INTEGRATED INTERVENTION PROGRAM FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS: A COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION APPLICATION

Dr.MA. Gemma P. Rasco[1]

[1]Faculty of Aklan State University
Banga, Aklan, 5601Philippines.

ABSTRACT

This study is an application of a Cognitive Behavior Modification (CBM) as an intervention that shaped the activities and strategies of an Integrated Intervention Program(IIP) which was designed, implemented and evaluated based on the results of its implementation for high school students with behavioral problems. The participants in this study were 10 high school students with identified behavioral problems in two high schools in the province of dementia, Philippines. The case study method was used to come up with an individualized and integrative findings of the study. The IIP was implemented through sessions where each participant attended 8 sessions with the researcher. An individual rubric observation checklist with scale was utilized to determine the changes in the target behaviors of the participants. The data were analyzed using frequency count, mean, mean average and t-test for paired or correlated samples. Descriptive equivalent of behavior changes based on mean average was employed. Results showed that the IIP using the CBM was effective in bringing changes to all the target behaviors.

KEYWORDS: Behavioral problems, Cognitive Behavior Modification (CBM), Integrated Intervention Program (IIP)

INTRODUCTION
Background of the Study:-

Educating the youth is a collaborative endeavor of family, school and community. However, schools as educational institutions are expected to develop the mental capabilities of the students as well as to enhance their other abilities in order to bring to full development their individual personality. It has also been observed that behavioral problems of students are oftentimes left to classroom teachers to deal with, disrupting the educational process and distracting the teachers' focus. Furthermore, classroom teachers find that students of today are very much different from students two decades ago in terms of discipline and academic performance. Teachers often complain that they have spend too much time on students behavior problems, not enough time on instruction and, social skills are not typically taught in schools as many schools have limited or no mental health services for students ("Emotional and Behavior Disorders," 2007). Philippine schools especially in the province of

Aklan are not free from behavioral problems occurring among high school students. From an established serious to a very serious off-task, attention-seeking and out-of-seat behaviors among others that affect classroom learning situation in these schools, behavioral problems added stress and strains to the classroom teachers' day-to-day role and disrupt their day-to-day plans as well as jeopardize other students' psychological well-being. Even just one student to stand out in the classroom because of his/her disruptive behavior, the flow of the teaching-learning process of the entire class will be affected, especially if the disruption happens in most of the time the student with such behavior is in school. The success of the teaching – learning process depends on how the students behave or react to any learning activities, how the teachers impart information or facilitate learning, what kind of outcome the educational system desires to accomplish or achieve, among others. But because of the interference of behavioral problems of some students, many class hours and desired outputs are hampered. Hence, there is a need for an integrated intervention programs for students with behavioral problems so as to help them eliminate or prevent their destructive behavior in school thus, making the latter a conducive and a meaningful place for learning for them as well as for others. Hence, this study aimed to design, implement and evaluate the results of an integrated intervention programs with the application of a cognitive behavior modification for high school students with behavioral problems. Specifically, it intended to:

1. Identify the behavioral problems of high school students

2. Design an integrated intervention program with the application of cognitive behavior modification in addressing the target behavioral problems

3. Implement the designed integrated intervention program

4. Evaluate the effect of the integrated intervention program

RELATED LITERATURE
Behavioral Problems in the Classroom Among the High School Students:-

Behavioral problems in schools are believed to interrupt the educative process. The flow of the teaching-learning situation with the purpose of attaining the fundamental educational goals may not be as smooth as what the classroom teacher earlier had in mind. Successful classroom management gave much challenge to the teacher with many students showing behavioral problems. "These behavioral problems are generally external symptoms of a child's internal struggles" ("Behavioral Problems," 2007).

Achenbach and Edelbrock (1979, cited by Hunt & Marshall, 1999), classified behavior as either externalizing and internalizing. Externalizing behaviors are those that are expressed overtly and are directed towards others or the environment. These include conduct disorder, socialized aggression, motor excess, aggressive behaviors and disruptive behaviors. Internalizing behaviors on the other hand are self-directed behaviors, such as withdrawal, avoidance or compulsiveness. Internalizing behavior may be a prelude to an externalizing behavior. This study will focused on the externalizing behaviors which can be easily recognized by the teachers and students because students with this kind of behavior typically stand out in a classroom for the impact of their negative behavior has on others. The specific causes of behavioral problems are not yet fully known, however, certain environmental and physiological factors seem to relate to behavior differences of students in school. In a research conducted by Ibe (2001), 18 externalizing behaviors or behavior problems in the Philippine schools are listed and the school principals judged the presence of each in their schools. These behavioral problems are: arriving late at school; absenteeism(unjustified); skipping class periods; violating dress code; classroom disturbance; vandalism; cheating; profanity; intimidation or verbal abuse of other students; theft; physical injury to other students; cigarette use/possession/ illegal drug use/possession; intimidation or verbal abuse of teachers or staff; inappropriate sexual behavior; weapon use/possession; alcohol use/possession and; physical injury to teachers et al. The highest ranking behavioral problems rated serious are: absenteeism; vandalism; arriving late at school; skipping class periods and; classroom disturbance. Absenteeism, tardiness and skipping classes are the predominant behavior problems in school as perceived by the school principals. These according to Ibe was because eighty percent of the 150 schools in the sample are rural schools located in the communities where transport facilities are wanting. Most of the students go to school by walking, even when they live several kilometers from the school and even if they want to ride, transport facilities do not start service early so students reach the school late.

On the other hand, a large scale survey reported that 81 percent of teachers believe that parents and society are largely responsible for students' behavioral problems in the classroom and 64 percent believe that schools can do little to improve student behavior (Jones & Jones, 1990, cited by Crowl, Kaminsky & Podell, 1997). Some educators however believe that schools themselves contribute to students' disruptive behavior. Teachers expect students to behave in certain ways in the

classroom such as to stay seated for hours at a time, to speak only when called on, to conform academically to the norms of their grade and to find the topics of instruction interesting. If a student fails to meet the teacher's expectation, the student is being blamed (Crowl et al., 1997).

Moreover, Kurt Lewin's Field Theory define a person's life space as the totality of facts that determine the behavior(B) of an individual at a certain moment which includes the person(P) and the psychological environment [(E): B = f(P,E)] (Mischel, Shoda & Smith, 2004). Lewin gave emphasis on the overlapping function of personal attributes of a person and the influence of his environment to form/shape his behavior. Ornstein and Levine (1984) find family as the first medium for transmitting culture to the child. To them, the family is the whole world to the very young child where its members teach children what matters in life, often without realizing the impact they are having. Because of the family influence, whatever changes or kind of family environment the child has specifically the family structure, would give great implication and impact to the child's intellectual functioning and social behavior.

The National Association of School Psychologists (2007) used the terms emotional and behavioral disorders to a condition in which behavioral or emotional responses of an individual in school are so different from his/her generally accepted, age- appropriate, ethnic or cultural norms that they adversely affect performance in such areas as self-care, social relationships, personal adjustment, academic progress, classroom behavior, or work adjustment. Students exhibiting the symptoms of having the disorders as observed in schools are called students with behavioral problems because of their effects to other people and to their environment as a whole. Students with behavioral problems specifically those exhibiting external behaviors can be labeled in an educational system as a discipline or management problem and emotionally handicapped youth or behavior disordered students and "antisocial" (Horne & Sayger, 1990).

Rogers (2002) cited the many aspects of a child's life, temperament, home and background circumstances and environment that adults have little or no control over and that contribute to and affect behavior in a school context. The way some children are treated at home – dysfunctionality in the home environment, structural poverty and parental long-term unemployment, lack of positive guidance, discipline, values and role models, the amount and kind of television that even young children watch, poor nutrition – are all aspects of a child's life that influence the child's behavior at school. Ehrle and Moore (2007) stressed that based on research, several

family and neighborhood characteristics are associated with the development of behavioral and emotional problems in children. Studies showed that greater parental depression and stress as well as living in a neighborhood with more low-income residents is associated with a higher incidence of behavioral problems such as destroying property or feeling worthless.

Several studies have reported the association of corporal punishment with elevated levels of externalizing behavior problems. To find out whether this association is true for culture with different norms for such punishment, an international team of researchers investigated physical discipline and children's problems reported by 336 mother-child dyad in China, India, Italy, Kenya, the Philippines and Thailand. Mothers in Thailand reported to use mostly physical discipline rated their children highest on the test for Aggressive behavior and Anxious/Depressed Syndromes, and equally important, children who reported the highest levels of physical discipline by parents in their culture rated themselves as highest on the test for Aggressive Behavior Syndrome (Landsford et al., 2005). It just simply shows that child-rearing affects children's behavior.

Walker, Ramsy and Gresham (2007) stated that children from troubled, chaotic homes are bringing well-developed patterns of antisocial behavior to school. especially when they get older, they wreak havoc on school, their disruptive and defiant behavior wastes teaching time, disrupts the learning of all students, threatens safety, overwhelms teachers and ruins their own chances for successful schooling and a successful life. Turnbaugh (1986 cited by Crowl et al., 1997) on the other hand, stated that the problems those kids bring to school are exacerbated by the discipline system in the school and the ways their teachers interact with them, as well as the insufficient interesting and engaging experiences in which they will be able to respond.

Dodge (1993) added that there were three primary causal factors that contribute to the development of conduct disorder and antisocial behaviors which are considered the major culprits for the existence of behavioral problems in schools: (a) an adverse early rearing environment, (b) an aggressive pattern of behavior displayed on entering school, and (c) social rejection by peers.

Many psychologists however believe that the failure of schools to meet students' basic needs results in much behavioral problems in the classroom. Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Papper (1982, cited by Crowl et al., 1997) contend that students misbehave to get attention, power, and revenge, and to cover up their sense of inadequacy. Students who fail to get the teachers' attention engage in disruptive

behavior to validate their social status. If teachers fail to respond effectively to such attention-getting behaviors, students seek power. If the teacher frustrates their efforts to obtain power, students become discouraged and seek revenge. They called it as goal theory. Maslow (1968, cited by Crowl et al., 1997) added that human beings have five basic needs that are arranged in hierarchical order. Needs at the lower end of the hierarchy must be met before higher-level needs can be satisfied. The implication of Maslow's theory is that students will learn if their basic needs are met, otherwise, they are likely to behave in maladaptive ways such as being disruptive in the classroom.

Intervention Program for Behavioral Problems in Schools:-

In the Philippines, the intervention program for high school students with behavioral problems is under the guidance and counseling service. According to Salazar-Clemena (1993), the guidance and counseling in the Philippine schools bears heavy traces of the U.S. influence wherein it is interwoven with the growth of psychology and the guidance movement in the schools. Although it started in 1945, its focus was more on vocational choices for students for the purpose of helping uplift the Philippine economy. It was in the late 60's when emotional problems of high school students were included as part of the guidance and counseling service or even in the curriculum as guidance and counseling became a course but nothing was mentioned about behavioral problems in particular. The choice of including behavioral problems in guidance and counseling was then left to the schools to decide. At present, Guidance and Counseling is already one of the courses in tertiary level and included in the secondary schools' services for the students. According to Hibler (2004), school-based interventions not only refer to the act that comes between but hopes to change the behavior that required an intervention. It also deals with formalized practices put into place to encourage some behaviors and discourage others.

Several guidance and counseling programs from different sources furnished varied scheme in their implementation of intervention for students with behavioral problems. Catalano, Loeber & McKenny (1999) listed the components of an intervention program or plan. According to them, a behavioral intervention program or plan will include, when appropriate: (1) strategies, including positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports; (2) programs or curricular modifications; and (3) supplementary aids and services that may be required to address the problem behavior. An example of an intervention plan for a student with behavioral problems after a case study was analyzed was

developed by Ellsworth (2001) for Northern Arizona University. The intervention plan includes both the teacher and the student's function in achieving certain goal that can help the latter change his target behaviors. It follows certain intervention techniques and possible reinforcements when a positive behavior is shown by the student. A school intervention program in Baltimore, MD, known as project CARE, uses classroom management techniques and cooperative learning to decrease delinquent behavior among junior high school students (Gottfredson, 1987 as cited by Catalano, Loeber and McKinney, 1999). The intervention program, planned and implemented by a team of teachers, administrators and other school staff, also included a parent volunteer component and a community support and advocacy program. Over the course of the 2-year program, students' self-reports of delinquency decreased significantly. There were also significant improvement in classroom orderliness..

In Charleston County , SC, a middle school intervention, the Multimodal School-Based Prevention Demonstration program was designed to reduce problem behaviors by improving academic achievement, social competency, and social bonding (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, and Skroban, 1996 as cited by Catalano, Loeber and McKinney, 1999). Academic interventions included cooperative learning techniques, a career and educational decision skills program, and one-on-one tutoring. The program addressed social competency with a life skills training course for sixth graders, a cognitive self-management course for seventh graders, and a cognitive self-instruction course and a violence prevention curriculum for all students. The program tried to increase social bonding through a mentoring program and through adult models who taught appropriate skills and behaviors. It also included organizational development strategies designed to strengthen the quality of program implementation. Evaluation results indicate that the program improved students' grade point averages and decreased their susceptibility to peer pressure to use drugs (Catalano, Loeber and McKinney, 1999).

Researchers at the University of Florida studied the effects of Cognitive Behavioral Intervention on 4th and 5th grade students who exhibit behavioral problems. It has been found that the curriculum helped students reduced their aggression and classroom disruption and the effects were maintained. The curriculum was designed to help students learn to find positive solutions to social problems. The curriculum was designed using a problem-solving framework focused on understanding and dealing with frustration and anger, The lessons included anger management and problem-solving concepts which students used a

sequential strategy when approaching a problem situation. Also included were direct instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice for skill development, along with opportunities for skill generalization (Smith, 2007).

Here In the Philippines, several educational institutions and centers offer intervention program for students with special needs including those with emotional and behavioral problems. The Little Campus North Bend School (2011) in Greenhills have special educational therapists, clinical and educational psychologists who work with children in preschool and teens in high school requiring sessions. The techniques they used are play therapy, behavioral treatments, short term psychotherapy, cognitive behavioral therapy and counseling.The Shine Special Education Center Inc. (2011) in Pasig used learning approach in intervention program to prevent behavioral issues or problems of students. Their curriculum is developmentally sequenced and targets objectives that are selected to suit each of the student's individual needs and unique developmental and learning patterns. Their individualized intervention program are found to have remarkable progress in their students' behavior. The techniques they used are reinforcement, stimulus generalization, extinction, redirection, response cost and, time-out in varying degrees.

In the Division of Aklan, no structured guidance and counseling program is followed by both private and public high schools as most of the guidance counselors are only designated. They were only given orientation and short guides on their responsibilities. So in case that there were complaints regarding behavioral problems, the common interventions are to talk with the concerned students and remind them of the school rules, reprimand the concerned students or to talk with the parents for them to take part in reminding their children about appropriate behavior in school. The designated counselors have difficulty in balancing classroom works and in dealing with students with behavioral problems.

In this study, the researcher utilized the cognitive behavior modification as intervention in bringing out the change in the behavior of the participants. Cognitive behavior modification (CBM) is an intervention that combines cognitive and behavioral learning principles to shape and encourage desired behaviors. It refers to theoretical and applied orientations that share three underlying assumptions: (a) an individual's behavior is mediated by cognitive events; (b) a change in mediating events results in a change in behavior; and (c) an individual is an active participant in his learning (Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism – March 2009). According to Heflin and Simpson (1998), the cognitive behavioral

approach assumes that individuals have both the capacity and preference for monitoring and managing their own behavior. Meichenbaum (1980), stressed that the premise of CBM is that individuals must develop the ability to notice (a) how they feel, think, and behave and (b) the impact their behavior has on others as a prerequisite to behavior change. Kendall (1993, cited by Smith, 2002) noted that cognitive-behavioral techniques for the remediation of social deficits can incorporate cognitive, behavioral, emotive, and developmental strategies, using rewards, modeling, role-plays, and self-evaluation. Furthermore, a student's cognition about social situations encountered throughout the school day can be examined and modified through verbal self-regulation (i.e., using self-talk to guide problem solving or some other behavior). Smith (2002) added that cognitive behavioral intervention incorporates behavior therapy (e.g., modeling, feedback, reinforcement) and cognitive mediation (e.g., think-aloud) to build what can be called a new "coping template."

MATERIALS AND METHODS/METHODOLOGY
Research Design:-
Considering the objective of the study, the descriptive type of research employing a case study method was used. Case study refers to the collection and presentation of detailed information about a particular participant or small group, frequently including the accounts of subjects themselves. The case study as a form of qualitative descriptive research, looks intensely at an individual or small participant pool, drawing conclusions only about that participant or group and only in that specific context. Researchers do not focus on the discovery of a universal, generalizable truth, nor do they typically look for cause-effect relationships; instead, emphasis is placed on exploration and description (Becker, et al, 2005). In this study, the information of the participants were taken from their teachers, guidance counselors, parents, classmates, anecdotal records and from the participants themselves. The participants attended sessions under the researcher's integrated intervention program. Individualized and sometimes grouped sessions were employed. The cognitive behavioral modification was the intervention applied in the intervention program in bringing out the behavioral change among the participants.

Participants:-
Purposive sampling was utilized in identifying the participants in the study. In purposive sampling, a personal judgment is used on selecting samples which is believed based on prior information could provide the data needed (Fraenkel and Wallen,

1994). Due to the difficulty in looking for students with behavioral problems where the guidance counselors, teachers and parents are willing to be involved, the researcher came out with only 10 participants from two high schools in Aklan: four students from a private school and six from a public school. The participants were identified through the nominations of guidance counselors, prefect of discipline and teachers based on their anecdotal records and previous observations in school, the parents' cooperation and the participants' willingness to participate in the study.

Data Gathering Techniques:-

The indigenous technique (Margallo, 1981)such as *pagtatanung-tanong* (asking spontaneous questions through informal interview)*, pagmamasid* (making realistic observations), and *pakikipag-usap* (engaged in formal conversations) was utilized in gathering needed and substantive information about the participants such as a brief background of their families, their behaviors in school, how they view themselves before and after the program and others. A rubric observation checklist with scale was used to establish a baseline data on the level of seriousness of the behavioral problems of the participants, and used again after the implementation of an integrated intervention program to find out the change in their behavior. Prior to the rubric observation checklist, an individual observation checklist was used to determine the frequency of behavior so as to confirm previous observation of the occurrence of behavioral problems as well as to eliminate bias in answering the rubric observation checklist. The rubric observation checklist with scale was constructed by the researcher and validated by a 5-member jury composed of a school head, prefect of discipline, guidance counselor, Values Education teacher and an English teacher.

Procedure:-

Taking into consideration the nature of this research, the researcher first used indigenous techniques such as *pagtatanung-tanong* (asking spontaneous questions through informal interview) and *pakikipag-usap* (engaged in formal conversations) to teachers, prefect of discipline and guidance counselors of the two high schools to help in identifying students with behavioral problems. These students constituted the pool from which the would-be participants in the study were chosen. Teachers' observations and anecdotal records from the guidance counselors were the bases in identifying the students. When possible participants were identified, the researcher sought the permission from the principal of the two schools. . The researcher then talked with the chosen students about the study and upon their approval to participate, their parents' consent was also sought through the informed consent form. An orientation with the teachers about the proposed study and the conference with the students' parents followed. After identifying the 10 participants the researcher followed specific steps in developing, implementing and evaluating the integrated intervention plan for high school students with behavioral problems:

1. Identify the target behaviors;

2. Design an integrated intervention plan or program;

3. Implement the intervention program; and

4. Evaluate the result of an integrated intervention program.

Data Analysis Treatment:-

Since a case study method was utilized, the data collected was individualized and kept in separate portfolios. A portfolio is a selection of artifacts and other evidences with reflective entries representing experiences, competencies, and growth over a period of time (Almeda et al, 2002). In this study, the individual portfolio contained the participant's testimonies, drawings, reflective feedback before and after the session, researcher's personal notes and accounts with the participant, individual observation checklists of the frequency of the behavioral problems and rubric observation checklists with scale.

Individual analysis of data was first done, then, analysis of the changes in the behavioral problems of selected cases was made. In the descriptive analysis, frequency count, was used to determine the target behavioral problems of high school students addressed by the integrated intervention program; mean, and mean average were utilized to find out the changes on each and overall target behaviors of every student after the implementation of the integrated intervention program. Descriptive equivalent/interpretation based on the mean average was provided.

Scale for Interpreting Mean Ratings Before the Integrated Intervention Program

Scale Descriptive Interpretation
1.0 - 1.7 Not a Problem
1.8 - 2.5 A Slight Problem
2.6 - 3.3 A Serious Problem
3.4 – 4.0 A Very Serious Problem

The scale above shows how to make a descriptive interpretation of the level/degree of the manifestations of behavioral problems before the implementation of an integrated intervention program. Based on the scores given by the four observers (teacher, guidance counselor, student and researcher) in the rubric observation checklist with scale, the mean of the scores was obtained. If the mean is between 1.0 to 1.7, the descriptive equivalent/interpretation is that the behavior manifested is not a problem in the classroom, but if the mean obtained is between 1.8 to 2.5, then the behavior causes a slight problem. If the mean is between 2.6 to 3.3, it means that the behavior is a serious problem in the classroom and, if the mean rating is between 3.4 to 4.0, the behavior is a very serious problem.

Scale for Interpreting Mean Ratings After the Integrated Intervention Program

Scale Descriptive Interpretation
1.0 - 1.7 Not a Problem/Big Change in Behavior
1.8 - 2.5 A Slight Problem/Moderate Change in Behavior
2.6 - 3.3 A Serious Problem/Slight Change in Behavior
3.4 – 4.0 A Very Serious Problem/No Change in Behavior

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program, a rubric observation checklist with scale was again used by the four observers. When the mean obtained from the four scores is between 1.0 to 1.7, the behavior is no longer a problem, thus, there is a big change in the behavior after the integrated intervention program. If the mean is between 1.8 to 2.5, the behavior causes a slight problem in the classroom so, there is a moderate change in the behavior. When the mean obtained is between 2.6 to 3.3, the behavior is a serious problem in the classroom, which means there is only a slight change in the behavior. But if the mean is between 3.4 to 4.0, the behavior is still a very serious problem, meaning, there is no change in the behavior after the integrated intervention program.

A t-test result for the changes in the behavioral problems of the 10 participants was also obtained to determine the over all effectiveness of the program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Cases of High School Students with Behavioral Problems in School:-

There were 10 cases of high school students with behavioral problems in school. Significant events/situations observed for each case were presented in order to have a clearer view on how behavioral problems were identified.

Lot. Lot is a 14 year old girl, in the second year class. She lives with her paternal grandmother, father, and 3 other siblings. Her mother works in Manila. Lot is not close to her father because when she was in elementary, she lived with her grandmother only. It was only last year when her father came home. During an interview with her or *pakikipag-usap,* Lot claimed that she seldom talked to her father because she was hurt when she heard her father saying that she was not his daughter. The behavioral problems identified to be manifested by Lot were **attention-seeking** and **out-of-seat behaviors**. These problems were observed in the classroom. Lot seeks attention to herself when she always makes loud noises or laughs out loud and frequently calls out to recite that disturb the rest of the class. When the teacher reprimands her of her disruptive behavior, she then goes from one seat to another (out-of-seat), disturbing her seatmates by either touching their works, books and other personal things.

Paulo. Paulo, a second year student is a working student (errand boy) in their family's distant relative. In an informal conversation between Paulo's relative and one of his teachers, who then related the conversation to the researcher, Paulo was described a "silent type" who seldom talks to them when at home, and when confronted with something, he just keeps his silence and looks blankly at the person talking to him. This behavior was also observed by the researcher during *pakikipag-usap* with him. Before he answered questions, he seemed to think for few seconds. When asked about this, he told the researcher that he just wanted to be sure of his answer for he might not give the correct answer and be reprimanded. Paulo further told the researcher that he was slapped by his father because he answered him in an incorrect way, an experience that he could not forget although it happened two years ago. During the first session he said he was angry because most of his classmates teased him and nobody could accept him for what he is. He said he's gay sometimes, not intelligent, and a bad person, so he would rather be alone. The problems identified to be manifested by Paulo were **off-task and out-of-seat behaviors**. In school, he was observed to exhibit an off-task behavior by not focusing his attention to the teacher for he was busy doing other things such as

drawing or reading other notes. When the teacher noticed this and called his attention, he stopped doing those things but after few minutes, went back to what he was doing earlier. Everytime he doesn't 't like his seatmates, he always goes from one seat to another (out-of-seat behavior) thus, disturbing the entire class.

Leo. Leo, a first year student, half-Italian, half – Filipino, is a timid boy at first but after one session with the researcher, he openly expressed about his life and ideas on many things. He said his passion is in caring for his dog, which he considered as his closest family member compared to the rest of his family. He is living with his maternal grandmother, his mother and 2 sisters. His father is in Bahrain for they have a family business there. During *pakikipag-usap* with Leo, he told the researcher that he really misses his father because he's the only one to whom he could share his ideas. At home, he said that he doesn't have long conversations with his mother because she is busy with many things and his two sisters are not talking or playing with him. The problems identified to be manifested by Leo were **off-task and out of-seat behaviors**. In school, he was observed to exhibit an off-task behavior by not listening to the teacher during class hours but instead found to be always sketching or drawing anime characters; the reason why he got low grades. When asked about this, he admitted doing it because he found the topics difficult and he felt bored especially when the medium of instruction was in Filipino. He also admitted going from one seat to another (out-of-seat behavior) when he felt bored with his seatmates. But once he like his seatmates, he always find time to talk to them even when the class is going on.

Ken. Ken is a third year student who told the researcher that his friends were only his reason for going to school and that he can't live without them. Although he said that he sometimes talked with his mother, most of those times were when she was reprimanding or confronting him of the things he did in school. His father according to him oftentimes arrived home drank and many times he overheard his father telling his mother that he didn't care anymore about what would happen to Ken. Ken told the researcher that he only finds happiness when he's with friends at school and at the computer shop. He really wants to change according to him but he fells nobody cares and that he's already callous to those labels he heard that he's of no use, no chance, and stupid. The behavioral problems observed to be manifested by Ken were **attention-seeking and out-of-seat behaviors**. He seeks attention during classhours that distract the focus of the teachers and other students when he always talked with his seatmates, laughed with them, and did some naughty

things on his other classmates such as tying and putting thrashes in their bags. He also found going out and talking with his friends in the school's comfort room a break from classroom rules and when he went back to the classroom, he's no longer in his assigned seat but rather, he goes from one seat to another (out-of-seat behavior) as according to him, he want to befriend everybody in the classroom. One of his former teachers told the researcher that before, Ken was an attentive student in class who would freely join in debates on any classroom topics. When told about this, he just shrugged off his shoulders and said he didn't care about it anymore because nobody loves him. First, he said his family is no longer minding him, his girlfriend dumped him and his teachers don't trust him.

Raymark. Raymark is a 14 year old boy who is taller than many boys his age. In fact, he is the tallest among his classmates. During a conversation with his mother, she admitted that her son is acting like a child although that he is already in his second year. Although Raymark is the youngest among 8 siblings, the attention he gets from his parents has not spoiled him for his mother always reprimands him everytime he does something wrong in school or at home. His mother further told the researcher that she got reports about Raymark's bad behavior only when they transferred him in Aklan because when he attended school in Iloilo, no reports of bad behavior were sent to her. The behavioral problems observed to be manifested by Raymark in school were **out-of-seat and teasing/bullying classmates**. Raymark was observed to move from one seat to another and his classmates always complained that Raymark teased them or hit them everytime they can't follow what he told them to do. When the teacher called his attention because of his teasing/bullying behavior, he just smiled back and said he just want to discipline his classmates.

Rodel. Rodel, a third year student, who admitted that he wants everybody to be happy, the reason why all his subject teachers are complaining that he always disrupts the class because of his **attention-seeking and out-of seat behaviors**. He seeks attention by always talking with his seatmates and telling stories that would make them laugh even during class discussion. As an only child, he told the researcher that he just wants to be with his classmates because at home, he doesn't have someone whom he can talk to. His mother seldom has time to initiate conversation with him, much more his father who he said is a very quiet man. He was also oftentimes observed to be doing other things such as drawing or designing tattoo instead of following instructions from his subject teachers. When asked about this, he admitted the act and told the researcher that he was

doing it if he finds the topics boring and sometimes finds difficulty in understanding the teachers' instruction.

Mark Dave. Mark Dave is a third year student who branded himself as the person who is full of life. Most of his subject teachers complains about his **attention-seeking and out-of-seat behaviors**. He seeks attention by being noisy in class such talking and laughing out loud even if the teachers assign him to sit beside quiet classmates. He was also observed to go from one seat to another(out-of-seat behavior) and disturb his seatmates. At home, Mark Dave told the researcher that he's happy but happier when he is in school because it is there where he can make other people happy by telling them stories that would make them laugh. Since Mark Dave's father is a seaman, he said that he's closer with his mother but they seldom have a heart-to-heart talk. When the father went home for vacation, Mark Dave oftentimes heard his parents arguing over money and because of fear of what will happen after, he just left home and stayed near the seashore, pondered on good things, and wished to be in school always.

Rush. Rush is a second year student, second among three siblings. His anecdotal records were filled with many complaints of **teasing/bullying classmates and out-of-seat behaviors**. During the *pakikipag-usap* with the parents, the mother told the researcher that when Rush was a kid, he was observed to be very playful and usually played jokes on his peers without realizing that he's already hurting them especially when he accompanied his jokes with hand twisting and hand slapping. In high school, his teasing/bullying classmates behavior continued. When teachers confronted him with such complaints, he immediately admitted what he did but that he didn't mean to harm his classmates. To him, everything is just but a joke, no deliberate intention to harm them. His records also show that he oftentimes incurred absences or tardiness, because he would skip classes especially in the afternoon. He said he felt bored and sleepy in his afternoon classes but lately, he was found to be attending his classes already. Most of his subject teachers told the researcher that Rush is good when it comes to academic standing but when he attends class, it is seldom that teachers don't receive complaints about Rush' teasing/bullying behavior(afterwhich, he always goes from one seat to another), that results in disruption of the class because the teacher has to attend to the complainants. The teachers oftentimes said that they are tired of reprimanding Rush about his behavior but everytime he's being reprimanded, he's always ready with his "sorry" and "I will not do it again" answers.

Vincent. Vincent, a third year student, lives with his parents and a sister who is in college. His father according to him was a former seaman and his mother is a teacher. At home, he told the researcher that he does not have open communications with his parents especially with his father. The only usual conversations he has is when his father asks him if he attends his classes. He said he finds happiness in school where according to him he can relax his mind from problems at home. The problems identified to be manifested by Vincent in the classroom were **attention-seeking and tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behaviors**. He seeks attention by talking about silly things with his classmates and to laugh with them even during class hours which to him, he finds it relaxing. When teachers scold him, he then stops talking but can't help to start laughing again with his seatmates for it is his only outlet according to him. With the influence of his friends, he said he was caught not attending classes or oftentimes, cutting /skipping classes.

Marjone. Marjone is a third year student, elder among the two siblings. The family income is considered middle class, both parents work at blue collar jobs, the reason why Marjone is a scholar of the nun missionaries in their town. The problems identified to be manifested by Marjone in school were **attention-seeking and tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes**. He said he only wants to have fun with his friends, his reason why even during classhours he is fond of doing some tricks and laughing with his classmates which oftentimes catch the attention of his teachers (attention-seeking). He was also caught many times climbing the school fence in order to cut or skip classes. When asked about this, he smiled and admitted he did it because of the influence of his friends. But sometimes according to him, he intentionally was absent from school because he did not like to attend class without having a good reason.

BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Based on the cases presented, the following were the behavioral problems of high school students addressed by the integrated intervention program: (1) Attention-seeking (calling out to recite or to ask questions, laughing out loud, clowning, touching other's work, things, etc.); (2) Out-of seat or loitering in the classroom (going from one seat to another); (3) Off-task (doing things unrelated to class discussions or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects, tattooing & talking to seatmates); (4) Teasing/bullying classmates (annoying classmates through mocking and inflicting harm through slapping, hair pulling, arm twisting, etc.) and; (5)

Tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting/skipping classes (going late to school, and not attending classes without valid reason either from the first to the last subject or only on selected subjects). Table 1 showed the distribution of cases.

Table 1. Distribution of Cases

Total No. of Cases	No. of Cases Exhibiting the Identified Behavioral Problems				
	Attention-seeking	Out-of-seat	Off-task	Teasing or bullying classmates	Tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting/skipping classes
10	6	6	4	2	2

Design of an Integrated Intervention Program Addressing the Target Behavioral Problems:-

The integrated intervention program was composed of the following: objectives, activities, strategies, resources, time frame and specific intervention technique based on Cognitive Behavior Modification (CBM). The matrix of the program was divided into two: the first part was self-knowledge and the second part was the general evaluation. Self-knowledge was further subdivided into four: behavioral awareness, the me concept, me and my classmates and, the we concept. Every objectives formulated have specific activities, strategies which include the procedure, resources, time frame and specific intervention technique. The duration or the time frame of the entire program was eight sessions per participant : 45minutes to 1 hour per session. The integrated intervention program was designed originally by the researcher based on the principles of cognitive behavior modification (CBM) which according to Meichenbaum (1980), the premise of CBM is that individuals must develop the ability to notice (a) how they feel, think and behave and (b) the impact their behavior has on others as a prerequisite to behavior change. Based on the mentioned premise, the researcher placed on the first part the self-knowledge for the participants to become aware of their bad behavior and his behavior's effects to others, increase the participant's self awareness which include his strengths and weaknesses, understand fully the importance of other people in his life and, recognize his contribution in attaining a common goal through cooperation with others. The design was validated by a school head, prefect of discipline, guidance counselor, Values Education teacher and an English teacher. The validation was based on the relevance of the contents/components of the intervention program to the purpose of the study, the suitability of the different components to the nature of students/participants, the clarity of the statements and directions particularly in the procedure and, the applicability of specific interventions to the different participants.

Implementation of the Designed Integrated Intervention Program:-

The designed integrated intervention program was implemented through sessions with individual participants following the sequence of the program:

Orientation. Prior to the implementation of the specific objectives in the intervention program, the researcher first conducted a group orientation session with the participants regarding the study, their involvement, and schedules for individual sessions. Orientation was made as a strategy for developing rapport with the participants. This include *pagtatanung-tanong* such as "who is the cutest/smart person in your class?" or "where is your favorite hang-out in the campus?" After the orientation, the objectives in the intervention program were followed per session. There were 8 sessions per participant. The first objective was knowledge of self. It was subdivided into behavior awareness, me concept, me and my classmates and, we concept.

Behavior awareness. In behavior awareness, the aim is to let the student become aware of his behavior and the context or his role and his behavior's effects to others. The activities were picture cue and G-I-P-SG (Guess, Identify, Predict and Set Goals). Before starting with the first activity, the researcher first asked the student about his feelings at the moment and his expectations for the first session. The student was then asked if he's ready for the session before the activity started.

Me Concept. The second component/subdivision of knowledge of self was the "me concept." This aimed to increase student's self awareness. The activities were self-disclosure through a personal drawing, hand language and Johari window. The activities were done for two sessions. In self-disclosure through a personal drawing (third session), the student was asked to draw anything he thought related to his characteristics. He was then requested to give a

written or oral description of himself in relation to the drawing. In this activity, the researcher provides the student an opportunity to express/describe his self based on his own perception and a chance to pour out what he thought and felt about his self. The researcher gave social reinforcements for the drawings and self disclosure made. Again, a reflective feedback was asked from the student.

In this activity, the researcher helped the student recognize his potentials by pointing out to him his self-revealed strengths and on what to do to overcome his weaknesses and the painful experience. The researcher also helped the student change his irrational beliefs about the negative things he heard about him and how he viewed his self by stressing to him his strengths and his will to achieve his ambitions.

Me and My Classmates. The third subdivision/component of the knowledge of self was the "me and my classmates," which aimed to guide the student in assessing his/her personal and social relationship with his classmates and understand fully the significance of other people in his life. There were three activities which were conducted for three sessions: one activity per session. Reflective feedback was requested before and after each session. The first activity (fifth session) was called "my personal and social sphere in the classroom." In this activity, the researcher first demonstrated on how to draw four spherical shapes around the word "Me" and writing the names of classmates on each sphere as if orbiting the center, from the closest to just a mere classmate/s. The researcher performed the demonstration while verbalizing the instruction. The student then followed the same and did the task again without verbalizing the instruction. In this activity, the researcher assisted the student in realizing his relationship with his classmates by analyzing the spheres the student made with the names of his classmates on each sphere, telling him that he has potentials in socializing with them, and at the same time learned to self-monitor and self-instruct through an internal speech wherein he was able to follow the researcher's instruction and then was also able to follow his own. A clear indication that he can change his bad behavior into a good one if he wanted to and make many friends from his classmates. All the participants able to follow the instruction of the researcher.

The second activity (6th session) was story telling. A revised story from a magazine related to the student's life was told with some questions at the beginning, at the middle and at the end as student's participation. The story would enhance the student's self efficacy in the sense that he would realize that (a) a bad behavior can be changed into a good behavior and (b) he is capable of changing for his self and for

other people.. In the 7th session, a video of a life testimony of a 4th year high school student considered as teacher's source of stress but turned out later as one of the teacher's pride was viewed. The life testimony serves to model a good behavior. All the participants commented that changing a behavior is not an easy one but they have to put effort and have determination.

We Concept. The last subdivision of the knowledge of self is the "we concept." This aimed to help the student recognize the need to cooperate with other people (classmates and teachers) in attaining a certain goal. A recall of the past sessions was done before the 8th session started. The activities were video analysis and problem solving. Two sets of video of 4th year students in a classroom setting during project making were viewed. In the first set, students showed inappropriate behavior such as being rude, disrespectful and being uncooperative. The second set of video shown is the same except that students worked cooperatively and cheerfully. The student/participant was asked to give comments on the first and the second video. A problem similar to the first video (group experiment instead of project making) was then given to the student and solution in the form of planning and moral decisions were required such as on what he (the student) can contribute in making the experiment successful within an allotted time and what he will do if others are not cooperating. Positive reinforcements in a form of compliments and candies were given to the student everytime he made a correct response.

After the session, the student was asked to give a reflective feedback such as how did he find the activity and what he learned from the activity. Before the researcher ended the last session with the student, there was a sharing of experience from the first session up to the last.

Evaluation of the Integrated Intervention Program Through :-

(a) Changes in Target Behaviors after the Implementation of the IIP;

(b) t-test Result of the Changes in the Behavioral Problems of 10 Cases Before and After the Implementation of the IIP.

Changes in Target Behaviors after the Implementation of the Integrated Intervention Program. The changes in each and overall target behaviors of the cases after the implementation of the integrated intervention program were rated by the teacher, guidance counselor, student and the researcher using a rubric. The results are hereby presented through tables for easy comparison showing the average scores and the descriptive equivalent of the degree of the manifestations of behavioral problems of every student/participant,

before and after the implementation of the integrated intervention program.. The scale for interpreting mean ratings before and after the implementation of the integrated intervention program was provided.

Lot: The Attention-Seeker. Lot's portfolio reveal her behavioral status before and after she underwent the Integrated Intervention Program

(IIP), which is shown in Table 2. Lot had a very serious behavioral problems particularly in attention-seeking and out-of seat or classroom loitering behaviors before the IIP.

Table 2. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After theIIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Attention-seeking	3.75	1.75
Out-of-seat	4	1.5
Total	7.75	3.25
Mean Average	3.88 (a very serious problem)	1.63 (big change in behavior)

The teacher, guidance counselor and the researcher rated Lot's attention-seeking and out -of- seat behaviors as four which means a very serious problem while the student rated herself three in attention seeking and four in out of seat behavior which has an equivalent of a serious problem and a very serious problem, respectively. The mean average of the two target behaviors was 3.88 which has a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem. Based on the rubric observation checklist with scale, it shows that Lot always calls out to recite or to ask questions, disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc., and most of the time out of seat for the entire duration of the class. The degree of the manifestations of the target behavioral problems really merit an intervention because if not given attention, the classroom teaching-learning process would most likely be interrupted thus, affecting other students.

After the IIP the teacher, guidance counselor and the researcher rated Lot's attention-seeking behavior as 2 or moderate change in behavior while the student herself rated it as 1 or big change in behavior. The average was 1.75 which is described as big change in behavior. For the out-of-seat behavior,

both the teacher and the student rated it as 2 while the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 1, or an average of 1.5, described as a big change in behavior. The mean average for the attention-seeking and out-of-seat behaviors was 1.63 with a descriptive equivalent of a big change in behavior which means that after the IIP, Lot never calls out to recite or to ask questions, never disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc., and never out of seat for the entire duration of the class. The average for each target behavior has a difference of .25 which suggests that the intervention program is more effective for the out-of- seat behavior than the attention seeking by .25 in the case of Lot. For Lot, integrated intervention program caused a big change in each and of her two target behaviors.

Paulo: The Silent Type. At first, Paulo's data shows that he has a very serious problem in an off-task behavior and serious problem in an out-of-seat behavior. The ratings of the teacher, the guidance counselor, the student himself and the researcher before and after Paulo underwent the IIP are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Off-Task	3.5	1.25
Out-of-seat	3	1
Total	6.5	2.25
Mean Average	3.25 (serious problem)	1.13 (big change in behavior)

Table 3 shows the degree of manifestations of the target behaviors of Paulo before and after the

implementation of the integrated intervention program. The off-task behavior has an average of 3.5 where the teacher and the student himself rated it as

4, while the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 3. A descriptive equivalent is "serious problem." The out-of-seat behavior on the other hand has an average of 3 as all the observers have the same ratings, which means a serious problem. Based on the rubric observation checklist with scale, a serious problem means that Paulo does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects and talking to seatmates most of the time and, many times out of seat for the entire duration of the class Since both the two target behaviors are serious problems, one can imagine the difficulty the classroom teacher had to suffer every time these behaviors were manifested inside the classroom and the effects on the learning process of other students.

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program, the two target behaviors which were considered a serious problems were rated 1.13 or a descriptive equivalent of a big change in behavior especially the out-of-seat behavior where all observers rated it as 1. Big change in behavior means that after IIP, Paulo listens attentively, never does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects, talking to seatmates and, never observed to be out-of seat for the entire duration of the class.

Leo: The Anime Fan. Leo's data as shown in Table 4 reveal his behavioral status before and after he attended sessions in the integrated intervention program. Leo's portfolios for behavioral problems before he underwent integrated intervention program shows a very serious problem for his two target behaviors.

Table 4. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Off-Task	3.75	2.25
Out-of-seat	3	2
Total	6.75	4.25
Mean Average	**3.38 (serious problem)**	**2.13 (moderate change in behavior)**

Leo had a very serious problem in the off-task behavior based on the average score of 3.75, as the teacher, guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 4, and the student himself rated it as 3 before the IIP. The out-of-seat behavior on the other hand has an average of 3, as all the observers have the same rating, which means a serious problem. The two target behaviors has a mean average of 3.38 which means a serious problem. Based on the rubrics, Leo has been observed to does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing and talking to seatmates most of the time and many times out-of-seat for the entire duration of the class.

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program, the off-task behavior has an average rating of 2.25 which is equivalent to a moderate change in behavior, as the guidance counselor, the student himself, and the researcher rated it as 2 while the teacher rated it as 3. For the out-of-seat behavior, all the observers rated it as 2, thus, having an average of 2 with a descriptive equivalent of a moderate change of behavior. The two target behaviors has a mean average of 2.13 which is equivalent to a moderate change of behavior. Based on the rubrics, a moderate change in behavior means that after the IIP, Leo rarely does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing or talking to seatmates and, rarely out of seat for the entire duration of the class.

Ken: The Friend Dependent. The degree of manifestations and changes in Ken's behavior before and after the implementation of the integrated intervention program is shown in Table 5. Before the IIP, Ken's behavioral problems show a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem and a serious problem respectively.

Table 5. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Attention-seeking	3.5	2.25
Out-of-seat	3	2
Total	6.5	4.25
Mean Average	**3.25 (serious problem)**	**2.13 (moderate change in behavior)**

Before Ken underwent an IIP, he and his teacher rated his attention-seeking behavior as 3 while the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 4, with an average of 3.5. The descriptive equivalent is a very serious problem. The out- of-seat behavior has an average of 3 with a descriptive equivalent of a serious problem as the teacher and the researcher rated it as 3 while the guidance counselor and the student rated it as 2 and 4 respectively. For the two target behaviors, the mean average is 3.25, which means a serious problem. Based on the rubrics, Ken has been observed to calls out to recite or to ask questions, disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, hair, etc., most of the time, and many times observed to be out-of seat for the entire duration of the class.

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program,   Ken's attention-seeking behavior has an average of 2.25 which is equivalent to moderate change of behavior as the teacher, the

student and the researcher rated it as 2 and the guidance counselor rated it as 3. The out-of-seat behavior on the other hand has an average of 2 with a descriptive equivalent of a moderate change in behavior when the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 2, the teacher rated it as 3 and the student rated it as 1. The two target behaviors has a mean average of 2.13 which means moderate change in behavior. Based on the rubrics observation checklist, a moderate change in behavior means that after the IIP, Ken rarely calls out to recite or to ask questions, rarely disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc., and rarely out-of-seat for the entire duration of the class.

Raymark: The Teaser. Raymark's data on his two target behaviors before and after he underwent IIP is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Out-of-seat	3.25	1.5
Teasing/bullying classmates	3.75	2
Total	7	3.5
Mean Average	**3.5 (a very serious problem)**	**1.75 (big change in behavior)**

Before the implementation of the integrated intervention program as shown in Table 6, the out-of-seat behavior of Reymark has an average of 3.25 as the teacher, the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 3 while the student himself rated it as 4. It has a descriptive equivalent of a serious problem. The teasing/bullying classmates behavior on the other hand was rated by the teacher, the guidance counselor and the researcher as 4 while the student rated it as 3. The descriptive equivalent is very serious based on the mean average of 3.75. The two target behaviors has an average of 3.5, which means a very serious problem. It shows that based on the rubrics, a very serious problem means that most of the time, Raymark has been observed to be out-of-seat for the entire duration of the class and always find ways to tease or bully classmates resulting to noise disturbance in the classroom.

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program, the out-of-seat behavior has an average of 1.5, equivalent to a big change in behavior

when the teacher and the student rated it as 2 while the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 1. The teasing/bullying classmates behavior on the other hand has an average of 2 as all the observers have the same ratings, which means a moderate change in behavior. The two target behaviors has an average of 1.75 which is equivalent to a big change in behavior.   The integrated intervention program caused a big change in Raymark's out-of-seat behavior and a moderate change in his teasing/bullying classmates behavior which mean that after the IIP, Raymark was never observed to be out-of-seat for the entire duration of the class and rarely teases or bullies classmates.

Rodel: The Comedian.   Rodel's portfolio of behavioral status before and after he attended IIP is shown in Table 7. His two target behaviors has an equivalent of a very serious problem before the IIP.

Table 7. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. Score Before the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Attention-seeking	3.5	1.25
Off-task	3.5	2
Total	7	3.25
Mean Average	3.5 (a very serious problem)	1.63 (big change in behavior)

Before he attended the IIP, Rodel's attention-seeking behavior has an average of 3.5 which is equivalent to a very serious problem, as the teacher and the student himself rated it as 3 while the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 4. The off-task behavior also has an average of 3.5, equivalent to a very serious problem as the teacher and the student rated it as 4 and the guidance counselor and the researcher rated it as 3. The two target behaviors has a mean average of 3.5, which means a very serious problem. Based on the rubrics, a very serious problem means that Rodel always calls out to recite or to ask questions, always reprimanded for disturbing the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc., and always does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects, tattooing and talking to seatmates. After Rodel attended the integrated intervention program his attention-seeking behavior has an average of 1.25, equivalent to a big change in

behavior when the teacher rated it as 2 while the guidance counselor, the student and the researcher rated it as 1. The off-task behavior on the other hand incurred an average of 2 with a descriptive equivalent of a moderate change in behavior as all the observers have the same ratings. For the two target behaviors, the mean average was 1.63 which is equal to a descriptive rating of a big change in behavior which means that after the IIP, Rodel never calls out to recite or to ask questions, never disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc. He listens attentively and never does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects, tattooing and talking to seatmates.

Mark Dave: The Happy Guy. Table 8 shows Mark Dave's data regarding his behavioral problems before and after he attended sessions in integrated intervention program.

Table 8. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. Score Before the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Attention-seeking	3.75	1.25
Off-task	4	2
Total	7.75	3.25
Mean Average	3.88 (very serious problem)	1.63 (big change in behavior)

The attention-seeking behavior was rated by the teacher, guidance counselor and the researcher as 4 while the student himself rated it as 3. The descriptive equivalent of this target behavior is a very serious problem based on the average of 3.75.

The off-task behavior on the other hand was rated by all the observers as 4 with a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem. The mean average of the two target behaviors is 3.88 which is equivalent to a very serious problem. This means that Mark Dave has been observed to always calls out to recite or to ask questions, disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc., and always does things unrelated to class discussion or activities such as drawing, reading notes in other subjects, tattooing and talking to seatmates.

After the integrated intervention program, Mark Dave's attention-seeking behavior was rated as 2 by the teacher and 1 by the guidance counselor, the student and the researcher. Based on the average of 1.25, the descriptive equivalent is big change in behavior. The off-task behavior incurred an average of 2, when the teacher rated it as 3, the guidance counselor and the researcher as 2 and the student as 1. The descriptive equivalent is moderate change in behavior. The two target behaviors has an average mean of 1.63 equal to a descriptive rating of a big change in behavior which means that after the IIP, Mark Dave never calls out to recite or to ask questions, never disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc. He never does things unrelated to class discussions or activities such as drawing reading notes in other subjects, tattooing and talking to seatmates, rather, he listens attentively.

Rush: The Playful. Table 9 shows Rush' behavioral status before and after the implementation of the integrated intervention program. His data in

Table 16 shows that he has a very serious problem in his two target behaviors.

Table 9. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. ScoreBefore the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Out-of-seat	3.25	2
Teasing/Bullying classmates	3.75	2
Total	7	4
Mean Average	**3.5 (very serious problem)**	**2 (moderate change)**

Before the implementation of the integrated intervention program, the out-of-seat behavior of Rush was rated as 4 by the teacher and 3 by the guidance counselor, the student and by the researcher. The descriptive equivalent is a serious problem based on the average of 3.25. This means that Rush was observed many times out-of -seat for the entire duration of the class. The teasing/bullying classmates behavior had an average of 3.75, equivalent to a very serious problem. The teacher rated it as 3 while the guidance counselor, the student and the researcher rated it as 4. Based on the rubrics observation checklist with scale, a very serious problem means that Rush always find ways to tease

or bully classmates resulting to noise disturbance in the classroom.

After Rush attended the integrated intervention program, both the out-of seat and the teasing/bullying classmates behaviors were rated by all the observers as 2 which means a moderate change in behavior. Based on the rubrics, a moderate change in behavior means that Rush rarely out-of-seat for the entire duration of the class and rarely teases or bullies classmates.

Vincent: The Relaxing Boy. Vincent's portfolio of behavioral problems before and after he attended the integrated intervention program is shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. Score Before the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes	4	2
Attention-seeking	3.25	2.25
Total	7.25	4.25
Mean Average	**3.63 (very serious problem)**	**2.13 (moderate change)**

Table 10 shows Vincent's degree of manifestations of behavioral problems before and after he underwent integrated intervention program. The tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behaviors were rated by all the observers as 4, with a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem while the attention-seeking behavior was rated by the teacher, the student and the researcher as 3, and the guidance counselor rated it as 4. The descriptive equivalent of the attention-seeking behavior is a serious problem based on its average of 3.25. The two target behaviors had an average of 3.63, which means a very serious problem. Based on the rubrics, Vincent has been observed to be always late in class, has 3 or more record of cutting/skipping classes and has more than 5 unjustified absences. Also, he always calls out to recite or to ask questions and always

disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc.

After the IIP, the tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behavior was rated as 2 by all the observers. The descriptive equivalent is moderate change in behavior. The attention-seeking behavior on the other hand incurred an average of 2.25 with a descriptive equivalent of moderate change in behavior as the teacher rated it as 3, while the guidance counselor, the student and the researcher rated it as 2. The two target behaviors had a mean average of 2.13 which is equal to a moderate change in behavior. This means that after the IIP, Vincent rarely arrives late in class, has no record of cutting classes and has only 1 or 2 unjustified absences. Furthermore, he rarely calls out to recite or to ask questions and, rarely disturbs the class by

either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc.

Marjone: The Fence Climber.
Marjone's behavioral status before and after he

underwent integrated intervention program is shown in Table 11.

The data shows that before the implementation of an integrated intervention program, Marjone has a very serious problem in tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behavior as well as in attention-seeking behavior.

Table 11. Degree of Manifestations of Behavioral Problems Before and After the IIP

Behavioral Problems	Ave. Score Before the IIP	Ave. Score after the IIP
Tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes	3.75	2.25
Attention-seeking	3.5	2.25
Total	7.25	4.5
Mean Average	3.63 (very serious problem)	2.25 (moderate change)

Before Marjone underwent integrated intervention program the teacher, the guidance counselor and the researcher rated his tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behavior as 4 while the student rated it as 3. It has an average of 3.75 which has a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem. The attention-seeking behavior had an average of 3.5 with a descriptive rating of a very serious problem as the teacher and the researcher rated it as 3 while the guidance counselor and the student rated it as 4. The two target behaviors have both a descriptive equivalent of a very serious problem which means that Marjone was observed to be always late in class, has 3 or more record of cutting classes and has more than 5 unjustified absences. He also always calls out to recite or to ask questions and disturbs the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc.

After the implementation of the integrated intervention program, the tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting classes behavior as well as the

attention seeking behavior both incurred an average of 2.25 which means a moderate change in behavior when the teacher rated both as 3, while the guidance counselor, the student and the researcher rated the two target behaviors as 2. The descriptive equivalent of the two target behaviors is moderate change. Based on the rubrics, moderate change means that after the IIP, Marjone was observed to rarely arrives late in class, has no record of cutting classes, and has 1 or 2 unjustified absences. He also rarely calls out to recite or to ask questions or to disturb the class by either laughing out loud, clowning, touching others' work, things, hair, etc.

t-test Result of the 10 Participants Before and After the Implementation of the IIP:-
To find out the effectiveness of the integrated intervention program in the behavioral problems of the 10 participants, the t-test for paired or correlated samples was used. The data were taken from the mean average results of the target behaviors of each participant.

Table 12. Differences in the Changes of the Behavioral Problems of the 10 Participants Before and After the IIP

Changes in the Behavioral Problems of 10 Participants	Mean	Diff.	t- Value	df
Before	3.52	1.68	11.93	9
After	1.84			

* the test was set at .05 alpha level
** table value = 2.262 (two-tailed)

The result showed that the t- Value was higher than the table value. This means that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the participants' behavioral problems before and after the

implementation of the IIP. Since that the hallmark of behavior modification theory was changes in the behavior after an intervention was applied to a particular behavior, the aimed for changing the

targeted behaviors was reached. As the participants had different characteristics brought about by different factors such as their family background, peers, environmental condition, role models and others, the effect of the IIP for all them showed significant differences as there were positive changes in their behavior. The need theory of Maslow conformed with the reactions/responses of the participants when they underwent an IIP. Maslow stressed that students have difficulty in learning until their basic needs are met, otherwise, they are likely to behave disruptively in the classroom. The IIP surely have filled the needs of the participants that they able to attain their goal of changing their behavior into a better and appropriate one. Based on the presented facts as the result of the changes in the behavior of the participants after the integrated intervention program implementation, the IIP was effective.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings in this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The behavioral problems of high school students addressed by the integrated intervention program are externalizing behaviors that disrupt the teaching-learning process in the classroom. These are attention-seeking; out-of seat or loitering in the classroom, off-task; teasing/bullying classmates and; tardiness, unjustified absences and cutting/skipping classes.

2. The design of the integrated intervention program is implementable, time wise, resources wise and applicable to behavioral problems of high school students. The design consists of objectives, activities, strategies, resources, time frame and specific intervention.

3. The implementation of the integrated intervention program is efficient and effective based on the changes in the behavioral problems of the participants. Furthermore everything in the design was followed as planned.

4. There are positive changes in each and overall target behaviors of every student-case after the implementation of the integrated intervention program as rated by the student, teacher, guidance counselor and the researcher. The changes range from moderate to big change in behavior.

5. The integrated intervention program is effective in addressing any of the five behavioral problems of high school students as evidenced by the positive changes in each and overall target behaviors of the participants.

REFERENCES

1.   Achenbach & Edelbrock (1979). Cited by Hunt, N. & Marshall, K. , Exceptional children   and   youth. An introduction to special education (p.198). Boston: Houghton Mifflin   Co.

2.   Almeda, R., Andora, H., Bilbao, P., Cabag, R., Delfin, P., Honda, V., Prizas, M., Solis,   A., &   Tan, A.(2002). Community Immersion A Dialogue of Life. Iloilo City,

3.   Philippines: West Visayas State University Press.

4.   Becker, B., Dawson, P., Devine, K., Hannum, C., Hill, S., Leydens, J., Matuskevich, D.,   Traver,   C.,   & Palmquist, M(2005).Case Studies. Writing@CSU. Colorado State   University Department of English. Retrieved   December   4,   2010   from http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/casestudy/.

5.   Bowen, Jenson & Clark (2004). Cited by Hibler, T. School-based interventions.   Retrieved January 2, 2011fromhttp://wik.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/Schoolbased_in terventions

6.   Catalano, R., Loeber, R., & McKinney, K (September 1999). School and Community In terventionsTo Prevent Serious   and   Violent   Offending. Juvenile Justice Bulletin.Retrievedfromhttp://cecp.air.org/fba/problembeh avior3/text.3.htm

7.   Dreikurs, Grunwald & Papper (1982, cited by Crowl, et al., Educational Psychology.   Windowson Teaching. USA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

8.   Dodge (1993). Causes of emotional disorder. Retrieved June12,2007fromhttp://www.slc.sevier.org/emoclass.htm

9.   Edwards & Gfoerer (2001). Cited by Hibler, T. School-based interventions. Retrieved   January 2, 2011 from http://wik.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/Schoolbased_interventio ns

10. Ehrle, J., & Moore, K.. (2007, June 12). Behavioral and emotional problems in children. ChildTrends. Retrievedfromhttp://www.fww.org/articles/misc/ctrends7.h tm

11. Ellsworth, J. (2001). Developing a behavior change plan. Retrieved from Northern   Arizona   University Web site: http://www.nau.edu

12. Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (1994). How to design and evaluate research in   education. USA: Mc Graw-Hill Inc.

13. Glasser (1990). Cited by Crowl, et al., Educational Psychology. Windows on   teaching.(p.357). USA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

14. Gottfredson (1987). Cited by Catalano, R., Loeber, R., & McKinney, K. (September   1999).   School and Community Interventions To Prevent Serious and Violent   Offending. Juvenile   Justice   Bulletin. Retrievedfromhttp://cecp.air.org/fba/problembehavior3/te xt.3.htm

15. Gottfredson, Gottfredson & Skroban (1996). Cited by Catalano, R., Loeber, R., &   McKinney,   K. (September 1999). School and Community Interventions To   Prevent Serious and Violent Offending. Juvenile   Justice   Bulletin.   Retrieved   from http://cecp.air.org/fba/problembehavior3/text.3.htm

16. Heflin, L. J., & Simpson, R. L. (1998). Interventions for children and youth with   autism:Prudent choices in a world of exaggerated claims and empty

promises. Part I:Intervention and treatment option review. Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 13, 194‑211. Retrieved fromhttp://www.ccbd.net/document/bb/bebe-17-01-07.pdf

17. Hibler, T.(2004). School-based interventions. Retrieved January2,2011fromhttp://wik.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/School-based_interventions

18. Horne & Sayger (1990). Conduct disorder. Article reprinted from the Society of special needsadoptive parents newsletter. V.14, Number 1 Spring 1998. Retrievedfromhttp://www.Imgruger.ca/newsletters/conduct.pdf#search='conduct%20disorder%20in%20girls

19. Hunt, N., & Marshall, K. (1999). Exceptional children and youth. Introduction to special education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

20. Ibe, M.D. (2001). Behavioral problems in Philippine schools. Miriam College Faculty Research Journal. Vol. 20, pp. 59-65.

21. Johnson, Walter J. (2010, Jan. 8). Behavior Modification.ehowContribution.Retrievedfromhttp:www./ehow.com/list_5844351_cons-behavior-modification-theory.html

22. Jones & Jones (1990). Cited by Crowl, et al.,Educational Psychology. Windows on teaching. (p. 339). USA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

23. Kelly, W.A. (1965). Educational Psychology. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company.

24. Kendal (1993). Cited by Smith, S. Applying Cognitive Behavioral Techniques to Social

25. Skills Instruction. Eric/OSEP Digest #E630. Retrieved from http://eric.hoagiesgifted.org

26. Landsford, J.K., Dodge, K.A, Malone, P.S., Bacchini, D., Zelli, A., & Chaudhary, N.(2005). Physical discipline & children's adjustment. Cultural normativeness as amoderator. Child development.76,1234-1246. Retrieved fr. http://www.ascba.org/research/discipline..htm

27. Margallo, Sonia P. (1981). In Relevance and Indigenization: From Concepts to Concrete

28. Application. Quezon City: University of the Philippines

29. Maslow A.(1968). Cited by Crowl, et al.,Educational Psychology. Windows on

30. teaching. (p. 339). USA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

31. Meichenbaum, D. (1980). Cognitive ‑behavior modification: A promise yet unfulfilled.

32. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 1, 83‑88. Retrieved from http://www.ccbd.net/document/bb/bebe-17-01-07.pdf

33. Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Smith, R.E. (2004). Introduction to personality toward anintegration. USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

34. Ornstein, A.C., & Levine, D.V. (1984). An introduction to the foundation of education.Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

35. Rogers, W.A. (2002). Classroom behaviour. A practical guide to effective teachingbehavior management & colleague support. USA: Paul Chapman Publishing.

36. Salazar-Clemena, R.M. (2002, March 1). Family ties and peso signs: challenges forcareer counseling in the Philippines. Career Development Quarterly. Retrieved from www.allbusiness.com/human...careers.../13392/-1.html

37. Smith, S. (August 2002). Applying Cognitive-Behavioral Techniques to Social Skills

38. Instruction. Eric/OSEP Digest #E630. Retrieved from http://eric.hoagiesgifted.org Turnbaugh (1986). Cited by Crowl, et al., Educational Psychology. Windows on teaching (p.339). USA: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

39. Walker, H.M., Ramsy, E., & Gresham, F.M. (2007). How early intervention can reduce defiant behavior-and win back teaching time. Retrieved June 12, 2007 fromhttp://www.aft.org/pubsreports/americaneducator/winter03 -04.earlyintervention.html

40. Behavior Defined. (2011). Retrieved Jan.2, 2011 fromhttp://www.slc.sevier.org/behavdef.html

41. Behavior Modification. (2011). In Wikipedia. Retrieved January 2, 2011,fromhttp://en.wikipdia.org/wikiBehavior_modification

42. Behavioral problems (2007). Retrieved June 12, 2007 fromhttp://www.threesprings.com/troubled_teens/behavioral_problem.asp

43. National Association of School Psychologists (2007). Definition of emotional and behavioral disorders. Retrieved June 12, 2007 from http://www.naspon/ine.org/information/pospapersebd.html

44. Philippine education. Critical policy area, which may be increasing or decreasing in importance. Retrieved June 12, 2007 from http://unpan1,un-org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan000223.html Shine

45. Special Education Center Inc. (2011). Retrieved March 10,2011fromhttp://www.Shineintervention.com/vision_and_mission/learning_approach

46. Texas Statewide Leadership for Autism (March 2009). RetrievedJune12,2007fromhttp://www.ccbd.net/document/bb/bebe-17-01-07.pdf

47. The Little Campus North Bend School (2011). Retrieved March 10, 2011 from http://www.thelittlecampus.com/the-little-campus-greenhills.htm

Acknowledgement