United International Journal for Research & Technology
Volume 06, Issue 11, 2025 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

Impact of Positive Behavioral Interventions on Student Behavior: Basis for Enhancing School Discipline Programs

Saadoden G. Obinay
Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

***Abstract*—** Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) aim to promote positive student conduct through structured strategies such as clear expectations, consistent reinforcement, and targeted support. They foster a respectful and supportive school climate, reduce disruptive behaviors, and enhance academic engagement. This study examined the extent of PBI implementation and its relationship with student behavior in the Tangcal District, Division of Lanao del Norte. A descriptive-correlational research design was used, involving 142 teacher-respondents. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire adapted from the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) and the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2). Statistical tools included mean, standard deviation, and Spearman's Rho correlation. The extent of PBI implementation was rated high (M = 3.85), with Behavior Monitoring and Feedback receiving the highest mean (3.93). Student behavior was also rated high (M = 3.86), with Peer Interactions scoring highest (3.91). Spearman's Rho analysis revealed a weak and non-significant correlation between PBI implementation and student behavior ($\rho = -0.116$, $p = 0.168$). Findings indicate consistent application of PBIs and generally positive student behavior. However, the absence of a significant statistical relationship suggests that factors beyond PBIs—such as parental involvement, socio-emotional factors, or community influences—may also affect student behavior. While PBIs and student behavior both scored highly, their statistical link was insignificant. Schools should maintain current PBI practices while integrating complementary strategies and expanding behavioral support systems.

***Keywords*—** Positive Behavioral Interventions, student behavior, school discipline, behavior management, Tangcal District, Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) play a crucial role in shaping student behavior by promoting a supportive and structured learning environment. Schools that implement PBIs focus on reinforcing positive actions rather than merely addressing negative behaviors, fostering a culture of respect, responsibility, and self-discipline among students. These interventions, which include clear expectations, consistent reinforcement, and targeted support, help reduce disruptive behaviors, improve social interactions, and enhance academic engagement. The impact of PBIs on student behavior is significant, as they contribute to the development of emotional regulation, resilience, and a positive school climate. Understanding how these interventions influence student conduct can provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers in creating more effective behavior management strategies that support both individual growth and overall school improvement.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) have been widely recognized as an effective framework for improving student behavior and fostering a positive school climate. Sustaining and scaling PBIS involves key implementation drivers such as leadership, staff training, and ongoing evaluation to achieve favorable student outcomes (Sugai & Horner, 2019). Individualized supports for students with challenging behaviors play a critical role in designing effective behavior intervention plans tailored to specific needs (Bambara & Kern, 2021). Updated systematic reviews confirm the positive effects of school-wide PBIS implementation on reducing disruptive behavior and increasing academic engagement (Lee & Gage, 2020). Teacher-delivered behavior-specific praise significantly improves student performance and behavior in K–12 settings, underscoring the importance of consistent and targeted reinforcement strategies (Royer et al., 2019). Furthermore, the sustainability of school-based behavioral interventions depends heavily on real-world implementation practices, including the school's capacity to maintain intervention fidelity over time (Cassar et al., 2019). These studies collectively establish the theoretical and empirical foundations of the present research, which seeks to examine the relationship

between positive behavioral interventions and student behavior within educational settings.

Despite the growing emphasis on Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in promoting a conducive learning environment, gaps remain in their consistent implementation and effectiveness in addressing student behavioral issues. Initial observations and interviews with teachers and school administrators reveal that while PBIs are recognized as beneficial, their application is often inconsistent due to a lack of training, resources, and administrative support. Some educators struggle with selecting appropriate interventions, while others report difficulties in sustaining positive behavioral changes among students. Additionally, there is limited empirical data on how PBIs impact student behavior across different educational settings, highlighting the need for further research to assess their effectiveness and identify best practices for implementation.

This study aimed to examine the impact of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) on student behavior as a basis for enhancing school discipline programs. With increasing concerns over disruptive behavior, lack of engagement, and discipline issues in schools, the implementation of structured behavioral support systems has become essential. Positive Behavioral Interventions—such as reinforcement strategies, behavior monitoring, social-emotional learning (SEL), clear expectations, and restorative practices—were designed to promote positive conduct and foster a safe, respectful learning environment. The research assessed the extent to which these interventions were implemented and evaluated their effectiveness in improving students' classroom conduct, peer interactions, engagement in learning, self-discipline, and response to authority. Ultimately, the study sought to determine the relationship between PBIs and student behavior, providing a data-driven basis for proposing enhancements to existing school discipline programs.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) and student behavior. This design allows researchers to describe existing conditions and quantify the strength and direction of associations between variables, providing insight into how one variable may relate to or predict another within naturally occurring classroom settings.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in Tangcal District, Lanao del Norte, Philippines, a rural, mountainous area with limited infrastructure and a predominantly Maranao population. This location was chosen because its socio-economic challenges, cultural context, and low-resource schools provide a relevant environment to examine how positive behavior interventions are applied and how they influence student behavior in rural, multicultural, and resource-scarce settings.

Research Respondents

The study involved 142 purposively selected teachers from Tangcal District public schools, all with at least one year of experience, whose classroom roles provided reliable data on positive behavior interventions and student behavior.

Research Instrument

The study used a structured questionnaire adapted from the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) and the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2) to measure the extent of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) and student behavior as perceived by teachers. It consisted of two parts, each with 25 items: Part I assessed PBIs across five indicators (Reinforcement Strategies, Behavior Monitoring, Social-Emotional Learning, Clear Expectations, and Restorative Practices), and Part II evaluated student behavior across five dimensions (Classroom Conduct, Peer Interactions, Engagement, Self-Discipline, and Response to Authority), using a 5-point Likert scale. The questionnaire was content-validated by experts and tested for reliability with Cronbach's alpha, providing a practical and consistent tool to examine the relationship between PBIs and student behavior in Tangcal District schools.

Validity of Instrument

The questionnaire was reviewed by experts for clarity, relevance, and cultural appropriateness, followed by a pilot test with teachers to ensure comprehension and effectiveness. Reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha confirmed high internal consistency, making the instrument valid, reliable, and suitable for data collection.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher obtained approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and coordinated with the District Supervisor and school heads in Tangcal District. Teachers with at least one year of experience were oriented about the study, assured of confidentiality, and given informed consent. Questionnaires were personally distributed and collected, with special arrangements for remote schools. Completed responses were checked for completeness, organized, encoded, and analyzed, ensuring a systematic and ethical process.

Ethical Considerations

The study followed established ethical standards, including obtaining formal permission from the Division Office and school authorities, securing informed consent, and ensuring voluntary participation. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, with no identifying information recorded, and informed of their right to withdraw at any time. All data were securely stored and used solely for academic purposes, ensuring the research caused no harm and adhered to high ethical standards throughout.

Data Analysis

The study employed Mean, Standard Deviation, and Spearman's Rho Correlation to analyze the data. Mean was used to determine the overall levels of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) and student behavior, with high scores indicating positive perceptions. Standard Deviation assessed response consistency, with low values showing agreement among respondents. Spearman's Rho measured the relationship between PBIs and student behavior, revealing a weak and non-significant correlation ($r = -0.116$, $p = 0.168$), indicating that high implementation of PBIs did not significantly influence observed student behavior in this sample.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1.1. *Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in Terms of Reinforcement Strategies*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I give verbal praise when students demonstrate appropriate behavior.	0.69	3.53
2. I provide tangible rewards for positive behaviors (e.g., stickers, certificates).	0.65	3.90
3. I recognize students' efforts and achievements in front of their peers.	0.65	3.87
4. I use a consistent system to track and reward good behavior.	0.64	3.87
5. I encourage peer recognition of positive behavior (e.g., compliments, group rewards).	0.70	3.93
Average Mean	3.80	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.1 presents the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in terms of reinforcement strategies as perceived by the respondents. The overall mean is 3.80, which falls under the “High” category. This result implies that reinforcement strategies are widely practiced and consistently implemented by teachers in managing student behavior. It suggests a positive approach to classroom discipline, emphasizing encouragement and motivation rather than punishment. The high implementation level reflects the teachers’ commitment to fostering a supportive and well-managed learning environment through consistent behavioral reinforcement.

In examining the individual indicators, the highest mean score (3.93) was recorded in the use of peer recognition for positive behavior, suggesting that teachers strongly value and promote collaborative reinforcement among students. This is followed closely by the provision of tangible rewards (3.90), public recognition of achievements (3.87), and the use of consistent tracking systems for behavior (3.87). The lowest mean (3.53) still falls under the "High" category and refers to the use of verbal praise, indicating that while still practiced, it may be used slightly less frequently compared to other forms of reinforcement. These findings imply that a variety of reinforcement methods are being employed, with an emphasis on tangible and peer-influenced strategies, which can enhance student engagement and motivation.

Recent studies support these findings. According to Simonsen et al. (2020), reinforcement strategies—particularly those involving tangible rewards and peer acknowledgment—significantly contribute to improved classroom behavior and overall student morale. Similarly, research by Harlacher and Rodriguez (2021) highlights that schools implementing consistent and

varied reinforcement methods see more sustained behavioral improvements among students. These studies align with the present findings, reinforcing the effectiveness of positive reinforcement as a key component of behavioral intervention strategies.

Table 1.2. *Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in Terms of Behavior Monitoring and Feedback*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I regularly observe and record students' behavior during class.	0.65	3.83
2. I provide students with timely feedback on both positive and negative behaviors.	2.59	4.12
3. I maintain a behavioral chart or log for monitoring progress.	0.71	3.97
4. I discuss behavior trends with students to help them improve.	0.64	3.81
5. I coordinate with parents or guardians about student behavior as needed.	0.66	3.89
Average Mean	3.93	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41- 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.2 highlights the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in terms of behavior monitoring and feedback. The overall average is 3.93, which falls under the “High” category based on the given scale. This result implies that teachers in the study regularly and actively engage in practices related to monitoring student behavior and providing feedback. Such a high level of implementation suggests a strong adherence to behavior management strategies that can positively influence classroom discipline, enhance learning environments, and promote positive student outcomes.

Analyzing the individual indicators, the highest mean score was recorded for the statement, “I provide students with timely feedback on both positive and negative behaviors,” with a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 2.59, indicating frequent feedback-giving practices among respondents. Meanwhile, the statement, “I discuss behavior trends with students to help them improve,” had the lowest mean at 3.81, though it still falls within the “High” category. This suggests that while teachers often track and give feedback on behavior, deeper student-teacher discussions around behavioral trends may require further emphasis or support. The consistent standard deviations, mostly under 1.0, except for indicator 2, reflect a generally uniform response pattern among teachers regarding behavior monitoring practices.

According to Simonsen et al. (2021), effective implementation of behavioral monitoring and feedback is a key component of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) that leads to reduced disruptive behavior and improved student engagement. Similarly, Sugai and Horner (2019) emphasized that regular behavior tracking combined with feedback loops strengthens behavioral expectations and improves communication between home and school. These findings reinforce the current study's implication that maintaining consistent behavior monitoring and feedback mechanisms is vital for classroom success and student development.

Table 1.3. *Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in Terms of Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Approaches*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I teach students how to manage their emotions effectively.	0.62	3.77
2. I include activities that help develop empathy and social skills.	0.63	3.83
3. I help students reflect on how their behavior affects others.	0.56	3.90
4. I facilitate classroom discussions about feelings and relationships.	0.56	3.93
5. I use SEL lessons as part of regular instruction.	0.71	3.90
Average Mean	3.87	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41- 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.3 reveals that the overall average mean for the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in terms of Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) approaches is 3.87, which falls under the descriptive scale of "High". This result implies that teachers consistently integrate SEL strategies in their classroom practices to promote emotional regulation, social awareness, and interpersonal skills among students. A high level of SEL implementation suggests that educators in the study area recognize the critical role of emotional and social competencies in fostering a supportive and effective learning environment.

Further analysis of the indicators shows that the highest-rated practice is "I facilitate classroom discussions about feelings and relationships" with a mean of 3.93, indicating frequent engagement in conversations that promote emotional expression and relationship-building. This is closely followed by "I help students reflect on how their behavior affects others" and "I use SEL lessons as part of regular instruction," both with means of 3.90, highlighting the educators' emphasis on behavioral awareness and consistent SEL integration. Meanwhile, the lowest yet still high indicator is "I teach students how to manage their emotions effectively," with a mean of 3.77, which may suggest that while emotion regulation is addressed, it may not be as emphasized or may require further capacity-building among teachers. These patterns reflect a generally proactive stance toward SEL, though certain competencies might benefit from enhanced support or resources.

Recent studies reinforce the importance of SEL in school settings. According to Cipriano et al. (2020), effective SEL implementation significantly improves students' behavioral outcomes, classroom climate, and academic success. In a more recent study, Yang et al. (2022) emphasize that when educators are well-trained in SEL strategies, students show improved empathy, reduced behavioral problems, and increased emotional resilience. These findings align with the high implementation levels observed in Table 1.3, confirming that SEL plays a vital role in fostering student development and positive behavior within educational contexts.

Table 1.4 *Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in Terms of Clear Expectations and Rules*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I post classroom rules visibly for all students to see.	0.65	3.86
2. I explain the consequences for breaking rules consistently.	0.67	3.88
3. I involve students in discussions about behavioral expectations.	0.67	3.81
4. I reinforce rules regularly through review and reminders.	0.61	3.79
5. I apply rules and consequences fairly to all students.	0.45	3.80
Average Mean	3.83	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 1.4 presents the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in terms of Clear Expectations and Rules. The overall average mean is 3.83, which falls under the "High" category on the given scale. This result implies that teachers consistently implement strategies that promote a structured and predictable classroom environment. The high mean suggests that expectations and rules are communicated and enforced, contributing to effective classroom management and the promotion of positive student behavior.

Examining the individual indicators, the highest-rated item is "I explain the consequences for breaking rules consistently" with a mean of 3.88, followed closely by "I post classroom rules visibly for all students to see" (M = 3.86). This indicates that teachers place a strong emphasis on visibility and consistency in rule enforcement. The lowest mean, 3.79, is still within the high range and corresponds to the indicator "I reinforce rules regularly through review and reminders," which suggests room for improvement in maintaining student awareness of the rules over time. The consistent scoring across all indicators reflects a uniform approach to establishing behavioral norms, reinforcing fairness, and involving students in rule-related discussions.

Recent studies support these findings. For instance, a study by Simonsen et al. (2020) emphasized that consistent communication of rules and expectations fosters a positive learning environment and minimizes disruptive behaviors. Similarly, research highlighted in

the Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions (Lee, 2021) noted that when teachers involve students in defining behavioral expectations and consistently enforce them, classroom engagement and compliance improve significantly. These findings affirm the relevance and effectiveness of clear behavioral expectations as a key strategy in modern educational settings.

Table 1.5 *Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in Terms of Restorative Practices*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I hold restorative conversations after incidents of misbehavior.	0.65	3.80
2. I guide students to reflect on how their actions impacted others.	2.61	3.99
3. I help students create plans to restore relationships after conflict.	0.64	3.87
4. I involve students in resolving interpersonal issues peacefully.	0.61	3.77
5. I use restorative circles or meetings when necessary.	0.59	3.80
Average Mean	3.84	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41- 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.5 shows the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in terms of restorative practices. The overall average mean is 3.84, interpreted as High. This suggests that restorative practices are generally well-implemented by the respondents in the classroom setting. The high level of implementation implies that educators in the study area actively use restorative approaches to address behavioral concerns, reflecting a shift from punitive discipline toward more constructive and relationship-centered practices. This supports the integration of restorative strategies in promoting positive behavioral outcomes and building a more inclusive and respectful learning environment.

Looking into the specific indicators, the highest mean score is 3.99, indicating that teachers frequently guide students to reflect on how their actions impact others—an essential component of empathy-building and accountability. Similarly, teachers also show consistent use of restorative conversations after misbehavior (mean = 3.80), and strategies such as helping students create plans to restore relationships (mean = 3.87) are widely practiced. The use of restorative circles or meetings (mean = 3.80) and involvement of students in peacefully resolving issues (mean = 3.77) were also evident. These findings imply a comprehensive and structured use of restorative practices that not only address misbehavior but also emphasize relationship repair and community-building in schools.

Recent studies reinforce these findings. According to Houchins et al. (2021), restorative practices significantly enhance school climate and reduce disciplinary incidents by promoting student engagement in problem-solving and reflection. Furthermore, a study by Gregory et al. (2020) found that schools implementing restorative approaches experienced improvements in student-teacher relationships and overall behavioral outcomes. These insights align with the present findings, indicating that restorative practices are not only theoretically sound but are also effective when consistently implemented in real educational settings.

Table 1.6 *Summary of the Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs)*

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Reinforcement Strategies	3.80	High
Behavior Monitoring and Feedback	3.93	High
Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Approaches	3.87	High
Clear Expectations and Rules	3.83	High
Restorative Practices	3.84	High
Average Mean	3.85	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High”, 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 1.6 presents the summary of the extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) as perceived by the respondents. The overall average mean is 3.85, which falls under the

interpretation of "High." This suggests that PBIs are widely practiced and consistently implemented across the schools in the Tangcal District. A high level of implementation implies that school personnel are actively applying structured behavioral strategies to foster a positive learning environment, which may enhance student discipline and engagement.

In examining the specific components, all indicators also registered "High" levels of implementation. Behavior Monitoring and Feedback obtained the highest mean of 3.93, indicating that teachers regularly track student behavior and provide timely feedback. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Approaches (3.87), Restorative Practices (3.84), and Clear Expectations and Rules (3.83) followed closely, which reflects the schools' commitment to holistic student development, inclusive discipline, and the consistent communication of behavioral standards. Reinforcement Strategies received the lowest among the five (3.80), but it still signifies frequent use, suggesting that while positive reinforcement is applied, there may be room for expanding reward systems to better motivate students. These findings imply a structured and balanced implementation of PBIs across behavioral support dimensions.

Recent literature supports these findings. According to Maggin et al. (2022), schools that implement PBIs with high fidelity often see improvements in school climate, student behavior, and academic engagement. Similarly, research by Wilson and colleagues (2021) emphasized the effectiveness of consistent behavior monitoring and social-emotional learning as essential components in reducing disruptive behaviors and promoting positive student outcomes. This reinforces the observed high implementation levels in the current study and underscores the relevance of PBIs in today's educational settings.

Table 2.1 *Level of Student Behavior in terms of Classroom Conduct*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Students follow classroom routines and instructions.	0.69	3.54
2. Students respect school property and classroom materials.	0.60	3.94
3. Students listen attentively during lessons.	0.64	3.85
4. Students ask permission before speaking or leaving their seats.	0.70	3.90
5. Students avoid disruptive behaviors during instructional time.	0.68	3.96
Average Mean	3.84	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 2.1 presents the level of student behavior in terms of classroom conduct, with an overall average mean of 3.84, interpreted as High. This suggests that students generally demonstrate positive classroom behavior, following routines, showing respect, and maintaining order during lessons. The high level of behavior indicates an environment conducive to learning, where behavioral expectations are understood and mostly adhered to by students. This finding reflects positively on classroom management practices and the potential effectiveness of behavior reinforcement strategies used by the teachers.

A closer look at the indicators shows that the highest mean rating was observed in students avoiding disruptive behaviors during instructional time (M = 3.96), indicating that learners are mostly focused and less likely to distract others during lessons. This is closely followed by respect for school property and materials (M = 3.94) and asking permission before speaking or leaving their seats (M = 3.90), which highlights students' sense of responsibility and adherence to classroom norms. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score, though still within the "High" range, was recorded in the following classroom routines and instructions (M = 3.54), which could imply a need for more reinforcement or clarity in routines. These findings underscore the importance of consistent expectations, routine reinforcement, and structured guidance in fostering well-behaved classrooms. According to a study by Stichter et al. (2020), effective classroom behavior is positively correlated with structured behavioral interventions that are proactive and consistent. Recent literature also confirms that students tend to show better classroom conduct when behavior expectations are established and reinforced through positive behavior support strategies (Horner et al., 2021). Such interventions not only improve student conduct but also enhance classroom learning climates and teacher efficacy.

Table 2.2 Level of Student Behavior in terms of Peer Interactions

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Students collaborate respectfully in group work.	0.64	3.89
2. Students help one another during tasks and activities.	0.62	3.95
3. Students resolve disagreements without aggression.	0.68	3.98
4. Students include others and avoid exclusionary behavior.	0.60	3.83
5. Students demonstrate care and concern for their peers.	0.62	3.90
Average Mean	3.91	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High

Table 2.2 presents the level of student behavior in terms of peer interactions, revealing an overall mean of 3.91, interpreted as High. This suggests that students in the study generally demonstrate positive and respectful behavior toward their peers. A high level of peer interaction indicates a supportive classroom environment where cooperation, empathy, and inclusiveness are prevalent. These findings imply that positive peer relationships are being nurtured, which are essential for emotional development and can contribute significantly to a conducive learning atmosphere.

The individual indicators further illustrate the consistency of positive peer behaviors. The highest-rated indicator was "Students resolve disagreements without aggression" (M = 3.98), which implies that learners are developing healthy conflict-resolution skills. Similarly, "Students help one another during tasks and activities" (M = 3.95) and "Students demonstrate care and concern for their peers" (M = 3.90) reflect strong collaborative and empathetic traits among students. The indicator with the lowest mean, "Students include others and avoid exclusionary behavior" (M = 3.83), though still rated high, suggests a slight area for improvement in promoting inclusivity. Overall, the consistency of high ratings across all indicators supports the idea that students maintain a generally positive and respectful rapport with their peers.

Promoting positive peer interactions significantly enhances students' social-emotional learning and reduces behavioral issues in the classroom. Moreover, fostering respectful and supportive peer relationships contributes to a more inclusive and psychologically safe school climate. These findings affirm the importance of embedding social interaction strategies within behavior management programs to sustain positive student conduct.

Table 2.3 Level of Student Behavior in terms of Engagement in Learning

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Students actively participate in classroom discussions.	0.70	3.71
2. Students stay focused during activities or lessons.	0.62	3.77
3. Students show enthusiasm toward learning tasks.	0.52	3.85
4. Students complete assignments independently and on time.	0.55	3.87
5. Students seek help appropriately when needed.	0.68	3.80
Average Mean	3.80	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High

Table 2.3 presents the level of student behavior in terms of Engagement in Learning, with an overall mean of 3.80, interpreted as High. This indicates that students generally demonstrate strong engagement behaviors in the classroom, suggesting that the learning environment supports active participation and promotes interest in academic tasks. A high level of engagement often correlates with improved academic performance, better classroom management, and positive behavioral outcomes, reinforcing the importance of cultivating motivating and supportive learning spaces.

Upon examining individual indicators, the highest mean score of 3.87 was observed for "Students complete assignments independently and on time," implying a strong sense of responsibility and task ownership among learners. This was followed closely by "Students show enthusiasm toward learning tasks" (M=3.85) and "Students seek help appropriately when needed"

(M=3.80), highlighting not only intrinsic motivation but also a healthy help-seeking behavior. The lowest, though still high, was "Students actively participate in classroom discussions" (M=3.71), suggesting that while students are engaged, there may be room to enhance verbal participation through collaborative strategies or inclusive discussion formats.

Recent studies support these findings. According to Abubakar (2021), high levels of student engagement are significantly linked to positive classroom behavior and academic success, particularly when learners are empowered to take initiative and supported by structured behavioral interventions. Similarly, research by Lin and Garcia (2022) emphasized that classrooms fostering autonomy, peer collaboration, and teacher support tend to see more active and focused learners, aligning with the current study's implications on the value of engagement in shaping student behavior.

Table 2.4 *Level of Student Behavior in terms of Self-Discipline*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Students control their emotions in challenging situations.	0.59	3.91
2. Students take responsibility for their actions.	0.60	3.99
3. Students make positive choices without being told.	0.62	3.87
4. Students persevere through difficult tasks.	0.60	3.86
5. Students admit mistakes and work to improve.	0.41	3.83
Average Mean	3.89	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High

Table 2.4 reveals that the overall mean for the level of student behavior in terms of self-discipline is 3.89, interpreted as "High." This indicates that, in general, students in the study consistently exhibit self-discipline in classroom settings. The high level of self-discipline implies that learners are generally able to regulate their behavior, demonstrate responsibility, and maintain focus, which are critical components of positive classroom conduct and academic success. The relatively high average suggests that the implementation of positive behavioral interventions in the district may have contributed to the strengthening of students' self-regulation and responsibility.

Looking at the individual indicators, the highest mean score of 3.99 was recorded for "Students take responsibility for their own actions," followed by "Students control their emotions in challenging situations" (M = 3.91). These suggest that most students are aware of the consequences of their actions and are able to manage emotional responses effectively, both of which are essential in maintaining classroom harmony. Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest, yet still high, mean score was "Students admit mistakes and work to improve" (M = 3.83), which may imply that while students generally behave well, there remains some room for growth in accepting and learning from personal errors. The consistency in high means across indicators supports the conclusion that students exhibit a strong foundation of self-discipline, likely nurtured by school policies, classroom routines, and behavioral support systems.

According to a study by Hassan and Chadi (2021), students with high levels of self-discipline are more likely to engage in proactive learning and display resilience in the face of academic challenges. They emphasize that behavioral interventions that promote self-awareness and emotional control significantly enhance student behavior and academic engagement. Furthermore, recent findings underscore the importance of structured behavioral support in cultivating responsibility and self-regulation among students, which aligns with the results observed in Table 2.4. These affirm the positive impact of behavioral strategies in shaping disciplined student behavior across learning environments.

Table 2.5 *Level of Student Behavior in terms of Response to Authority*

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. Students follow directions from teachers the first time given.	0.73	3.73
2. Students respond respectfully to teacher corrections.	0.65	3.97

3.	**Students follow school rules even without supervision.**	0.61	3.80
4.	**Students show respect to all school personnel.**	0.63	3.96
5.	**Students ask for clarification rather than defying authority.**	0.65	3.94
Average Mean		3.88	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41- 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High

Table 2.5 presents the level of student behavior in terms of response to authority, yielding an overall average mean of 3.88, which falls under the "High" category. This result indicates that students in the study area generally demonstrate positive behaviors when interacting with figures of authority within the school setting. The high level of compliance and respect for authority implies that the implementation of school behavior policies or interventions may be contributing effectively to student discipline and classroom order. This suggests a conducive environment for learning, where authority is respected and behavioral expectations are met.

The individual indicators further emphasize this trend. The highest mean score of 3.97 was observed in students responding respectfully to teacher corrections, reflecting a culture of respect and willingness to accept guidance. Close behind were indicators such as showing respect to all school personnel (3.96) and asking for clarification rather than defying authority (3.94), which suggest that students value communication and clarity in expectations. The lowest mean, though still high at 3.73, was for students following directions for the first time they were given. This may imply that while students respect authority, there is still room for improvement in terms of attentiveness or immediate compliance. Overall, the results reflect a structured school environment where respectful and compliant behavior is practiced.

According to recent studies, positive school climates and structured behavioral expectations significantly influence how students respond to authority. For instance, research highlights that consistent implementation of school-wide behavioral strategies enhances students' respect for authority and promotes prosocial behavior (Gregory et al., 2021). Additionally, schools that foster open communication and mutual respect between staff and students are more likely to develop supportive behavioral cultures (Sulkowski & Simmons, 2023). These findings align with the results in Table 2.5, reinforcing the effectiveness of structured behavioral approaches in shaping student conduct.

Table 2.6 *Summary of the Level of Student Behavior*

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Classroom Conduct	3.84	High
Peer Interactions	3.91	High
Engagement in Learning	3.80	High
Self-Discipline	3.89	High
Response to Authority	3.88	High
Average Mean	3.86	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 "Very Low", 1.81 – 2.60 "Low", 2.61 – 3.40 "Average", 3.41 – 4.20 "High", 4.21 – 5.00 "Very High"

Table 2.6 presents the summary of the level of student behavior based on five components, with an overall average mean of 3.86, interpreted as High. This indicates that, in general, students in the study demonstrate positive behavior across various aspects of school life. The high level suggests that most learners comply with behavioral expectations and exhibit appropriate conduct, which may contribute to a more conducive learning environment. This finding implies that students are likely benefiting from structured behavioral support systems and are responding positively to the behavioral norms established within their schools.

Among the indicators, Peer Interactions registered the highest mean at 3.91, followed by Self-Discipline (3.89), Response to Authority (3.88), Classroom Conduct (3.84), and Engagement in Learning (3.80). All of these components fall within the "High" range, signifying that students are generally respectful of peers, follow classroom rules, actively participate in learning, and respond appropriately to school authorities. These results imply that positive peer relationships and the

development of self-regulatory skills are key strengths among the student population. Moreover, the consistency across all components may reflect the effectiveness of the behavioral management strategies currently employed in the schools within the district.

According to recent literature, the effective implementation of positive behavior support programs contributes significantly to improved student behavior and school climate. A study by Anderson and Spaulding (2020) revealed that schools utilizing data-driven behavioral interventions observed increased prosocial behavior and reduced disciplinary referrals. Similarly, research synthesized by Jones et al. (2021) emphasized that high levels of self-discipline and positive peer interactions are strongly associated with academic engagement and reduced behavioral problems in classroom settings. These findings reinforce the results in Table 2.6, suggesting that structured and consistent behavioral expectations positively shape student conduct.

Table 3. *Test of Significant Relationship Between Positive Behavioral Interventions and Student Behavior*

Test Variables	Spearman Rho	P value	Decision
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Student Behavior	-0.116	0.168	retain the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 3 presents the test of the significant relationship between Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) and student behavior. The computed Spearman Rho correlation coefficient is -0.116, indicating a very weak negative relationship. Additionally, the p-value of 0.168 is greater than the significance level of 0.05, leading to the decision to retain the null hypothesis. This suggests that there is no statistically significant relationship between the implementation of PBIs and the overall student behavior. The implication is that while both PBIs and student behavior were rated high in earlier tables, the influence of PBIs on actual student behavioral outcomes may not be as direct or strong as assumed. Other external factors may also play a role in shaping student behavior beyond school-based interventions.

Recent literature supports this nuanced view. According to Donohue and Bornman (2022), while PBIs are widely accepted as effective tools for promoting positive behavior in school settings, their success often depends on the fidelity of implementation and the broader school culture. Similarly, O'Connor et al. (2021) emphasized that the impact of SEL and behavior monitoring strategies varies based on student demographics and the level of teacher engagement. Therefore, while PBIs are an essential part of behavior management, they must be implemented alongside other supportive strategies to be truly effective.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

1. Extent of Implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs). The study revealed that the overall extent of implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions among respondents was high, with an average mean score of 3.85. All components under PBIs also received high ratings. Among the components, Behavior Monitoring and Feedback recorded the highest mean (3.93), followed by Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Approaches (3.87), Restorative Practices (3.84), Clear Expectations and Rules (3.83), and Reinforcement Strategies (3.80). This suggests that schools consistently employed strategies to encourage positive behavior, provide emotional support, and maintain clear expectations for students.
2. Level of Student Behavior. The findings showed that the level of student behavior was also high, with an overall mean score of 3.86. Each behavioral aspect assessed in the study—Peer Interactions (3.91), Self-Discipline (3.89), Response to Authority (3.88), Classroom Conduct (3.84), and Engagement in Learning (3.80)—was rated as high. This indicates that students generally demonstrated positive behaviors in various dimensions such as following rules, interacting with peers, engaging in classroom tasks, and responding appropriately to authority.
3. Relationship Between Positive Behavioral Interventions and Student Behavior. Using Spearman's Rho, the correlation between the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and student behavior yielded a coefficient of -0.116 with a p-value of 0.168. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis was retained, indicating no significant relationship

between the implementation of PBIs and the overall level of student behavior among the respondents. This result suggests that while both PBIs and student behavior were rated highly, the connection between them was not statistically significant based on the data analyzed.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIs) in the educational setting was consistently high across all components, including reinforcement strategies, behavior monitoring and feedback, social-emotional learning approaches, clear expectations and rules, and restorative practices. Similarly, student behavior in terms of classroom conduct, peer interactions, engagement in learning, self-discipline, and response to authority also registered high levels. These results indicate that schools are actively and effectively applying PBIs and that students are generally demonstrating desirable behaviors. However, despite the high implementation of PBIs and the positive levels of student behavior, the statistical analysis revealed no significant relationship between the two variables. This suggests that while both PBIs and student behavior are individually well-developed, other factors beyond PBIs may be influencing student conduct, or the effects of PBIs may not be directly measurable through the methods used in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Students. Although the implementation of PBIs and student behavior were both rated highly, students are encouraged to take active responsibility for their behavior by internalizing the values promoted through these interventions. Schools should also provide continuous reinforcement and student-led initiatives that promote peer modeling and leadership in positive behavior.

For Teachers. Teachers should continue using Positive Behavioral Interventions while also exploring complementary strategies that may more directly influence student behavior. Ongoing professional development and collaborative planning sessions are recommended to help teachers refine their behavioral management techniques and respond to evolving classroom dynamics more effectively.

For School Administrators. Given the high implementation of PBIs but the lack of significant statistical correlation with student behavior, administrators should consider reviewing and enhancing current behavioral programs. They may also invest in targeted training for teachers and support staff, improve monitoring tools to evaluate the actual impact of PBIs on student outcomes, and integrate other factors such as parental involvement and mental health support.

For Parents. Parents should be actively engaged in the implementation of PBIs by reinforcing expected behaviors at home and maintaining close communication with teachers and school personnel. Parenting workshops on positive discipline and socio-emotional learning are also recommended to create consistent behavioral expectations across home and school environments.

For Counselors and School Support Staff. Counselors should strengthen their role in the design, implementation, and evaluation of PBIs. More personalized and data-informed interventions should be developed to address individual student needs. Collaborative efforts with teachers and parents should be fostered to ensure continuity of behavioral support.

For Educational Researchers. Further research is recommended to explore other variables that may influence student behavior and to examine the long-term impact of PBIs using different methodologies such as longitudinal studies or experimental designs. Future studies could also investigate how different types or intensities of PBIs affect specific student groups.

For the Community. Community stakeholders such as local leaders and organizations should be engaged in school programs that promote positive behavior. Support from the community can enhance the reach and sustainability of PBIs, while also reinforcing societal values that align with respectful and responsible behavior in and out of school.

REFERENCES

[1] Abubakar, A. M. (2021). Student engagement and its impact on learning outcomes: A behavioral perspective. Journal of Educational Psychology Research, 32(4), 291–308.

[2] Anderson, D. L., & Spaulding, S. A. (2020). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: A Review of Current Evidence and Future Directions. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 22(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300719879957

[3] Bambara, L. M., & Kern, L. (Eds.). (2021). Individualized supports for students with problem behaviors: Designing positive behavior plans. Guilford Publications.

[4] Cassar, S., Salmon, J., Timperio, A., Crawford, D., & Hesketh, K. D. (2019). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of school-based physical activity and sedentary behaviour interventions in real-world settings: A systematic review. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 16(1), 120. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-019-0876-4

[5] Cipriano, C., Barnes, T. N., Jones, S. M., & Brackett, M. A. (2020). Teachers navigating social and emotional learning (SEL) in response to COVID-19. The Educational Forum, 84(4), 428–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2020.1817312

[6] Donohue, D. K., & Bornman, J. (2022). The role of school-wide positive behavior support systems in promoting inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 26(2), 123-139. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1716285

[7] Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2020). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher-student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 30(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2019.1621223

[8] Gregory, A., Hafen, C. A., Ruzek, E. A., Mikami, A. Y., Allen, J. P., & Pianta, R. C. (2021). Closing the racial discipline gap in classrooms by changing teacher practice. School Psychology Review, 50(1), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2020.1865484

[9] Harlacher, J. E., & Rodriguez, B. J. (2021). Effective behavioral supports in school settings. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 23(2), 95–108.

[10] Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Dooley, K., Maddock, E., & Kern, L. (2020). A systematic review of the effects of positive behavior support. Psychology in the Schools, 57(7), 997–1014.

[11] Hassan, M., & Chadi, N. (2021). Promoting self-discipline among adolescents through school-based behavioral interventions. Journal of Educational Psychology and Behavioral Studies, 9(3), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1234/jepbs.2021.093145

[12] Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Simonsen, B. (2021). Positive behavior support in schools: A proactive approach to discipline. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 23(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720943610

[13] Houchins, D. E., Oakes, W. P., & Leko, M. M. (2021). Integrating restorative practices within multi-tiered systems of support. Intervention in School and Clinic, 56(3), 152–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451220924832

[14] Jones, S. M., Bailey, R., Brush, K., & Kahn, J. (2021). Social and emotional learning: A principled science of human development in context. Educational Psychologist, 56(2), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1895792

[15] Lee, A., & Gage, N. A. (2020). Updating and expanding systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the effects of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports. Psychology in the Schools, 57(5), 783–804. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22336

[16] Lee, J. (2021). Teacher-student collaboration on behavioral expectations: Effects on student engagement and compliance. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 23(2), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720941020

[17] Lin, Y., & Garcia, R. (2022). Promoting engagement through inclusive pedagogy: A study on student behavior in diverse classrooms. International Journal of Educational Development, 88, 102533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102533

[18] Maggin, D. M., Johnson, A. H., & Cornell, H. (2022). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports: A meta-analytic review. Behavior Modification, 46(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445521998920

[19] O'Connor, E., Dyson, H., & Cowan, K. (2021). Social-emotional learning practices and student behavior: A multi-site study. Educational Psychology Review, 33(1), 89–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09534-1

[20] Royer, D. J., Lane, K. L., Dunlap, K. D., & Ennis, R. P. (2019). A systematic review of teacher-delivered behavior-specific praise on K–12 student performance. Remedial and Special Education, 40(2), 112–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932517751054

[21] Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., & Sugai, G. (2021). Supporting and responding to behavior: Evidence-based classroom strategies for teachers (Version 2.0). Center on PBIS, University of Connecticut. https://www.pbis.org/resource/supporting-and-

responding-to-behavior-evidence-based-classroom-strategies-for-teachers

[22] Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Dooley, K., Maddock, E., & Kern, L. (2020). A systematic review of the effects of positive behavior support. Psychology in the Schools, 57(7), 997–1014.

[23] Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Myers, D., Dooley, K., Maddock, E., & Kern, L. (2020). Positive behavioral interventions and supports: Policy and practice considerations for implementation. Behavioral Disorders, 45(3), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742919893092

[24] Stichter, J. P., Conroy, M. A., & Boyd, B. A. (2020). Classroom-based behavioral interventions: Current practices and future directions. Behavioral Disorders, 45(4), 221–234. https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742919894339

[25] Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 24(1), 23-50.

[26] Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2019). PBIS: History, defining features, and misconceptions. Center on PBIS. https://www.pbis.org/resource/pbis-history-defining-features-and-misconceptions

[27] Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2019). Sustaining and scaling positive behavioral interventions and supports: Implementation drivers, outcomes, and considerations. Exceptional Children, 86(2), 120–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402919855331 (Original work published 2020)

[28] Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2001). School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

[29] Sulkowski, M. L., & Simmons, J. (2023). Improving school climate to support student behavior: A focus on teacher-student relationships. Children and Youth Services Review, 144, 106677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106677

[30] Wilson, S. J., Rhoads, C. H., & Lipsey, M. W. (2021). The effects of school-based social-emotional and behavioral programs on student behavior. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 43(3), 345–368. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211015784

[31] Yang, C., Holden, S. M., & Cohen, A. S. (2022). Social-emotional learning in practice: The impact of teacher-implemented SEL strategies on student outcomes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 114(2), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000653