

# From Prevention to Intervention: Mapping Collaborative Classroom Behaviour Management Practices Among Secondary School Teachers

Chittattukara Sheen C. S.<sup>1</sup>; Dr. Vini Sebastian<sup>2</sup>

Research Scholar<sup>1</sup>; Professor<sup>2</sup>, Principle<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>St. Xaviers' Institute of Education, Mumbai

Publication Date: 2026/05/14

## Abstract:

### ➤ *Background:*

Managing classroom behaviour remains a constant challenge in secondary schools, and teachers use a wide range of strategies depending on the situation. Collaborative Classroom Behaviour Management (CCBM) encourages teachers to act as proactive, relationship-focused managers rather than simply react to misbehaviour. This approach provides a full framework for understanding how teachers prevent, respond non-verbally to, and verbally address student misbehaviour.

### ➤ *Methods:*

A quantitative survey design was utilized with a sample of N = 673 secondary school teachers from schools throughout Greater Mumbai. The validated CCBM scale, which measures 18 subdimensions across three dimensions: Prevention, Non-Verbal Interference, and Verbal Intervention, was administered. Data analysis included descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis) and one-sample t-tests comparing each subdimension mean to the scale midpoint (2.5) on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Never to 4 = Always).

### ➤ *Results:*

Teachers exhibited consistently high levels of Positive Phrasing (M = 3.699), Motivation (M = 3.670), Direct Appeal (M = 3.583), and Expert Authority Base (M = 3.554), with all scores significantly exceeding the scale midpoint ( $p < .001$ ). Moderate levels of practice were identified for Physical Environment (M = 2.789), Classroom Rules (M = 2.748), Proximity Interference (M = 3.076), and Questioning Awareness (M = 3.165). Notably, Planned Ignoring was the only subdimension to fall below the midpoint (M = 2.366,  $t(671) = -6.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ), suggesting a consistent underutilisation of strategic non-response.

### ➤ *Discussion:*

Findings indicate that teacher management profiles are marked by strong verbal and motivational strategies, while non-verbal and environmental practices remain comparatively underdeveloped. The consistent avoidance of Planned Ignoring suggests that authority-conscious teachers may unintentionally reinforce minor misbehaviour through excessive responses. The prominence of Motivation and Logical Consequences as central subdimensions indicates that professional development programmes should prioritise these areas as foundational entry points for cultivating a more comprehensive and integrated CCBM repertoire.

**Keywords:** CCBM, Classroom Behaviour, Verbal and Non-Verbal Interventions, Teacher–Student Relationship, Motivation.

**How to Cite:** Chittattukara Sheen C. S.; Dr. Vini Sebastian (2026) From Prevention to Intervention: Mapping Collaborative Classroom Behaviour Management Practices Among Secondary School Teachers. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(5), 206-209. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26may774>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Effective classroom management is among the most important factors for student learning outcomes and teacher

satisfaction (Hattie, 2009; Evertson & Weinstein, 2006). When teachers manage their classrooms well, they can focus more on teaching and less on discipline. This helps students feel safe, involved, and motivated to learn. On the other hand,

poor classroom management is often linked to teacher burnout, early career turnover, and lower student achievement, especially in large urban schools (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Marzano, Marzano & Pickering, 2003).

The main discourse about classroom management has often focused on two approaches. One is reactive and punitive, where teachers respond to misbehaviour with sanctions and authority. The other is proactive and relational, where teachers prevent disruption through planning, building relationships, and using strategic interventions (Lewis, 2001; Edwards & Watts, 2008). Collaborative Classroom Behaviour Management (CCBM) belongs to the second approach. In CCBM, the teacher is seen not as a disciplinarian, but as a strategic partner in the classroom. This approach uses prevention strategies, subtle cues, and step-by-step verbal interventions to maintain a productive learning environment without relying on strict authority (Glasser, 1998; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1998).

Although the theoretical foundations of CCBM are well established, there is little empirical evidence on how secondary school teachers actually use these strategies, especially at the sub-dimension level and in urban Indian settings. Most studies on classroom management in India focus on general disciplinary practices, teacher attitudes toward misbehaviour, or the relationship between classroom management and academic performance (Sharma, 2014; Nair & Pillai, 2019). However, there is a lack of detailed, quantitative research on which specific CCBM strategies teachers use most often, which ones they use less, and how these strategies form consistent management approaches.

➤ *The Following Research Questions Guide this Study:*

- How much does each CCBM sub-dimension show up in the practices of secondary school teachers in Greater Mumbai?
- Which sub-dimensions are used at high, moderate, or low levels compared to the scale midpoint?
- What structural links are there between CCBM sub-dimensions, and which one act as central hubs in management practices?

➤ *Theoretical Framework*

• *The Behaviour Management Continuum*

Levin, Nolan, Kerr, and Elliott (2005) place these ideas on a spectrum with three approaches: Student-Directed, Collaborative, and Teacher-Directed. Collaborative models, based on the work of Dreikurs (2004), Glasser (1992), Curwin and Mendler (1999; 2008), and Nelson (2006), try to balance the needs of the group with those of each student. They argue that lasting behaviour change comes from students' understanding and taking ownership of their actions, rather than from outside pressure.

• *Prevention: Structuring the Collaborative Environment*

CCBM uses three main ways to prevent problems. First, teachers arrange the classroom so that every student can reach

and everyone can see the lesson. Second, teachers and students create rules together to make sure teachers can teach, students can learn, and everyone stays safe. Third, teachers build strong relationships with students by using their influence and expertise, encouraging motivation (i.e., Expectation of Success times Value of Outcome), and helping students feel important, capable, good, and empowered (Levin et al., 2005).

• *Intervention: The Three-Tier Decision-Making Hierarchy*

If prevention does not work, CCBM has a three-step intervention system (Levin et al., 2005). The first step uses non-verbal actions like ignoring, using signals, moving closer, or gentle touch to quietly redirect behaviour. The second step uses words, starting with mild approaches like peer support, mentioning names, humor, 'I Messages,' direct requests, positive language, Glasser's Triplets, reminders, and clear directions, always treating students with respect. The third step involves logical consequences, where students are given a clear choice and the result is directly connected to their actions, but not as a punishment. The process always begins with the least disruptive and most supportive option.

## II. METHODOLOGY

➤ *Research Design*

This study used a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design through a stratified random sampling. Using a Likert-scale survey follows established methods in large-sample research on teacher attitudes and behaviour. The cross-sectional approach enabled data collection across many schools simultaneously, providing a broad view of teacher CCBM practices at a single point in time.

➤ *Participants*

The sample included 673 secondary school teachers from schools throughout Greater Mumbai, Maharashtra, India. Schools were chosen to represent different types (government-aided, unaided private, and municipal), geographic areas (North, South, Central Mumbai), and management affiliations. Participation was voluntary, and all ethical guidelines, such as informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality, were followed. The participants taught a range of subjects and had varying levels of experience, offering a broad snapshot of secondary school teaching in the region.

➤ *Instrument*

The scale included items that measured teacher practices across 18 sub-dimensions, grouped into three main areas: Prevention (with six sub-dimensions: Physical Environment, Classroom Rules, Expert Power, Expert Authority Base, Self-Esteem, and Motivation), Non-Verbal Interference (with four sub-dimensions: Planned Ignoring, Signal Interference, Proximity Interference, and Adjacent Reinforcement), and Verbal Intervention (with eight sub-dimensions: Name Dropping, Humor, Questioning Awareness, Direct Appeal, Positive Phrasing, Reminder of Rules, Explicit Redirection, and Logical Consequences). Each item was rated on a 4-point Likert scale.

### ➤ Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, median, skewness, and kurtosis, were calculated for each sub-dimension. One-sample t-tests assessed whether sub-dimension means differed from the theoretical scale midpoint of 2.50 ( $p < .05$ ). The scale midpoint, labelled as 'sometimes,' represents moderate practice; means above this value indicate frequent use, whereas means below suggest under-utilisation. Pearson correlations among sub-dimensions were used to identify structural connections and hub sub-dimensions within the CCBM questionnaire. Scale values were interpreted as follows: 1.00–1.74 as Very Low, 1.75–2.49 as Low, 2.50–3.24 as Moderate, and 3.25–4.00 as High.

## III. RESULTS

### ➤ Overall CCBM Profile

Teachers in Greater Mumbai showed mostly moderate to high levels of CCBM practice across all 18 sub-dimensions. Of the three main dimensions, Verbal Intervention had the highest mean ( $M = 3.257$ ,  $SD = 0.357$ ), followed by Prevention ( $M = 3.209$ ,  $SD = 0.303$ ) and Non-Verbal Interference ( $M = 2.859$ ,  $SD = 0.361$ ). All dimension means were well above the midpoint of the scale ( $p < .001$ ), suggesting that teachers in this sample use CCBM strategies frequently. However, this overall view does not tell the whole story. At the sub-dimension level, there is considerable variation, showing that teacher practice is not uniform.

- **High-Performing Sub-dimensions:** Six sub-dimensions achieved high scores ( $M \geq 3.25$ ), all with strong statistical significance ( $p < .001$ ). Positive Phrasing had the highest score on the CCBM scale ( $M = 3.699$ ,  $SD = 0.572$ ,  $t(670) = 54.299$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and its strong negative skewness ( $-1.850$ ) and high kurtosis ( $2.814$ ) show that this practice is nearly universal and consistent. Motivation ( $M = 3.670$ ,  $SD = 0.373$ ) had the second-highest score and was the only sub-dimension linked to all 17 others ( $r = .100$  to  $.330$ ,  $p < .05$ ), making it the most connected practice in the CCBM model. Direct Appeal ( $M = 3.583$ ,  $SD = 0.664$ ) and Expert Authority Base ( $M = 3.554$ ,  $SD = 0.418$ ) were also widely used. Expert Authority Base was associated with 15 of 17 sub-dimensions, indicating that subject expertise is a key part of the management system. In the non-verbal category, only Signal Interference ( $M = 3.253$ ,  $SD = 0.509$ ) reached a high level, indicating that teachers are skilled at managing behaviour through eye contact, gestures, and proximity. However, this skill did not carry over to other non-verbal methods.
- **Moderate-Performing Sub-dimensions:** Eight sub-dimensions were in the Moderate range ( $2.50 \leq M < 3.25$ ), all scoring above the scale midpoint ( $p < .001$ ). Logical Consequences ( $M = 3.234$ ,  $SD = 0.598$ ) was the most theoretically significant in this group. Even though it was classified as moderate, it showed significant associations with all 17 other sub-dimensions. Together with Motivation, Logical Consequences acts as a second structural anchor. Teachers who use it thoughtfully tend to apply the full range of CCBM strategies.

- **Lowest-scoring Prevention sub-dimensions:** Physical Environment ( $M = 2.789$ ,  $SD = 0.602$ ) and Classroom Rules co-construction ( $M = 2.748$ ,  $SD = 0.616$ ), are especially important for practice. Both are proactive strategies that should be put in place before classroom activities begin. Their moderate scores suggest that many teachers begin classroom management without first establishing the physical space and rules that help prevent problems later. Adjacent Reinforcement ( $M = 2.986$ ,  $SD = 0.607$ ), which involves praising an on-task student to redirect another student, was the most strongly connected non-verbal strategy to GEI (correlating with 5 of 6 GEI sub-dimensions). This shows that it works through both emotional awareness and behavioural techniques.

## IV. DISCUSSION

### ➤ Verbal Fluency vs Spatial and Preventive Intelligence

Teachers in Greater Mumbai are skilled in language-based approaches such as Positive Phrasing, Motivation, Direct Appeal, and Reminders of Rules, which they use consistently and effectively. These methods share a key feature: teachers can use them on the spot without planning ahead. However, teachers are less confident with strategies that require planning, such as arranging the physical environment or working with students to set classroom rules, as well as those that require ongoing spatial awareness, such as Proximity Interference and Adjacent Reinforcement.

### ➤ Motivation and Logical Consequences: The Management Backbone

Instead of viewing CCBM as 18 separate skills to train one by one, it makes more sense to focus on these two core skills first. Once these are in place, the rest of the management system becomes easier to learn. This idea fits well with the theory. Teachers who motivate students by recognising effort, connecting lessons to their experiences, and encouraging growth help create a setting where consequences are needed less often. When consequences are necessary, teachers who use logical consequences that are fair, consistent, and directly related to the behaviour tend to manage their classrooms more effectively.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

### ➤ Implement 'First-Week Management Protocols' at the School Level

Physical Environment ( $M = 2.789$ ) and Classroom Rules co-construction ( $M = 2.748$ ) both scored low, showing a gap in how teachers start the school year. Schools should establish clear First-Week Protocols to help teachers arrange the classroom, establish class norms with students, and explain management expectations from the first day. Research shows that the first five days of school set the tone for the rest of the year (Wong & Wong, 2009).

### ➤ Develop Non-Verbal and Proximity-Based Skills

The differences between high and moderate Signal Interference scores and between moderate and low Proximity Interference and Adjacent Reinforcement scores indicate that teachers understand non-verbal management but have not yet

incorporated movement-based strategies into their teaching style. Formal workshops alone are not enough. These skills develop best when teachers participate in structured peer observation cycles, watching for movement patterns and nonverbal responses.

➤ *Establish School-Wide CCBM Frameworks with Shared Language*

Individual teachers are more effective when they work within a clear, school-wide management culture. Schools in Greater Mumbai should use a shared CCBM vocabulary and a step-by-step intervention structure, starting with Prevention, then Non-Verbal, and finally Verbal strategies. This way, students receive consistent management across all classes, and teachers can collaborate using the same language. This approach also eases the load on individual teachers and strengthens the school as a whole.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This study looked at how 673 secondary school teachers in Greater Mumbai use CCBM strategies, with a focus on specific areas that overall scores might overlook. The findings show that teachers are strong in verbal and motivational strategies, but often need to improve their non-verbal and environmental management skills. The analysis highlights that Motivation and Logical Consequences are central to CCBM, and that Expert Power closely connects with emotional intelligence. These results point to clear priorities for teacher training and professional growth. The study gives both a warning and hope. It is concerning that almost none of the teachers use strategic non-response, even though it is a proven management tool. Still, the analysis shows clear ways to improve: build motivation, use logical consequences, develop relational authority, and learn when it is best to do nothing. CCBM is more than just a theory; it is a set of skills that can be taught, and this study offers a practical guide for doing so.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2013). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- [2]. Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. (1998). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis.
- [3]. Edwards, C. H., & Watts, V. J. (2008). *Classroom discipline and management* (5th ed.). Wiley.
- [4]. Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [5]. Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory in the classroom*. HarperCollins.
- [6]. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- [7]. Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [8]. Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The perspectives of Australian school students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(3), 307–319.
- [9]. Levin, Nolan, Kerr, & Elliot (2014). *Principles of classroom management*. Pearson.
- [10]. Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. ASCD.
- [11]. Sharma, S. (2014). Classroom management and its impact on student learning. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(38), 53–58.
- [12]. Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 31(3), 351–380.
- [13]. Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Macmillan.
- [14]. Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2009). *The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher* (4th ed.). Harry K. Wong Publications.