Available online at JDR Website: http://journal.unublitar.ac.id/jdr

Journal Of Development Research, 3 (2), November 2019, Page 60-68

DOI: https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v3i2.77

Influence of Intervention Method And Intelligence to Ability Centralization Children With Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder in Inclusive Basic School

Endang Sutisnowati[(1)], Martini Jamaris, Mulyono Abudurrahman

Department of Early Childhood Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: esutisnowati_pauds306@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id

Received: 3 July 2019; Revised: 20 September 2019; Accepted: 25 September 2019

Abstrack

Conceptually the problem of education for children with special needs and special services in the setting of inclusive education is the actual problem that is needed now. Many developmental disorders that begin in infancy and can continue into adulthood. Disorders of children who can not concentrate is a multifactoral status disorder. Inclusive education is expected to solve one problem in handling the education of children with disabilities, especially children with impaired concentration and hyperactivity, or often known as ADHD. This study aims to determine and measure empirical data about differences in the ability of focus concentration of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) children who are treated with the Back in control method and the Lovaas method, by paying attention to the intelligence of students in grades 1 and 2 at Bojongrenget State Elementary School II Tangerang (Inclusive school). The basic problem in this study, is the concentration of ADHD children, therefore this study uses the method of intervention modification of Back in Control and Lovaas method with 2x2 factorial design experiments. Conclusion of Hypothesis testing, there is also a very significant interaction effect between the method of intervention Back in Control, Lovaas and intelligence on the ability to focus concentration on children with ADHD, so that a simple effect occurs, a further test (tukey test) occurs. T test results can be concluded, ADHD children with high intelligence have better concentration ability when given treatment with the Back in Control method, than Lovaas method treatment. ADHD children with low intelligence have better concentration ability using Lovaas method treatment, than Back in Control method. Thus there is a significant difference between the ability of concentration with the treatment of the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method .

Keywords: Intervention methods, Intelligence, Concentration, ADHD children

Introduction

Growth of children physically and mentally requires care, special protection, and legal protection. Therefore, education for children must provide services that are appropriate to the needs of children, and according to their characteristics. This is in accordance with the Child Protection Act (2003) in article 9 paragraph 1, namely: "Every child has the right to receive education and teaching in the context of his personal development and level of intelligence according to his interests and talents. This is in line with the Law of the National Education System (2003) article 12, paragraph b, states that every student in each education unit is entitled to receive educational services in accordance with their talents, interests and abilities. On this basis, Santoso (2004) emphasized that the Early Childhood Education Program (PAUD) is an education that determines the formation of a child's personality.

In general, children's needs can be classified into physical, emotional, social and intellectual needs. So the purpose of education is to direct and ignite a person to achieve self-actualization, which makes a person fully "human", to live out the fundamental interests of humans, equal rights and freedoms, thus creating a cultural life

that enhances the spiritual and emotional where human dignity and brotherhood become basic life.

Based on direct observation through the pattern of mentoring learning in the early classroom thematic learning at SDN Bojong Renget, several problems were found, which should receive special attention by teachers and parents, namely: 34% of children lack Children lack of understanding and pay less attention to the learning process, with indicators like nosy, annoying with friends, not doing and or not finished in doing the tasks given by the teacher, running around in class, so that learning achievement has a tendency to often decline. While 39% of teachers and parents do not understand and pay attention to differences, uniqueness, needs and the level of development of children, teachers and parents do not know in dealing with children properly and or in applying rules that are not appropriate to the characteristics of children. The school environment also influences children's development, such as snacks for unhealthy children, yard hygiene, safety and comfort

Inclusive learning sets the class conditions that is prepared with a form of learning service that designed with special treatment to meet special needs in the context of mainstream education.

Based on observations, the researcher found several problems that should get special attention by teachers and parents, namely: 32% of Children lack of understanding and pay less attention to the learning process. The indicators are being noisy, bothering friends, not doing and or not completing given tasks by the teacher, running around in class. So, learning achievement has a tendency to often decline. While teachers' ability to overcome this, found that 38% of teachers and parents do not know in dealing with children appropriately and/or in applying rules of discipline that are in accordance with the characteristics of children. Deal with a decrease in learning achievement due to the disorder shows conformity with the results of the research Miller et al (2012) which states there is a significant interaction, shows that children with ADHD show a lack of focusing, greater difficulty to remember central information rather than peripheral information compared to controls.

The school environment also influences children's development, such as snacks for children who are less healthy, yard hygiene, safety and comfort. Like the results of research conducted by Sarver et al (2015) more than half of environmental factors contributing to GPPH are temporary, lasting no more than one year (one time point of research), with a balance, which is not trivial in number, being stable from preschool to grade 2.

Therefore, teachers and parents together in the handling of children with ADHD must be properly conditioned, so that the disturbance of ADHD can be resolved as early as possible, not to continue into adulthood. This is in line with the results of his research Moghaddam et al (2012), who stated in the last few decades, researchers from all regions of the world have made substantial efforts to determine the prevalence of GPPH that prevalence worldwide in children ≤18 year has been estimated at 5.3%. Thus through this research the title Influence of Intervention Method and Intelligence to Ability Centralization Children with Attention Dificit Hyperactivity Disorder in Inclusive Basic School. The fundamental problem in this study, is the concentration of ADHD children, therefore this study aims to find out empirical data about differences in the ability of the concentration of attention of children with Concentration Attention Dificit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) who get treatment with the Back in control method and Lovaas method, by paying attention to the intelligence of students.

Material and Methods

Back in Control (BiC) Method developed by Bodenhoamer (1988). This program is based on a system that is based on rules, so it does not depend on the child's desire to be obedient. The Lovaas method firstly developed by Prof. Ivaar Lovaas from the University of California, Los Angeles. Method is based on behavior modification or discrete trial training (DDT), which uses the sequence: A. B. C. A or antecedent (preoccurrence), is the provision of instructions, children are given 3-5 seconds to respond. B or behavior, is the child's response. C or consequences, is effect (Baihaqi 2006).

The basic theory of behavior modification and learning refers to behavioristic theory and cognitive theory.

According to behavioristic psychology, learning activities are marked by changes in behavior,. and educator or teacher will always be associated with behavior modification activities (behavior modification). Behavioristic theories that underlie this research include those from Pavlov, Skinner,

Thorndike, and Robert Gagne in Delpy (2009).

Table 1. 2x2 treatment by level design

	A.	
	A_1	A_2
B_1	A_1 B_1	A_2 B_1
B_2	A_1 B_2	A_2 B_2

The cognitive behavioral approach emphasis on making children (students) monitoring, managing and managing their own behavior. The cognitive behavioral approach comes from cognitive psychology, which emphasizes the effects of the mind on behavior, and techniques for changing behavior. People in cognitive learning theory, including Jean Piaget, Vygotsky and Bandura.

This research is an experimental study with the research design used in this study, is the treatment design by level 2k (2x2) with the disaggregation factor of the intervention method which is divided into the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method, and the intelligence that is distinguished by high intelligence and low intelligence on the focus ability on ADHD children.

This research design uses a 2x2 treatment by level design or 2k factorial design. The design shown in Table 1. The design is in the form of a square whose angles are formed by a combination of the independent variable (A) and the attribute / moderator variable (B) and into a combination of treatment as follows: A = The treatment method is the Back In Control method (A_1) and the Lovaas method (A_2) as an independent variable that gives treatment to the dependent variable that is the concentration of GPPH children. B = GPPH child with a high level of intelligence (B_1) and low level of intelligence (B_2) as an attribute / moderator variable. A_1 B_1= Group of children with high intelligence GPPH who were treated with the Back In Control method or who stated the combination of treatments that occur due to the application of the Back In Control method to the ability of focusing children with GPPH with a high level of intelligence. A_2 B_1 = Group of children with high intelligence GPPH who are treated with the Lovaas method. Stating the combination of treatments that occur due to the application of the Lovaas method to the ability of focusing children with GPPH with a high level of intelligence.

A_1 B_2 = A group of children with low intelligence GPPH who are treated with the Back In Control method or declare a combination of treatments that occur due to the application of the Back In control method to the ability to focus the attention of children with a low intelligence level. A_2 B_2 = A group of children with low intelligence GPPH who were treated by the Lovaas method or stated a combination of treatments that occur due to the application of the Lovaas method to the ability to focus the attention of a child with a low level of intelligence.

For this study, the population is the Bojongrenged II Elementary School (SD), Rawaburung Village, Kosambi District Tangerang Regency, Banten Province in the early grades (first and second grade). To determine certain characteristics begins the assessment data begins with a group of early classes of class council and continues in collaboration with the psychology bureau Mulyatama. The results of the psychological assessment obtained 12 children who have a tendency to ADD, especially in attention deficit disorder

Results and Discussion

The results of the study which included a description of the data of each variable at the meeting, testing requirements, testing hypotheses and discussing the results of research and limitations of the study

Table 2. General Description Of The Entire Research Data

Data Description			A		Total
			A1	A2	
B	B1	N	598.00	386.00	984.00
		Avarage	99.67	64.33	82.00
		Min	96.00	63.00	63.00
		Max	104.00	66.00	104.00
		SD	3.14	1.21	1.36
		Median	99.50	64.50	82.00
	B2	N	327.00	249.00	576.00
		Avarage	54.50	41.50	48.00
		Min	45.00	35.00	35.00
		Max	63.00	48.00	63.00
		SD	8.57	4.89	2.61
		Median	55.50	41.00	48.25

Data Description

There are four groups that will help ADHD children, namely: 1) the help group with the Return on Control method for children who have high intelligence, 2) the Back in Control method support groups for children with low intelligence, 3) the group Lovaas method assistance for children with high intelligence, and 4) Lovaas management group for children with low intelligence. A general description of the entire research data is shown in Table 2:

Testing Requirements Analysis

Normality test is a test to see whether the variables studied follow normal distribution or not. The hypothesis that applies to this test is,
Ho: The observed variables follow the normal distribution H1: The observed variables do not follow the normal distribution.
Homogeneity Test is a test to see whether the data examined has a homogeneous variety or not. The hypothesis used is Ho: The observed data have homogeneous variations H1: The observed data do not have homogeneous variations

Factorial Hypothesis Testing

Factorial analysis (ANOVA) results showed that there were significant differences between the treatment factors of the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method abbreviated with Factor A, the high and low intelligence group abbreviated with Factor B, and the interaction between the two factors was Factor A and Factor B with hypotheses as follows:

Factor Hypothesis A

H_0 : There is no difference between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method

H_1: there is a difference between the Back in Control and Lovaas method

Factor Hypothesis B

H_0: There is no difference between groups high intelligence and low intelligence

H_1: there are differences between groups high intelligence and low intelligence

Hypothesis The interaction between factors A and B

H_0: There is no difference between methods Back in Control and Lovaas method on high and low intelligence groups

H_1: there is a difference between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high and low intelligence groups.

Table 3. Results Of A Variety Of Analyzes Of The Method Of Focusing Attention On High And Low Intelligence

Result	JK	db	KT	F Count	F table	Sig.
Factor A	3504.167	1	3504.167	128.909	4.351	.000
Fator B	6936.000	1	6936.000	255.156	4.351	.000
FactorA * Factor B	748.167	1	748.167	27.523	4.351	.000
Error	543.667	20	27.183			
Total	113132.000	24				

The following are the results of a variety of analyzes of the method of focusing attention on high and low intelligence shown in Table 3:

ANOVA method it can be seen that there are significant differences in Factor A, Factor B and the interaction between Factor A and Factor B to the observed response because it can be seen from the calculated f value more than f tables in manadb1 = 1 and db2 = 20 and a significant value smaller than alpha 5% so reject H0 and it can be concluded that there are differences between the two methods namely the Back in Control and Lovaas method (factor A), and there are differences in the high intelligence group with the low intelligence group (the factor B) and there are differences in interactions between factor A and B in the observed response so that further t-test analysis can be performed because it has two treatments on Factor A, namely the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method, and Factor B, namely the high intelligence group and the intelligence group low.

Testing Criteria Using the T-Test
Factor Testing A

Hypothesis testing results of the ability to focus attention on ADHD children who are bored with the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group. The average value of the Back in Control method in the high intelligence group which is of greater value than the Lovaas method with a large enough difference is 34 so that the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group are said to have significant differences. This means that the Back in Control method at high intelligence is better than the Lovaas method T-Test Results The Back in Control Method and the Lovaas Method show that the value of t-count (th) is greater than the value of t-table (ttb) (t count: 3.061> t table: 2.473). T-test results on the final test / monitoring scores indicate that there

are differences in the ability to focus attention between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method. Thus, the final state of the ability to focus attention on ADHD children between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method occurs a significant difference.

These results indicate the provision of treatment in accordance with the characteristics of children in this case in accordance with the behavioral theory of rules that state verbal stimuli that control behavior because it specifies the consequences of certain behaviors, in certain situations. In this case, the ADHD child listens to commands, the teacher's instructions, according to Garry and Peear (2015), are called "role governed behavior" which is behavior that is controlled by the statement of a rule.

Thus the results of the ability to focus the attention of ADHD children who are treated with the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group support the behavioristic theory of Pavlov and Skinner, in Delphie (2007) which states that to change individual behavior is given a stimulus the right to get a response in accordance with what is desired and Skinner added that there are positive reinforcement or negative that can take the form of punishment and reward

Factor B testing

The data of Comparison of Focusing Ability in the High Intelligence and Low Intelligence Groups shows that there is sufficient evidence that the average of the high and low intelligence groups shows a significant difference. This can be seen in the average value in the high intelligence group is greater than the low intelligence group with a large enough difference, which is 34 so that the high and low intelligence groups are said to have significant differences. T-Test Results in the High and Low Intelligence Group (B) indicate that the value of t arithmetic (th) is greater than the value of t-table (ttb) (t arithmetic: 5.641> t table: 2.473). T-test results on the final value indicate that there is an interaction of ability in focusing attention between high and low intelligence groups. Thus, the final state of the abilities of ADHD children in the ability to focus the attention of high intelligence and low intelligence groups occurs significantly.

The ability to focus attention on ADHD children becomes good if the method of intervention is applied, adjusted to the level of intelligence, so that children gain new experiences so that children can have the ability to adjust to their environment. This is in accordance with Piaget's theory in Asroi (2007), namely intelligence as a special form of organism adjustment, can only be known thanks to a process called assimilation and accommodation. The process of treatment and training for concentration shows the ability of the intelligence level. This process is in accordance with Piaget's cognitive theory in Jamaris (2010) about intelligence, that intelligence develops through the quality of cognitive structures. This is supported by Edward Thorndike's statement that reveals intelligence is the ability of individuals to provide an appropriate (good) response to the stimulation they receive. With the existence of a significant level of difference supported by the results of research conducted by Widayanti et al (2012) the results of the study showed that in students (children) with specific learning difficulties learning strategies are needed in accordance with the intelligence capacity of children. So that children will be more motivated to achieve success.

T-test results on the final value indicate that there is an interaction of ability in focusing attention between high and low intelligence groups. Thus, the final state of the abilities of ADHD children in the ability to focus the attention of high intelligence and low intelligence groups occurs significantly. This can be explained by the average value produced by the two different groups, where the group of high intelligence has a higher value than low intelligence, meaning that children with ADHD have higher intelligence than low. Testing factor B, it can be concluded that $F_{oAB} > F_{tab}$ or H_0 is accepted, it means that there is a difference in the average concentration ability of the high intelligence group and the low intelligence group

Interaction Testing

The result of Interaction Testing shown in Table 4. Based on the interaction testing table, it can be concluded, that $F_{oAB} > F_{tab}$ that is, there is a

Table 4. The Interaction Testing Table

Factor A	Factor_B	Mean	F count it	Value F table	Signif icant	Information
Back In Control Mwthod	High Intelligence	99.667				
	Low Intelligence	54.500	27.523	4.351	0.000	Take effect
Metode *Lovaas*	High Intelligence	64.333				
	Low Intelligence	41.500				

very significant interaction effect between factor A (intervention method) and factor B (intelligence) on the ability to focus attention on ADHD children. Due to the significant interaction effect there is a simple effect. Thus a further test (t-test) occurs, in other words a simple effect must be tested.

The results of this study indicate that there is an effect of interaction between the Back in Control method with the Lovaas method and high and low intelligence on the ability to focus. These results support the theory of constructivism in Asroi (2007), arguing that interactions with various objects and events affect and understand patterns of handling and against these objects and events. Likewise, Bandura's social cognitive theory also supports the results of this study that states in Jamaris (2010), a reciprocal determinant model that consists of three main factors, namely (1) behavior, (2) person (cognitive), (3) environment. These three factors interact to influence learning. Environmental factors influence behavior, person/cognitive factors influence behavior, and cognition influences the environment and vice versa.

The intervention method which consists of Back in Control and Lovaas methods can be applied to high and low intelligence groups. In the explanation of factorial analysis, factor A and factor B has a significant influence on the ability of concentration of attention in children. This proves that there is a significant interaction between factor A and Factor B. Related to the interaction between factor A (intervention method) and factor B (intelligence) in accordance with Skinner's theory, which at the conclusion of the theory, that the response a person receives is because the stimuli given will interact with each other and the interaction between the stimuli will affect the response resulting from.

This supports the theory of Jamaris (2009), which states that the handling of ADHD children with behaviorism-based behavior modification, especially carried out on children with low intelligence. Whereas in children with ADHD whose intelligence is normal or above normal using a cognitive-behavioral approach.

Therefore ability is very needed in providing services to ADHD children, so teachers before providing treatment services need training to get a better understanding, such as the results of research stated by g Liang and (2016), that training More effective teachers in ADHD must be implemented to prepare teachers for challenging assignments. Because there is a significant interaction effect there is a simple effect, so a further test (t-test) occurs, in other words a simple effect or simple effect must be tested, namely:

A_1B_1 dan A_2B_1

Hypothesis testing results of the ability to focus attention on GPPH children who were treated by the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group. T-Test Results of the Back in Control Method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence Group, The significance value of the t-test is 0.000 where the value is less than 5% so it can be concluded that sufficient evidence of the average Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group shows a significant difference. T-Test Results of the Back in Control Method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence Group with the results of the final treatment / monitoring calculation of the Back in Control method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence group, the t-count (th) is 25.709. This shows that the value of t arithmetic (th) is greater than the value of t table (ttb) (t arithmetic: 25.709> t-table: 2.968). T-test results on the final test scores indicate that there are differences in the ability to focus attention between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group.

The results of this study support the theory underlying the Back in Control method and the Lovaas Method. In this case the Lovaas method is one of them in accordance with Thorndike's theory, known as connectionism theory or association theory which has laws of learning, namely the law of readiness, the law of practice and the law of effect. Whereas the Back in Control method is more in line with the cognitive learning theory of Piaget, Bandura that children build their own knowledge from their own experience with their environment. In addition, the Back in Control method is able to change or reduce hyperactive behavior, the lack of concentration of attention, therefore the Back in Control method is also in accordance with cognitive behavior theory (cognitive behavior). Associated with Santrock (2008) cognitive factors (in his study of cognitive factors that are emphasized is self affrication or belief someone can master the situation and produce positive results and bring influence on behavior.

A_1B_2 dan A_2B_2

Hypothesis testing results of the ability to focus attention on GPPH children who were treated by the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group. T-

Test Results of the Back in Control Method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence Group. The significance value of the t-test is 0.000 where the value is less than 5% so it can be concluded that sufficient evidence of the average Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group shows a significant difference. T-Test Results of the Back in Control Method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence Group with the results of the final treatment / monitoring calculation of the Back in Control method and the Lovaas Method in the High Intelligence group, the t-count (th) is 25709. This shows that the value of arithmetic (th) is greater than the value of t table (ttb) (t arithmetic: 25.709> t-table: 2.968). T-test results on the final test scores indicate that there are differences in the ability to focus attention between the Back in Control method and the Lovaas method in the high intelligence group.

The results of this study support the theory underlying the Back in Control method and the Lovaas Method. In this case the Lovaas method is one of them in accordance with Thorndike's theory, known as connectionism theory or association theory which has laws of learning, namely the law of readiness, the law of practice and the law of effect. Whereas the Back in Control method is more in line with the cognitive learning theory of Piaget, Bandura that children build their own knowledge from their own experience with their environment. In addition, the Back in Control method is able to change or reduce hyperactive behavior, the lack of concentration of attention, therefore the Back in Control method is also in accordance with cognitive behavior theory (cognitive behavior). Associated with Santrock (2008) cognitive factors in his study of cognitive factors that is emphasized is self efficacy or belief someone can master the situation and produce positive results and bring influence on behavior.

A_1B_1 dan A_1B_2

Hypothesis testing results of the ability to focus attention on GPPH children who were treated by the Back in Control method in the high and low intelligence groups. The results show that the average evidence of high intelligence and low intelligence groups in the Back in Control method shows a significant difference. This can be seen in the average value of the high intelligence group in the Back in Control method which is of greater value than the low intelligence group with a large enough difference, which is 45 so that the high intelligence group and low intelligence in the Back in Control method are said to have significant differences.

Final Test T-Test Results Back in Control Method in the High and Low Intelligence Groups. Based on the results of the calculation of the final value of high intelligence and low intelligence on the Back in Control method it is known that the t-count (th) is 12,117. This shows that the value of t arithmetic (th) is greater than the value of t table (ttb) (tcount: 12,117> t table: 2,968). T-test results on the final value indicate that there are differences in ability to focus attention between high and low intelligence groups on the Back in Control method. Thus, the final state of the ability to focus attention on ADHD children in the high intelligence and low intelligence groups there is a significant difference in the Back in Control method.

The results of this study indicate that the high intelligence group treated with the Back in Control method has higher concentration ability than the low intelligence group, after controlling for initial abilities. These results support the brain -based learning theory according to Jensen (2011), namely that what is very good for the brain is challenging, new, and complex tasks, demanding intense and multi-task thinking. Eric further stated in his theory of learning coaches, namely teachers provide analogues by offering substance so that students fill their own containers, putting teachers back in the framework as more than learning coaches.

The theory is in accordance with the Back in Control Method which is based on a system of rules that is timed and carried out strictly which is not dependent on the child's desire to be obedient. Children are given the freedom to choose an activity, and are carried out jointly between parents, and the school (teacher) in the treatment of giving treatment, monitoring and evaluation, so that it can change the child's behavior well.

The concept of the Back in Control method which requires strict rules, consistency and the existence of penalties and rewards is very suitable for ADHD children who have normal or high intelligence. This is in accordance with the theory of behavioristic-cognitive learning. Davison (2006), namely the existence of operant conditioning to improve social and academic behavior. Whereas intensive behavioral intervention can be as effective as Ritalin combined with operant programs.

A_2B_1 dan A_2B_2

Hypothesis testing results of the ability to focus attention on ADHD children who were treated with the Lovaas method in the high intelligence and low intelligence groups. The data shows the average value of the high intelligence group on the Lovaas method is of greater value than the low intelligence group with a large enough difference, that is 23 so that the high intelligence and low intelligence groups on the Lovaas method are said to have significant differences.

T-Test Results Final Assessment of the Lovaas Method in the High and Low Intelligence Groups. Based on the calculation of the final value of high intelligence and low intelligence in the Lovaas method it is known that the t-count (th) is 11. This shows that the t-count value (th) is greater than the value of t-table (ttb) (t count: 12,117>table: 2,968). T-test results on the final value indicate that there are differences in the ability of concentration between the high and low intelligence groups on the Lovaas method.

The results are in line with the basic concept of the Lovaas method, which is a behavior modification method that can reduce excessive behavior by giving a negative feed back, that is, it can be with the word "no", a disappointed face, shaking his head, or others. For groups of high intelligence with repetition the child will dislike and become saturated, according to the theory of brain-based learning, that the brain adapts based on experience, if the experience is not stimulating, it causes boredom or boredom. While the application of the Lovaas method is more in line with the group of children with low intelligence ADHD.

The results of this study which stated that the group of children with high intelligence ADHD who were treated by the Lovaas method showed higher concentration of attention ability than the group of children with low intelligence ADHD with the same method of treatment, namely the Lovaas method. This is in accordance with the theory of behavior modification of cognition sourced from cognitive psychology proposed by Santrok (2008: 292), which states that the cognitive behavioral approach emphasizes making children manage, regulate their own behavior, not through external factors

Conclusion

Normality testing using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method on the ability to focus attention which includes the Back in Control method, Lovaas method and high intelligence and low intelligence. the test results obtained that the assumption of normality has been fulfilled because the significance value in each method of the concentration of observed ability is greater than alpha 5%. While homogeneity testing using the F Test on the concentration of attentiveness results obtained that the homogeneity assumptions were not fulfilled because the significance value on each method of concentration of the observed ability was smaller than alpha 5%. Based on the results of the hypothesis test with ANOVA which is continued by the difference test whose research was carried out at Bojongrenged II Elementary School, Kosambi District Tangerang, by using the treatment (intervention) and intelligence variables on the ability to focus attention on children with ADHD, it can be summarized as follows:

Concentration results of ADHD children who are treated using the Back in Control method are higher than the ability to deny attention using the Lovaas method;

The result of the ability to focus the attention of ADHD children with high intelligence is better, compared to the ability to focus the attention of ADHD children with low intelligence;

There is an interaction effect between the Back in Control treatment method, the Lovaas method and high and low intelligence on the ability to focus attention on ADHD children;

In the group of ADHD children who have high intelligence are treated with the Back in Control method, the result of their concentration ability is higher than the group of children of ADHD who have high intelligence given the Lovaas method;

In the group of ADHD children who have low intelligence given treatment with the Back in Control method, the results of their concentration ability is higher than the group of children of ADHD who have low intelligence given the Lovaas method; and

In the group of ADHD children of high intelligence who were treated by the Back in Control method, the results of the ability of concentration of the child was higher than that of the children of ADHD of the high intelligence group who were treated by the Lovaas method

In the group of children with low intelligence ADHD who were treated by the Lovaas method, the results of the ability to focus their attention was lower than those of children with low intelligence ADHD who were treated with the Back in Control method.

Suggestion

Teachers should be better able to stimulate and practice the ability to focus attention on ADHD children on an ongoing basis, develop treatment in child-centered learning, and teachers are expected to make a variety of exercises and methods that are appropriate to the characteristics of the child, and always work together with parents in dealing with problems children in learning .

References

Amanda C. Miller & at all, (2012) *Reading Comprehension in Children with ADHD: Cognitive Underpinnings of the Centrality Deficit,* Published online: 11 October 2012 Springer Science+Business Media New York.

Asroi Mohammad, (2007) *Study Psychology*, CV Wacana Prima, Bandung.

Albert Ellis in Gerald. C Davison at. All (2006), *Abnormal Psychology, Limited liability* Company Raja Gravindo Persada, Jakarta,

Bodenhamer. Gregory, (1988) *Back In Control* Pretince Hall Press, New York.

Baihaqi MIF & Sugiarmin M, (2006) Understanding Children ADHD, Bandung Rafika Aditama.

Costrie Ganes Widayanti, et. al, (2012) Profile of Intelligence in Students with Learning Difficulties in SD Gisikdrono Semarang, Faculty of Psychology, Diponegoro University Prof Sudharto. Bachelor of Law campus Tembalang, Semarang, 50275, *Jorrnal psychology Undip* Vol. 11, No.1, April.

Delphie. Bandhi, (2009) *Hyperactive Children's Behavior Services*, Yogyakarta, Intan sejati,

Dustin E. Sarver at all, (2015) *Hyperactivity in Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD): Impairing Deficit or Compensatory Behavior?* Published online: 12 April 2015 # Springer Science+Business Media New York.

Eric Jansen, (2011) Translator Benyamin Molan, *Brain Based Learning, New Teaching Paradigms Limited liability* company Indeks, Jakarta,

Gerald.C Davison et al, (2006) *Psychology Abnormal, tick to 9*, Limited liability Company Raja Gravindo Persada, Jakarta.

Habibolah Taghizade Moghaddam, at al, (2014) Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in Children: A Short Review and Literature, Mashhad University of Medical sciences, Mashhad, Iran, *International Journal of Pediatrics,* Vol.2, N.4-3, Serial No.12. (http:// ijp.mums.ac.ir

Jamaris Martini. (2010) *Difficult Learning Difficulties, Assessments and Countermeasures,* Jakarta, foundation Penamas Murni.

J. Piaget (1988) *Between Actions and Thoughts,* language transfer by Agus Cremers (2008) tick to 2 Jakarta, Gramedia,

Limeng Liang and Xuesong Gao, Pre-service and In-service Secondary School Teachers' Knowledge about Attention-deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Attitudes toward Students with ADHD, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education,*2016VOL,63,NO.3,369–383 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2015.1123231

Martin Garry, Joseph Pear, (2015) *Behavior Modification, Meaning and Its Application,* Learning Library, Yoyakarta.

Santrock, JW. (2001) *Educational Psychology,* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Santoso Sugeng (2004), *Early Childhood Education Programs* (Educational Imagery Jakarta,

Santrock. John W, (2008) *Study Psychology* Second Edition, Jakarta, Kencana.