesterday we had an interview Foundation Phase teachers and they said it’s not nice for them cause right now from the beginning the value system is going to be instill in the children so they know how to behave, they know what the goal is. So 2012, 13 and 14 you must have had some of those kids maybe early years, could you see that the younger groups show that, that foundation that was laid in Foundation Phase helped or didn’t you pick up something or am I now putting the cat amongst to pigeons here?

[March]: No not really because I’ve been in the foundation phase for the past 4 years and now with the seniors and so some of learners that have been in grade 2 with me that’s now in grade 5 so I’ve picked up that some of the children have grown emotionally that is very important, especially when it comes to the intersen phase you can see the difference, like little things that they know when they with me old rubbish around you, and that’s your little office, and you must keep your little space around you, you must keep it clean, so they know already when I come in; “papers”, you know, so they know you’ve learned something from foundation phase till here. The other thing that we are struggling in is the intersen phase is bubblegum. Bubblegum is terrible and what I normally do, I don’t shout the children, I just watch them, go up to them, I don’t call Siphiwe, come here, because they are big and its very embarrassing as well, then I go up to them, just put a piece of paper down and they know they must take their bubblegum out. The others will see what’s happening and they will
immediately do it, and I also show them, do you know how much money you wasting by chewing that bubblegum in the morning because some children have 5 or 6 bubblegum’s for the day and at the end of the day look at all the money you have been wasting, you see so there’s many things that the people person, teacher instills in a child and later years you see it really works even with James. James was extremely naughty. He was in grade 1, cut his teacher’s curtain and also cut one of the learner’s hair and then he was in an incident. James also improved and he’s dressing a little bit better, he’s wearing his tie, although he’s a very busy body person, he cannot sit still, what I normally do is, “James come sit here by teacher please”. Mrs. Avgerinos wasn’t here, so James sat on Mrs. Avgerinos’ chair and be the teacher for the day. He liked it so much, just to keep him calm and let him feel important, don’t you want to take this to Mrs. Pillay there, yes teacher or else if you don’t keep your finger on James, he was like, coming back to the school rules that has been, was very important to me like you cannot talk, you can’t expect children not to talk in class, so my thing in the class is you see, like the isiXhosa children, mm Xhosa is a very loud language you cannot expect those children to click silently, you will hear them but the tone of your voice, the volume that’s important and you can’t tell children to keep quiet the whole day it’s not good, that’s not good, they need to converse with one another, they need to liaise, cause if you in an office space speak to your colleagues as well, but there’s just the tone and the volume, it’s little things, but it comes through so and children they love, just tell them the majority of the day you are with me, so I’m your mother whether you like it or not, so you better behave because you are going to be unpleasant the whole day, because you stuck with me.

The focus is more on a value system rather than an old system that helps you feel comfortable with that?

[Polo]: If I’m allowed to read something that I wrote down; learners are build up and not broken down, learners have an understanding that discipline is not a punishment but a correction of behavior, learners are molded in a way we like them to be, learners are not embarrassed, like mam were saying, and do not recent authority, learners now strive to please, the techniques and strategies that happened by Adolph Schauder is SWPB system, high in program, teach learners with respect and takes into account their background, like sir mentioned, it also allows them to praise and teaches learners self-control and self-
discipline, so I think the system now help them as a whole to help develop their inner to, to chew bubblegum not to just please teacher, this is gonna happen to me and to know I want to be a better person.

How do you personally feel, do you feel, do you feel empowered, do you feel respondent about discipline, if I talk to my student teachers that’s coming back, after a crypt session. First thing they complain about is discipline, so if I put the word down there for you, how do you feel of about the discipline in your school, is it still displeased or do you feel more manageable, you know where you going.

[Runx]: For me personally, is definitely more manageable, cause I’m also involved in the sport at school so when you get to the sports field but some of the kids having class, they can’t be on the sports field, sometimes they don’t listen, after the whole program implemented at school, I must say the behavior on the sports field definitely improved, people don’t listen to you they speak to each other, you hear they speak to each other, you literally hear they have respect, not all shouting this and shouting that, one learn team work as well to work together at the end of the day, is not about themselves, it’s about the team, it’s not one person that holds the whole team they face they learn to work together, it works. So there’s a vast connection from outside activities and school activities, okay.

[Humo]: Maybe I can just come in to latch to the sports part, there’s also a sports program running at the school on Fridays to help learners channel their access energy in taking part, which internally helps them to change their attitudes they learn more about comradery, honesty, trust, how to play fair and by the rules, how to show good sportsmanship and how to enjoy themselves and also being excepted by the team. The situation boosted their self confidence and this seeks to change their aggressive attitudes and the general outlook on life or feel that they are worth something. Learners also get a chance to develop their social skills, example how to be a good winner or loser, how to interact with fellow and opposition players, Mr. Vissie mentioned, how to interact with referees and coaches. I want to mention the hockey team that Mrs. Craig said, they lost a game but they showed they can be a good loser also being aggressive or shouting or swearing. And the hockey team was rewarded by winning, they were taken out to McDonalds by Mr. Matthews to reward them for their good behavior and for the winning of the game, I definitely feel that sports place also a very important role in their discipline.
Last question, so if we would like to sell this to another school, cause all the schools are looking for some way of handling the discipline that’s more empowering and not a shouting game. What would you think in your system still need to be developed or like to change or make better, that we can use as guidelines so we can tell somebody else, this is how we done it, this is still need to be done.

[Aveo]: The incident book should be monitored more to make sure the teachers are all writing, there’s no gaps, we have an honesty/amnesty, there are gaps between some of the grades, teachers don’t write as much as they should, um that that the reward system should be encouraged more perhaps in the classrooms so maybe once a week you choose someone, the teacher choose or ask the class to choose someone, I think maybe something like that, to motivate you.

And sort of a second level, like a big hero or a super hero or something like that can be rewarded, okay. Nothing else, do you know what to record in the incident book?

[Aveo]: It’s really transgression that you feel was not conducive to teachers, so it’s not just the hitting the shouting its bad language, behavior like the child this one, its homework shakes the whole time it could be a sign of something that distill passes in the future, could be ADHD you kind have, I would write emotional things if I see the child is weepy, maybe we should change, it’s not the incident we should maybe change to another word, we record everything

[March]: It all makes the teacher more observant, you must be very observant to have your kids in the class, you must try to learn to know the children as soon as possible and you can also as previous class teachers because some children have major problems that the teacher is not aware of, with that’s where the incident book comes in, you not aware of it, so teachers need to liaise with each other.

[Aveo]: One thing I do wanna say is what an idea to pass the book on to the next teacher and some of us, I included thinks it wasn’t necessary, it’s better to keep your own book, say another teacher reads the book and the child of my class was a terrible cause constantly badgering me, he reads and might have a negative opinion to a child even in the class, what we’ve done is, I keep my book, the problem is can I come check your book for this child from last year, we can talk over like that I think that is what supposed to be suggested to other
Did you feel one or two of you came afterwards, it was implemented, what happened in the beginning of the year, did you receive workshops that say how the discipline system was running and this is how we fill it in or do you think that would help. Or just a meeting a guidelines meeting, not workshops okay. We also learned yesterday in a meeting or the conversation we had with the Foundation Phase they said that if the incident book was standardized. The standardized incident book certain of these behaviors documented with the description so you can just tick off, so you can just tick of and if you check the dates as well, dates, and what I’m hearing, there’s also space for a person to reflect on other things although these are the things we sort of look at, there must be an emotional more reflective piece so you can write with that, be acceptable, be official as well,  

[Polo]: should be taken as an observation book to observe the child to record their behavior, maybe you should think of changing the word, maybe we can have a place where we can have the parent consulting where the parent can maybe sign on that day he came in for the time. That type of behavior transgression maybe, definite, easier to monitor than if there is a pattern of bad behavior.

And your bad behavior and their bad behavior is the same bad behavior, currently you may think, whispering to loud is bad behavior and she is only going for shouting or something like that, so it is standardized as if its needed, that’s where the life orientation person comes in not everything that standardized is always good okay. Anything else,

[Spear]: may I ask a question, I’m worried about the implementation of this whole thing for a lack of better word, do you feel you were bullied into the system being a student first, doing his masters and also being the leader of the school and also its reality so amongst those 3 issues, do you feel we could have implemented this one in a better way or how do you feel it was implemented, was it forced on you. [Humo]: This is our everyday life we deal with discipline so it was a learning experience for us also. I don’t think we were bullied into implementation, what also happened and I think from a supervisors
point of view if I can latch on 2012 you started certain things, 2013 it came a little bit more, 2014 even more, it wasn’t old system new system immediately, so you were gradually developing and moving in, you felt comfortable within that, cause we need to give guidelines to another school, how would you implement it, get a consultant develop something for them and 2011 the old system, 2012 it’s system new or must it come organically from the school, use the principles that we would spell out or what would you tell a new school or another school.

[March]: *A person learns actually every day, gradually you learn, so I don’t think... like, you can say, it will stay like that you will always add something else at another school that will work for them, and even here as well we learn every day, so we can keep on talking for years about this, it won’t stay the same but you feel these guidelines really work. Okay, expose the guidelines and the schools need to decide how they going to move forward, how to implement it, I hope, I’m still on my time. Anything else you would like to leave us with, nothing. I’m going to provide you with a written document, can I just stop this.*
Appendix D1: Effective Behaviour Support (EBS) Self-Assessment Survey

Version 2.0

Effective Behaviour Support (EBS) Survey
Assessing and Planning Behaviour Support in Schools

Name of school ___________________________ Date ________________
District ________________________________

Person Completing the Survey:

· Administrator · Special Educator · Parent/Family member
· General Educator · Counsellor · School Psychologist
· Community member · Other

1. Complete the survey independently.

2. Schedule 20-30 minutes to complete the survey.

3. Base your rating on your individual experiences in the school. If you do not work in classrooms, answer questions that are applicable to you.

To assess behaviour support, first evaluate the status of each system feature (i.e. in place, partially in place, not in place) (left hand side of survey). Next, examine each feature:

a. “What is the current status of this feature (i.e. in place, partially in place, not in place)?”

b. For those features rated as partially in place or not in place, “What is the priority for improvement for this feature (i.e., high, medium, low)?”

4. Return your completed survey to ___________________________ by ____________


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-wide</strong> is defined as involving all learners, all staff, &amp; all settings.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
<td>Not in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A small number (e.g. 3-5) of positively &amp; clearly stated learner expectations or rules are defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expected learner behaviours are taught directly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expected learner behaviours are rewarded regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problem behaviours (failure to meet expected learner behaviours) are defined clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consequences for problem behaviours are defined clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Distinctions between office v. classroom managed problem behaviours are clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behaviour occurs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Procedures are in place to address emergency/dangerous situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School administrator is an active participant on the behaviour support team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Data on problem behaviour patterns are collected and summarized within an ongoing system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Priority for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td><strong>School-wide</strong> is defined as involving all learners, all staff, &amp; all settings.</td>
<td>High, Med, Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
<td>12. Patterns of student problem behaviour are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (e.g. monthly).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>13. School has formal strategies for informing families about expected learner behaviours at school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Booster training activities for learners are developed, modified, &amp; conducted based on school data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. School-wide behaviour support team has a budget for (a) teaching learners, (b) on-going rewards, and (c) annual staff planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. All staff are involved directly and/or indirectly in school-wide interventions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. The school team has access to on-going training and support from district personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. The school is required by the district to report on the social climate, discipline level or learner behaviour at least annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of School ___________________________ Date ______________
## NONCLASSROOM SETTING SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td><strong>Non-classroom settings</strong> are defined as particular times or places where supervision is emphasized (e.g., hallways, cafeteria, playground, bus).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
<td>1. School-wide expected learner behaviours apply to non-classroom settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>2. School-wide expected learner behaviours are taught in non-classroom settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Rewards exist for meeting expected learner behaviours in non-classroom settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Physical/architectural features are modified to limit (a) unsupervised settings, (b) unclear traffic patterns, and (c) inappropriate access to &amp; exit from school grounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Staff receives regular opportunities for developing and improving active supervision skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Status of learner behaviour and management practices are evaluated quarterly from data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. All staff are involved directly or indirectly in management of non-classroom settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of School ____________________________ Date __________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Classroom settings are defined as instructional settings in which teacher(s) supervise &amp; teach groups of learners.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
<td>1. Expected learner behaviour &amp; routines in classrooms are stated positively &amp; defined clearly.</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>2. Problem behaviours are defined clearly.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Expected learner behaviour &amp; routines in classrooms are taught directly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Expected learner behaviour are acknowledged regularly (positively reinforced) (&gt;4 positives to 1 negative).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Problem behaviours receive consistent consequences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Procedures for expected &amp; problem behaviours are consistent with school-wide procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Classroom-based options exist to allow classroom instruction to continue when problem behaviour occurs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Instruction &amp; curriculum materials are matched to learner ability (math, reading, language).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Learners experience high rates of academic success (≥ 75% correct).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Teachers have regular opportunities for access to assistance &amp; recommendations (observation, instruction, &amp; coaching).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Transitions between instructional &amp; non-instructional activities are efficient &amp; orderly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of School _____________________________________ Date ______________
# INDIVIDUAL LEARNER SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td><strong>Individual student systems</strong> are defined as specific supports for students who engage in chronic problem behaviors (1%-7% of enrollment)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
<td>1. Assessments are conducted regularly to identify students with chronic problem behaviors.</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>2. A simple process exists for teachers to request assistance.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. A behavior support team responds promptly (within 2 working days) to students who present chronic problem behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Behavioral support team includes an individual skilled at conducting functional behavioral assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Local resources are used to conduct functional assessment-based behavior support planning (~10 hrs/week/student).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Significant family &amp;/or community members are involved when appropriate &amp; possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. School includes formal opportunities for families to receive training on behavioral support/positive parenting strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Behavior is monitored &amp; feedback provided regularly to the behavior support team &amp; relevant staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of School  

Date
### Appendix D.2: EBS data

#### SCHOOL-WIDE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON CLASSROOM SETTING SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Priority for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Priority for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Priority for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>Partial in Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Documents related to the implementation of SWPBS

E.1: Code of conduct and school rules prior to implementation of SWPBS

Adolph Schauder Primary

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR ALL LEARNERS

This code is a set of rules for behaviour at school, and infringements will be dealt with by a disciplinary committee.

Parents choose Adolph Schauder Primary school as the choice of school to further their child/ren’s education.

RULES

1. Learners are at Adolph Schauder to LEARN, and no learner may disrupt or interfere with other learners’ learning in anyway.

2. All learners must have a homework diary in which to enter their homework to be completed at home.

3. Learners should at all times move briskly along corridors, neither running nor shouting or whistling is permitted in the building.

4. After each lesson, learners should leave desks and classrooms neat and tidy.

5. No learner is permitted to move about the buildings while lessons are in progress unless he/she has permission from educator.

6. No learner is permitted to move about the building while lessons are in progress unless he/she has permission from an educator.

7. The public telephones may not be used while lessons are in progress.

8. Learners, who take ill during the day, may request permission to go home.
9. Learners leaving the school during the day for medical or other appointment must obtain prior permission.

10. There may be no physical abuse or harassment of learners, and no victimization. Learners must respect one another’s cultures and backgrounds. The school believes in the right of all learners to be in charge of their own bodies, and no sexual harassment will be tolerated.

11. There is to be no substance abuse (e.g. alcohol, drugs, dagga, or any other intoxicants). There is to be no smoking.

12. Learners should be aware that their behaviour as learners in the vicinity of the school is reflected on the whole school, and they should strive to set an example for all learners in the area.

13. Learners will be required to work together in class at all times and to facilitate the learning of others; co-operative learning is considered to be an important part of education at school.

14. No learners may be late for class. Learners must attend all classes every day. No bunking will be allowed.

15. Learners who are ill must contact the school as soon as possible and MUST bring a letter or doctor’s certificate on his/her return.

16. Learners are expected to co-operate with and be polite to educators and fellow learners at all times. Visitors to school must be politely treated.

17. The school building and grounds should be kept tidy at all times. Bins are to be used for litter and no litter is to be left in classrooms.

18. There may be no eating in class or chewing gum, at all.

19. Learners are to respect one another’s property. Noting may be taken from another learner without permission.

20. Nothing may be removed from the classrooms without the permission of the educator. Learners may not remove anything from the school which does not belong to them. This includes books, magazines, newspaper and cleaning materials.

21. Hair must be cut to regulation and neatly groomed.
22. No make-up and jewellery may be worn. No sharp objects or cellphones will be allowed.

23. The school reserves the right to take any actions against any learner behaving in a manner which in the school’s opinion, reflects adversely upon its good name.

24. Any violation of these rules may result in punishment by detention, written work, labour squad, suspension or expulsion.

DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE

1. Class detention- on a daily basis

2. A verbal warning for a first offence

3. A second offence, parents are called to school to discuss the seriousness of the offence.

4. If (1) to (3) fails, then a temporary suspension shall apply.

5. If procedures (4) fail a permanent expulsion is applicable.
E2: Vision and Mission statement of school based on SWPBS principles

Vision Statement
To empower learners to become capable of making life long significant contributions to society.

Mission Statement
To encourage positive work ethics through quality education, sport, arts & culture and nutrition.

Core Values
Show Respect
Be Responsible
Be Accountable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>BE SAFE</th>
<th>BE RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>BE RESPECTFULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>*Handy and eat your own food</td>
<td>*Raise your hand for help</td>
<td>*Use inside voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep hands and feet to self</td>
<td>*Clean up your area</td>
<td>*Follow adult direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Move carefully</td>
<td>*Take only what you can eat</td>
<td>*Use kind words and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Always walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblies</td>
<td>*Keep hands and feet to self</td>
<td>*Follow directions</td>
<td>*Listen quietly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Stay with your group</td>
<td>*Keep quiet</td>
<td>*Show appreciation appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Enter and exit quietly with your teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep eyes on performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallways</td>
<td>*Walk in a straight line facing forward</td>
<td>*Walk directly to where you are going</td>
<td>*Walk silently 8:00 - 15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep hands and feet to self</td>
<td>*Always carry a hall pass</td>
<td>*Honour hallway teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Pay attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>*Wash hands with soap and water before</td>
<td>*Use toilets and sinks for intended purposes</td>
<td>*Keep walls and doors free of marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep feet on floor</td>
<td>*Report problems to adults</td>
<td>*Use quiet voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Flush</td>
<td>*Return to class quickly</td>
<td>*Give people privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>*Use equipment for intended purposes</td>
<td>*Line up quickly at first signal</td>
<td>*Use kind words and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Stay in boundaries</td>
<td>*Return play equipment</td>
<td>*Take turns and share equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep hands and feet to self</td>
<td>*Listen to staff and follow directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Run safely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Report any strangers, or dangerous items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immediately to adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>*Keep hands and feet to self</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Always walk</td>
<td>*Try to solve own problems and ask for help if</td>
<td>*Follow direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Move carefully</td>
<td>*Clean your area</td>
<td>*Use kind words and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use materials for intended purposes</td>
<td>*Use inside voice</td>
<td>*Leave toys at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>*Hands and feet to self</td>
<td>*Use emergency door only in emergency</td>
<td>*Use quiet voices (no loud, vulgar language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*No weapons or hazardous material</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep bus clean and undamaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Stay seated</td>
<td>*Be at your bus stop at least 5 minutes before</td>
<td>*Listen to driver and follow directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transport arrives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Keep hands, head inside bus at all time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Cross in front of bus or as driver directs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*No eating, drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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