

Differential Effects of a Tier Two Behavior Intervention Based on Function of Problem Behavior

Kent McIntosh

University of British Columbia

Amy L. Campbell

Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

Deborah Russell Carter

Boise State University, Idaho

Celeste Rossetto Dickey

University of Oregon, Eugene

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of a tier two daily behavior card intervention and differential effects based on function of problem behavior. The participants were 36 elementary school students nominated for additional intervention beyond universal School-Wide Positive Behavior Support. Measures included standardized behavior rating scales and rate of office discipline referrals before and after 8 weeks of intervention. A multivariate analysis of variance was used, and results showed statistically significant differences in response to intervention based on teacher-identified function of problem behavior. Results are discussed in terms of considering function of behavior in selecting tier two interventions and implementing a three-tier response to intervention model.

Keywords: *behavioral assessment; functional assessment; challenging behavior(s); positive behavior support(s)*

The 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004) allows educational agencies to use a response to intervention (RTI) model for identifying students under the category of specific learning disability. In contrast to previous models of special education eligibility that relied on results of standardized measures of cognition and academic achievement, RTI relies on the continuous monitoring of student progress while providing multiple tiers of prevention and intervention. Although the specific components of RTI vary by implementation context, the RTI process generally includes the following: (a) screening all students to identify who may benefit from additional support, (b) implementing evidence-based interventions, (c) providing a continuum of intervention through multiple tiers of intensity (i.e., primary, secondary, and tertiary), (d) continuously monitoring all student progress, and (e) examining student progress data to make special education eligibility decisions (Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003; Gresham, VanDerHeyden, & Witt, 2005).

Although the majority of research and scholarly discussion has focused on using RTI models for academic concerns, several researchers have proposed a similar model for social behavior problems (Eber, Sugai, Smith, & Scott, 2002; Fairbanks, Sugai, Guardino, & Lathrop, 2007; Gresham, 1991; Sugai, Horner, et al., 2000). In the field, more than 6,600 schools across North America are

Authors' Note: This research was supported in part by U.S. Department of Education Grants No. H324D020031 and Q215E050001. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the department should be inferred. The authors are grateful for the assistance provided by the Bethel School District Leadership Team, including Monica Bounds, Drew Braun, Remie Calalang, Carl Cole, Ginger Kowalko, and Margaret Lathrop. The authors would also like to thank Aaron Barnes, Olivia Bradway, Chad Harrison, Nicole Roberts, Billie Jo Rodriguez, and Jessica Swain-Bradway for their assistance.

Please address correspondence to Kent McIntosh, University of British Columbia, Educational and Counselling Psychology and Special Education, 2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4; e-mail: kent.mcintosh@ubc.ca.

Action Editor: Don Kincaid