Kelly you included a summary of 10 pieces of work, but need to review the difference between a **literary article and an empirical research study**. Not all of your works were research studies that the instructions called for. **Be sure to include key points of each article (purpose, research method, research design, sample, data collection instrument, results).** I do not see a clear description of how these studies individually lead to the research gap that your dissertation study will fill. You need to make sure that you look for what and who is not studied to identify a gap. Look at the recommendations for future research and the limitations to the studies. These may lead to a gap.

**Summary of Articles**

The following annotated bibliographies are referencing articles that discuss the effects of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS). As school districts work to utilize instructional time, student behavior is often a huge hindrance to maximizing instruction. George Sugai and Robert Horner (2001), from the University of Oregon, created PBIS, an initiative based on positive reinforcement and proactive awareness of behaviors. As the concern to address negative behavior rises, the determination of the best way to address this behavior is paramount to teachers, schools, and districts across the country.

Key Points of Articles

**Bradshaw, C. P., Pas, E. T., Debnam, K. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2015). A focus on implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) in high schools: Associations with bullying and other indicators of school disorder.*School Psychology Review, 44*(4), 480-498.**

The authors are well known, and respected academicians in the field of behavioral disorder psychology have written and taught extensively on the subject and been cited on many occasions. The study shows that the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports focused on studying and solving bullying issues in elementary and middle schools. Their study therefore had negligence as they neglected cases of bullying in the high school setting. The author thus studied the procedures and the programs for the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports in high school. The author in his study was able to identify that the schools that implemented PBIS had high cases of bullying. The research was exhaustive and the author included in his study 31 high schools with the aim of identifying the factors that enabled the implementation of the PBIS as well as the factors that hindered its implementation. The results revealed that the schools administrators need to make use of available data to determine the implementation of positive behavioral implementation system (PBIUS). Use of data is helpful in examining the bullying changes and school climate within a given time.

**Fitzgerald, C. B., Geraci, L. M., & Swanson, M. (2014). Scaling up in rural schools using positive behavioral interventions and supports. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 33(1), 18.**

The research by the authors has shown that the education of children with disabilities can be made more efficient by providing incentives for whole-school approaches. The study was based on the rule that has been given to the schools to adopt the positive behavioral interventions and supports to help the students whose performance is affected by their behaviors. This is so and mostly the ones with disabilities either mentally or emotionally. To implement the PBIS effectively, the study put forward the need for the knowledge of PBIS methods and discussion regarding specific school district data and practices is necessary. For instance due to the environmental challenges facing the students, like poverty, alcohol, and drug abuse, community disorganization puts the students at higher risks of developing various problems which include the emotional and behavioral problems. The above again calls for the need to develop the policies and also the procedures that would address the social, emotional and physical health to curb the developments of such behaviors on the student. The processes may include wrap-around services to service planning and delivery for students with emotional and behavioral difficulties. The procedures implemented were to help curb behavioral changes in the students. Preventing disruptive behavior, rather than reacting to it, provides the most effective and efficient system of behavior management.

**Jolivette, K., Swoszowski, N. C., & Ennis, R. P. (2013). PBIS as Prevention for High-Risk Youth in Alternative Education, Residential, and Juvenile Justice Settings. *Education & Treatment Of Children*, *36*(3), 1-2.**

The authors in their research study have put the focus on providing empirical and practical information on the PBIS framework for educators and other service providers that work with high-risk youth in alternative setting or residential in order to improve the teacher effectiveness and outcome for the youth. The article has for instance provided an overview of the goals and needs for the PBIS system in restrictive educational settings. The research studies were conducted for a significant length as it took over 15 years in an alternative setting. This study made a suggestion that the focus of the PBIS system should be in two parts; behavioral and academic. However, there were concerns as in order to implement a successful PBIS within an alternative setting there may be issues that arise. The article thus put forward and discusses the issues surrounding adapting and adopting PBIS in a more restrictive setting. Even with the issues that surround adapting and adopting the PBIS it still proved to benefit the at-risk youth and staff members. The authors encourage the use of such an intervention system in alternative education setting in order to gain increases in behavior, academics, and attendance.

**Lagana-Riordan, C., Aguilar, J. P., Franklin, C., Streeter, C. L., Kim, J. S., Tripodi, S. J., & Hopson, L. M. (2011). At-risk students' perceptions of traditional schools and a solution-focused public alternative school.*Preventing School Failure, 55*(3), 105-114. doi:10.1080/10459880903472843**

The authors through their research study have put an emphasis on how the success of positive behavioral intervention and supports (PBIS) in schools has brought it to the attention of many educators. They showed that due to the great success in school, the idea of implementing in juvenile justice setting has surfaced. The idea behind using this program thus is to help with rehabilitating youth in order for them to return to society where they belong as productive citizens. The idea of replacing punishment-based disciplinary strategies with the PBIS approach has come to question. The author found that PBIS is what is required in order to as it has a positive effect on the youth. However, there are also many components involved in the implementation of the program. Many of these components are not widely available in juvenile justice setting. The PBIS program will require adapting for secure setting to improve the effects. With these improvements better outcomes will result for the youth and staff. The main component of the PBIS program is creating a leadership team to develop and implement the program.

**Lampron, S., & Gonsoulin, S. (2013). PBIS in restrictive settings: The time is now. *Education And Treatment Of Children*, *36*(3), 161-174.**

The article purpose was to highlight how the positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) framework can make a contribution to the promotion of the goals within restrictive setting and meet the needs of the at-risk youth. The authors have made a discussion on the benefits of a PBIS which include safety for staff and youth, social, emotional, educational, other skill acquisition, and youth responsibility. The PBIS framework as is put by the authors is described as a solid, proven, but flexible support system where rules and interventions are used to best meet the varied needs in the different settings. Considering the importance the authors do suggest the key to implementation of a successful PBIS framework is community-wide involved. It is proven by their study that all the stakeholders must be willing to commit to the implementation of the system. The concept behind the PBIS system is changing the old punitive philosophies focused on control to teaching the students to better understand the reasons not to engage in concern behaviors. Through PBIS youth can be provided a structure and foundation that allows them to develop social skills and manage their behavior, allowing them to focus of making academic progress which will ultimately return them to their homes and communities.

**Mathur, S., & Nelson, C. (2013). PBIS as prevention for high-risk youth in restrictive settings: Where do we go from here?. *Education And Treatment Of Children*, *36*(3), 175-181.**

Due to the aspect that the concept of implementing a PBIS program in restrictive settings for at-risk youth is rising. The authors on the article shows how they have examined the effects of PBIS on preventing entry into the school-to-prison pipeline, identify factors that influence PBIS implementation, and creating models of professional development to facilitate implementation in restrictive settings. The authors indicated that in order to reach these goals leadership must create a long-term vision for the PBIS efforts. The above aspect has a requirement that it should be joined by research that contributes to the vision that link practices to outcomes through effective decision-making. The article is evident to be contributing to the growing literature suggesting that PBIS is a viable framework for successfully transforming punitive environments in to positive culture that are conducive to producing positive youth outcomes. Further research is needed that would work towards helping to identify risk factors for involvement with the juvenile justice system including suspension rates, expulsion, truancy, and drop out that may impact the PBIS program. Efforts to reform the system and practices in alternative education, residential facilities, and juvenile justice are going to need to factor in the framework of the PBIS and adopt a vision linking it to outcomes of effective decision-making.

**Pinkelman, S. E., McIntosh, K., Rasplica, C. K., Berg, T., & Strickland-Cohen, M. (2015). Perceived enablers and barriers related to sustainability of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Behavioral Disorders, 40*(3), 171-183.**

All the authors are well known and respected academicians in the field of behavioral disorders; this article focused on, researched and identified different factors that enable sustainability of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and support which include school administrator support. The authors indicate that the school administrator is the key player and thus is capable of implementing evidence-based practices in schools through the use of positive leadership and managerial skills. The other enabler that has been identified by the authors includes staff support and teaming. They also showed that the support from teachers and constant meeting of the staff and administrators enhances the implementation of the evidence-based practices. The above practices however may also fail to be achieved due to lack of resources, lack parents engagement, behavioral disorders, logistical barriers, competing priorities and lack of administrator or staff support. In conclusion, the authors did identify that the most important enabler staff is a buy-in. Therefore, it is important that staffs members need to be included while selecting the method of practice that a school chooses to implement the SWPIS.

**Simonsen, B., &Sugai, G. (2013). PBIS in Alternative Education Settings: Positive Support for Youth with High-Risk Behavior. *Education And Treatment Of Children*, *36*(3), 3-14.**

The purpose of the article is to discuss how similar challenges and characteristic of alternative and public schools support the use of a PBIS framework in order to support the needs of at risk youth. The PBIS framework provides the systems and tools for building a foundation of evidence-based practices for all students in general to special education and alternative setting. The importance of selecting the best evidence-based practices to be implemented is crucial. This will help to promote the successful in increasing the positive behaviors while decreasing the negative ones. The article stated that the PBIS framework may be intensified in alternative settings. It is a common misconception that all at risk youth require a tier 3 support. Research suggests that all three tiers are necessary. Yet each tier should be adapted and intensified based on the responsiveness of the student’s behavior. Continuing evidence supports the implementation of intensified proactive and positive practices with a PBIS framework to support the at-risk youth in alternative settings.

**Sprague, J., Scheuermann, B., Wang, E., Nelson, C., Joliyette, K., & Vincent, C. (2013). Adopting and adapting PBIS for secure juvenile justice settings: Lessons learned. *Education and treatment of children*, *36*(3), 121-134.**

The authors have stated clearly a rationale and guidelines that would aid the adoption and the implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) in an alternative setting. The article again has also state that the benefits that can be gained through a PBIS program for the youth and staff members. For instance their research study shows that the effective juvenile justice systems communicates, promotes, and reinforces the appropriate behaviors and limits opportunities for juveniles to interact in the problematic behaviors. The authors have found that the adoption and also the implementation strategies for the PBIS in secure juvenile justice system are in line to those put in place into the general education. The research study’s baseline measures, data, and training were provided to over 40 facilities across the United States for the study. Even though the same strategies that have been developed and implemented seem parallel in the two settings, the remaining question is will the improving conditions and quality of treatment in the secure juvenile justice facilities have an long term impact of behavioral change and be generalized into home, school, and community settings.

**Steed, E. A., Pomerleau, T., Muscott, H., & Rohde, L. (2013). Program-wide positive behavioral interventions and Supports in rural preschools. *Special Education Quarterly*, *32*(1), 38-46.**

The above article has made a description of the finding from an evaluation of program-wide positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS) in three rural preschool programs. Each of the rural preschool programs that were involved included children three through five years of age. The study was specifically focused on the students with and also those without disabilities. Following the three years of the on-site training, the technical assistance, and also the coaching support in the universal tier PBIS, the participating preschool programs increased their use of strategies and supports to prevent young at-risk children’s challenging behavior. The specific improvements in the universal PBIS practices are presented across each year of the initiative. The article thus discussed the challenges involved in implementing program-wide PBIS in rural preschools. Three measures were used to evaluate implementation of universal PBIS in each program. These measures were administered during the first, second, and third years of implementation. The findings also indicated that administrative leadership and support at the preschool, district, and state level are crucial to successful implementation. It is essential to interweave content in PBIS with support in developing and maintaining effective team processes.

**Research Gap**

All the articles have shown in their research study the aspect of research gap. First, Bradshaw, Pas, Debnam, and Johnson (2015) carried out a study which was solely focused on the issues of bullying. The study research gap is extended by the article as it is only focused on the solving of the bullying issues in the middle and the elementary schools and thus the authors never had a consideration of other educational settings. The above is with the aid of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports focused and thus it was only directed on the cases of bullying in high schools and no other settings. Bradshaw et al. thus made their studies which were specifically intended on the implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports in the high school setting. The authors’ study is thus not making full contribution to the study as their conclusion only ended with identification that the schools that implemented PBIS and in fact had high cases of bullying cases. The authors through their study show an aspect of research gap where it never had any developments on the alternative setting as it only revealed that the schools administrators need to make use of available data to determine the best way of the implementation of positive behavioral implementation system (PBIUS) for the benefit of the learners.

Fitzgerald, Geraci, and Swanson (2014) the other hand shows the research study of the authors that was solely on the education system of the children with disabilities. The study they did was rigorous and shows that their education require incentives meant for whole-school approaches for efficiency purposes. A rule mainly intended for the emotionally and mentally disabled children requires that schools need to adopt positive behavioral interventions and also supports to facilitate the students’ performance affected by their behaviors. Their study however has a research gap as it is only focused on the implementation of effective PBIS for the specific school district of special population. The authors thus had their study only mainly eyed on the development of prevention measures of the disruptive behavior due to the many environmental challenges that exist which are facing the students. The above aspect of the study thus is contributing to the research gap as the developed procedures and policies are only meant to specifically address and curb behaviors and enhance the emotional, social and physical health of the students. An example of the procedures is the wrap-around services to service planning and delivery for students with emotional and behavioral difficulties. The procedures implemented were thus exclusive and specific for the prevention of the disruptive behavior and not the reaction to it as it is assumed to be a necessary aspect of the most effective and efficient system of behavior management.

Juvenile justice is also another setting to be considered. The *PBIS as Prevention for High-Risk Youth in Alternative Education, Residential, and Juvenile Justice Settings* is an article as shown by Jolivette, Swoszowski, and Ennis (2013) has an aspect of research gap as they were only much interested and focused on the improvement of the PBIS system goals and needs and also the provision of practical and empirical information in order to improve the outcome of the youth and also the effectiveness of the teachers. The specific focus of the study is also only on an alternative setting of high-risk youths. The article thus individually is adding on the research gap as the study was only conducted on restrictive educational settings that are an alternative setting. The study however with its results made a big add on the alternative setting as a suggestion made was for the PBIS system to be in two parts that are academic and also behavioral. Again the research gap is extended further where the article discusses the issues that surround the adaptation and the adoption of a PBIS in a more restrictive setting. However, there is need to recognize the authors encouragement on the use of such an intervention system in alternative education setting in order to gain increases in behavior, academics, and attendance.

The research gap is also shown by the study on the At-risk students' perceptions mainly of the traditional schools and a public alternative school setting. Lagana-Riordan, Aguilar, Franklin, Streeter, Kim, Tripodi, and Hopson (2011) discuss in their article for instance surrounds on the success of positive behavioral intervention and supports (PBIS) in schools as it has been brought to the attention of a number of educators. The surfacing of how it is to be implemented in a juvenile justice setting is an issue of research gap. It is because of the need for the programs that would be focused on rehabilitating the youth in order to have them in the society as productive citizens. The major question thus that would demand further research perhaps is the idea of replacing punishment-based disciplinary strategies with the implementation of PBIS approach, as the author through the study found that PBIS have a positive contribution to the youth. However, the implementation is also another issue of concern as the program implementation would demand various components for it to successful. The research gap is thus evident because a good number of the components are not even available in the juvenile justice setting. In conclusion, it would for instance call for adaption to a secure setting for the improvement of the effects, which would call for studies to determine how it is going to be achieved.

Lampron and Gonsoulin (2013) focused on the restrictive setting that shows the authors’ rigorous study which had a sole focus on the promotion of goals within a restrictive setting and also meeting the needs of the at-risk youth. According to the authors suggestion, the key to implementation of a successful PBIS framework is community-wide involved, which again becomes what can be considered to be a research gap. It is because according to the study all the stakeholders must be willing to play their part and commit to the implementation of the system. The old punitive philosophies would thus need to be changed and thus teach the students to better understand the reasons not to engage in concern behaviors which can be achieved by another study.

The concept of implementing a PBIS program in a restrictive setting and the achievement of its goals needs the creation of a long-term vision for the PBIS efforts by the leadership which evidently is contributing to the research gap. Mathur and Nelson (2013) examine this idea in their study. It is because it has become an aspect which needs to be joined by a study that contributes to the vision that link practices to outcomes through effective decision-making. The article thus individually is a big player on the research gap as it holds on the need for further research helping to identify risk factors for involvement with the juvenile justice system which include suspension rates, expulsion, truancy, and drop out that may impact the PBIS program. The research and the efforts for reform would for instance need to be exhaustive enough and thus factor in the framework of the PBIS and thus adopt a vision that would be linking it to outcomes of the effective decision-making. Their study thus opened ways for the need of extra researches.

Pinkelman, McIntosh, Rasplica, Berg, and Strickland-Cohen (2015) made a contribution to study behavioral disorders also have shown a research gap. In their study different factors have been identified that enable sustainability of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and support which include school administrator support. The research gap sets in as the practices may fail to be achieved due to lack of resources, lack parents engagement, behavioral disorders, logistical barriers, competing priorities and lack of administrator or staff support. They never put forward how the above issues are going to be addressed and thus calls for a study that would focus on them and how their influence would be addressed. The authors made their conclusion that the most important enabler is staff buy-in and thus other research studies needs to be conducted to address the issue exhaustively. The authors recommendation is the need for staff members to be included while selecting the method of practice that a school chooses to implement the SWPIS.

Simonsen and Sugai (2013) which focused on positive support for students with high-risk behaviorsalso never did a conclusive research. The authors discuss how similar challenges and characteristic of alternative and public schools support the use of a PBIS framework in order to support the needs of at risk youth. Provided the necessity of the PBIS framework, the research gap is evident where the author’s emphasis is on the crucial nature of the importance of selecting the best evidence-based practices to be implemented. It needs to be considered as it will help to promote the successfulness in increasing the positive behaviors while decreasing the negative ones. The article states that the PBIS framework may be intensified in alternative settings and that there is a common misconception that all at risk youth require a tier 3 support. The authors however failed to show the ideal and the required support for the risk youth. Therefore the research gap is evident where a further research would be necessary for a continued evidence support on the implementation of intensified proactive and positive practices with a PBIS framework in order to support the at-risk youth in alternative settings.

Sprague, Scheuermann, Wang, Nelson, Joliyette, and Vincent (2013) through their research study show clearly the necessary rationale and the guidelines for the adoption and implementation of positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) in alternative settings. The article shows how the study was focused on the juvenile justice system which clearly states the benefits of effective juvenile justice systems which include communication, promotion, and reinforcing the appropriate behaviors and limits opportunities for juveniles to interact in problematic behaviors. The authors through their study found and put forward the need for the adoption and also the implementation of the strategies for the PBIS in secure juvenile justice system as they are in line to those put in place into general education. However, even though their study was rigorous the same strategies were parallel in the two settings. Therefore an aspect of research gap and the remaining question that need to be addressed is whether the improving conditions and quality of treatment in the secure juvenile justice facilities have a long term impact of behavioral change and be generalized into home, school, and community settings which lead to the avoidance of the parallel factor.

Finally Steed, Pomerleau, Muscott, and Rhode (2013) also individually contributes factors to the research gap surrounding it as it describes the finding from an evaluation of program-wide positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS) in only rural preschool programs. Therefore their study was focused on the rural preschool setting where their program included children of five years with and without disabilities. Their study made a revelation that the participating preschool programs proved to have increased their use of strategies and supports to prevent young at-risk children’s challenging behavior. The study therefore has a research gap where it was only specific on the improvements in universal PBIS practices as presented across each year of the initiative. The article thus discussed the challenges involved in implementing program-wide PBIS in rural preschools setting only. The findings also indicated that administrative leadership and support at the preschool, district, and state level are crucial to successful implementation. Therefore there is the need for an essential study which would avoid the interweaving of content in PBIS with support in developing and maintaining effective team processes.

**Conclusion**

There is a constant drive within the field of education to ensure that the needs ofall students are met in a variety of ways. Negative behavior can have a direct impact on the amount of instruction given and also the quality of the instruction within the classroom. This behavior can act as a barrier to the instruction of content knowledge for all students in the learning setting, which affects the academic outcomes for all students. As the concern to address negative behavior rises, the determination of the best way to address this behavior is paramount to teachers, schools, and districts across the country. It is important then schools to identify strategies that will help to reverse the behaviors in order to increase the academic gains.
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