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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of the Good Behavior Game on reducing the amount of out of seat and talking out behavior of a group of fourth and fifth grade urban elementary school students with Specific Learning Disabilities. A changing criterion design was used over a six-week period. Baseline was taken on out of seat and talking out behavior of the target students in the lunchroom. Interobserver agreement was taken approximately 1.5 times per week and averaged 79% for teams A and B. During The Good Behavior Game, an interdependent contingency was used to change target behaviors. The lunchroom monitor completed a questionnaire regarding her perceptions of each students’ ability to perform out of seat behavior before and after the intervention. The students completed a pre and posttest to rate their perceptions of their ability to perform target behaviors. Results of this study suggest that the Good Behavior Game was an effective tool for helping children reduce out of seat and talking out behaviors. However, several limitations and poor social validity affected the results.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

An important aspect of schooling for students is to interact successfully with peers during informal settings, such as mealtime. Along with recess and occasional field trips, lunch time in the cafeteria provides an opportunity for students to make new friends and maintain existing relationships. Lunch time should be a time when students can interact peacefully between classes.

However, children with specific learning disabilities have challenges in social situations, including school lunch. Children with learning disabilities often have difficulty with reading facial affect or displaying socially acceptable behavior (Dodge & Coie, 1987). Consequently, lunch time for this population can be a time of stress and anxiety as well as a time when these students may be punished for displaying inappropriate behavior.

Ironically, the consequences that many children with learning disabilities face due to inappropriate behavior removes them from the very settings in which they need practice displaying appropriate behavior. For example, children with learning disabilities are often ostracized or picked
on by other students. This kind of treatment can cause a negative spiral of students acting out due to hurt feelings.

Teachers and school staff are constantly searching for effective ways to help children behave appropriately. Proactive approaches to behavior modification are positive tools because the goal of such interventions is to reinforce appropriate behaviors as they occur. One example of a proactive approach to helping children emit appropriate behavior is The Good Behavior Game (Barrish, Saunders & Wolf, 1969). Essentially, children are reinforced for helping each other to emit desired behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review contains five sections. First, literature that substantiates the challenges with social skills that children with specific learning disabilities tend to have will be discussed. Shaping students' responses through reinforcement will be shared next. Third, training students to emit desired behavior through direct instruction will be explored. Subsequently, three contingency systems will be defined and compared. The Good Behavior Game (Barrish, Saunders, & Wolf, 1969) will be discussed. Social validity will be explored. Finally, the purpose of the study and research questions will be shared.

There is evidence in the literature to support the notion that children with Specific Learning Disabilities have great challenges displaying appropriate social behavior (Asher & Parker, 1987; Fox & McNeil, 1987;
Knapczcyk, 1988). According to Sabornie and Beard (1990), people with poor social skills tend to have low social status (Ray, 1985; Sabornie & Kauffman, 1985, 1987), rarely spend their free time with others (Deshler & Schumaker, 1983; Sabornie, Thomas, & Coffman, 1989), are generally unhappy with their relationships (White, Schumaker, Wamer, & Desh, 1980), and have challenges attaining friendships (Zetlin & Muttaugh, 1988).

Woody (1969) found that children most likely to be placed in classes for special education had more challenges with social skills and excessive talking. These skills are considered extremely important for students with learning disabilities to gain access to general education settings. Further research has demonstrated that the mastery of seemingly insignificant behaviors, such as staying in one's seat, may prove significant as a functional skill in the child's future (O'Leary, 1972).

Society has unspoken rules and behavior conventions that impart a person’s social acceptance. Displays of inappropriate behavior lead people to shun or admonish those exhibiting inappropriate or annoying behavior. Children with specific learning disabilities are often unaware of how their behavior affects others' perceptions of them or do not think through consequences of inappropriate behavior (Pearl, Bryan, & Donahue, 1983). For example, children who talk loudly, excessively, or use inappropriate language may be offensive to their peers. Moreover, children who constantly shift in their seats (without permission) are disruptive to children.
who have already formed a seating arrangement. As a result, situations like lunch time that are supposed to be pleasant times to interact become times when relations are strained. Consequently, opportunities for social development are diminished.

Reinforcement

Mealtimes are an opportunity for students with learning disabilities to socialize with each other and their typically developing peers. Unfortunately, students with learning disabilities often have great challenges meeting acceptable levels of behavior from their peers and teachers. For example, one researcher found that students with learning disabilities are often rejected due to their inappropriate behaviors (Knapczyk, 1988).

Literature has supported the notion that children who are able to perform target behaviors and understand desired levels of performance often need a catalyst to begin emitting the appropriate kind and amount of behaviors. Reinforcement procedures that are anchored in Direct Instruction and Group Oriented Procedures have been demonstrated to be effective (Stevenson & Fantuzzo, 1984; Litow & Pumroy, 1975).

Direct Instruction

According to Kronick (1978), one of the main reasons that children with mild disabilities have challenges in social situations, like eating with others, is because they lack knowledge of how to emit appropriate social behaviors. Allen, Gottseig, and Boylan (1982) also linked the notion that the likelihood of students
emitting appropriate behavior as long as the behavior is "... in their repertoires."

In other words, unless a student is taught how to perform a behavior he or she will be unlikely to perform it. This is concurrent with much of the literature that suggests that students with learning disabilities often do not perform target behaviors due to lack of explicit instruction. Examples of programs of social skills training include: ACCEPTS, (Walker, McConnel, Tolmes, Walker, & Golden, 1983) Skills Streaming, (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1984) Social Skills in Class, (Stephens, 1978) Think Aloud, (Camp & Bash, 1981) and ASSET (Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman & Sheldon-Wildgen, 1981).

Aside from commercially obtainable programs, direct instruction in mealtime behavior has been attributed to more appropriate mealtime behaviors for children of various ages and disabilities (Balogh, 1983; Feinberg, 1980; Gardner, 1981; Knapczyk, 1988; Ng, 1980; Short, 1982; Strain, 1976). Each of these studies included teacher modeling, role playing, and opportunities for students to practice target social behaviors. Specifically, several researchers have found that teaching and reinforcing appropriate verbalizations was effective for improving mealtime behavior (Knapczyk, 1988; Ng, 1980; Short, 1982). These studies support the notion that children with disabilities should be taught directly and reinforced for emitting target behaviors.

However, Long and Williams (1973) pointed out that cognition and even knowledge of how to perform a given behavior are not necessarily related. The students they studied were aware of the target behavior and goals related to the
target behavior yet they still did not perform the target behavior. Knowledge of expected behavior may be necessary, but not sufficient for performance of behavior. While social skills training, coupled with reinforcement for appropriate behavior, appears to be a necessary component for target students’ achieving appropriate behavior, it may be too costly to use alone. That is, the time it takes for students to acquire and master behaviors may preclude them from opportunities to act appropriately with peers. Moreover, the lunchroom environment is one where students often instigate and react to behavior of others. Given this characteristic of the target setting, it is logical to pursue an intervention with some component that has a great likelihood of promoting a desire for shared (positive) outcomes. Dependent, independent and interdependent group contingencies are three approaches.

Contingency Systems

Litow and Pumroy (1975) distinguished three types of contingency systems. The dependent contingency system allows a group to earn reinforcement depending on the performance of a single target student for desired behavioral goals. Independent contingencies are implemented to the extent that each member of a group may attain reinforcement based on individual goals. One common example of an independent contingency is the use of a contract system for a student to earn grades based upon the amount and quality of work completed. Finally, interdependent group contingencies are behavioral systems that make reinforcement contingent on the performance of the group of students selected.
Research clearly shows that dependent and interdependent group contingencies have been effective in improving social or mealtime behaviors of students with disabilities (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Sabornie, & Beard, 1990; Strain, Shores, & Kerr, 1976). According to researchers, dependent and interdependent group contingencies have advantages that include, but are not limited to, peer reinforcement (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Smith & Fowler, 1984), cooperation (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Smith & Fowler, 1984), efficiency (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Speltz, Shimamura, & McReynolds, 1982), and the facilitation of students’ coming into contact with naturally occurring social contingencies of reinforcement (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Smith & Fowler, 1984; Speltz, Shimamura, & McReynolds, 1982).

More importantly, dependent and interdependent group contingencies appear to be conducive to groups as well as individuals’ being motivated to emit desired behavior. Long and Williams (1973) noted that the implementation of a group contingency resulted in “spontaneous peer tutoring.” This finding is quite significant as it suggests that children may not have to be directly taught or pressured unnecessarily to ‘cooperate.’ Moreover, the spontaneity of peer interaction is an added bonus as it allows children more time to interact on positive levels - which is a much needed factor for many children with learning disabilities. Secondly, group contingencies have been shown to produce positive outcomes for the entire group in both general and special education (Gresham & Gresham, 1982). In a study that compared group and individual contingency systems, Gresham and Gresham (1982) found that the group contingency system created a
sense of, "...group solidarity and cooperation... (p. 109)" because they were striving to achieve a shared goal. One may draw the conclusion that children may transfer this team spirit to other aspects of their classroom interactions.

Some may question the notion of using dependent or interdependent contingencies on the basis that certain classmates may be scapegoated due to their responsibility for a team losing a chance to earn reinforcement. However, several researchers have noted that 'peer harassment' toward classmates who may have contributed significantly to a team not earning reinforcement simply was not a factor (Fishbern & Wasik, 1981; Litow & Pumroy, 1975). Litow and Pumroy (1975) attributed the lack of peer reprisal to the fact that, "...only the scores and not the names of the students were reported to the group (p.193)."

**Independent Vs. Dependent and Interdependent Group Contingencies**

Interdependent and individual contingency systems have been compared within the context of academic as well as social behavior. Though some studies have indicated both systems are equally effective in eliciting target behaviors from students (Grandy, Madsen, & De Mersseman, 1979; Soloman & Tyne, 1981), literature has borne out the fact that interdependent contingency systems are more effective in some instances.

**Academic Performance**

Researchers have compared the effects of individual and group contingencies on the academic performance of students. Studies indicate that while both contingencies are successful in eliciting target academic responses, interdependent group contingencies are either equally or slightly more effective.
than independent contingencies. For instance, Lloyd, Eberhardt, and Drake (1996) compared the effects of individual and group reinforcement contingencies with the goal of improving students' vocabulary quiz scores. Participants included seventeen students in a first-year Spanish class. An ABAB experimental design, alternating between no contingencies, group, and individual contingencies was used. The researchers noted that, "...on average, across the class, group contingencies produced performance superior to individual contingencies (p. 189)."

Another study compared the effects of no contingency, interdependent, and independent contingencies on improving the spelling performance of six second and third grade students with learning disabilities in a resource room. Although the researcher could not claim any, "...functional or clinical difference in performance under the various conditions (p. 53)," the interdependent contingency system was more effective for the third grade class than the independent contingency (Schlairret, 1982).

Social Skills

Nevin, Johnson, and Johnson (1982) compared the effects of no contingency, group and individual contingencies on academic performance and social relations of special needs students using several A-B-A designs. Subjects included four first-graders, 11 seventh-graders, five ninth-graders, and five first-graders. The students were placed in special education programs due to challenges with academic achievement and continuous inappropriate behavior toward their peers. The results showed that the interdependent contingency
proved far more effective than the no contingency and individual contingency interventions. Moreover, the interdependent contingency system was said to, "...promote higher achievement, more appropriate classroom behavior, greater social acceptance by non handicapped peers, and higher self-esteem (p. 41)."

In a study that compared the effects of dependent and interdependent group contingencies on the aggregate behavior of groups, dependent and interdependent contingencies proved superior (Gresham & Gresham, 1982). A modified reversal design was used to determine the effectiveness of each contingency system for 12 students with developmental disabilities ages six to ten years. Target behaviors included out of seat, verbal or physical aggression, and/or throwing objects. Gresham and Gresham (1982) noted that independent group contingencies used were not as effective as interdependent and dependent group contingencies. Gresham and Gresham hypothesized that low levels of reinforcement were responsible for the reduced effectiveness of the individual group contingency model on ameliorating lunchroom behaviors of target students. In other words, reinforcement based on individual vs. group performances was rare because target individuals could not meet the reinforcement goals; hence, the schedule of reinforcement was too thin.

In a study that compared the effects of group and individually contingent free time with inner-city junior high school students on reducing the number of out of seat, and inappropriate noise behaviors, Long and Williams (1973) noted that, "...lessons and tokens did not produce high levels of desired behavior (p.465)." Instead, both individual and group contingencies that offered free time as a
reinforcer significantly increased the number of desirable behavior. Moreover, the group contingency proved the most effective of the intervention in terms of reaching desired goals for target behaviors.

Interdependent contingency systems have shown to be effective methods for eliciting desired academic and social behavioral goals. More students are likely to benefit from interdependent contingency systems because reinforcement is contingent upon the performance of the group versus one individual. Unlike direct instruction, interdependent contingency systems require little time to implement and operate. Finally, children benefit from the spontaneous peer tutoring and cooperation that appears to happen as a result of the implementation of group contingencies.

Social Validity

According to Wolf (1978), social validity refers to whether an intervention is socially significant and is determined by soliciting evaluative data from participants in a given study. Three factors are considered. First, the, “...social significance of the goals” is questioned, or do the goals match what people actually desire? Second, the, “...social appropriateness of the procedures” is considered, or do the people involved in the intervention view the method as appropriate? Third, the, “social importance of the effects,” or are the participants ‘satisfied’ with the outcome (Wolfe, p. 207, 1978). For instance, Wolf (p. 210, 1978) cited a study by Kent and O’Leary (1976) that subjective data from parent and teacher surveys
tended to reflect objective data that showed improved behavior of target students.

The social validity of this intervention was determined through the use of a pre and post teacher survey as well as a pre and post test regarding target students’ perceptions of appropriate lunchroom behavior. Opinions regarding student performance of appropriate lunchroom behavior before and after the intervention were also assessed. The lunchroom monitor, who had no part in the intervention nor saw any data relating to the intervention, completed a pre and post intervention questionnaire regarding her perceptions of the students’ ability to elicit the target behaviors (See Appendix B).

Purpose of the Study

Acting appropriately at mealtimes is an important social skill. Studies have shown the powerful effects of using social skills training to reduce inappropriate mealtime behavior (Balogh, 1983; Feinberg, 1980; Gardner, 1981; Knapczyk, 1988; Ng, 1980; Short, 1982; Strain, 1976) and/or using social skills training in the context of a group contingency to increasing the number of appropriate mealtime behaviors (Gresham & Gresham, 1982; Sabornie & Beard, 1990; Strain, Shores, & Kerr, 1976).

Interventions that encourage students to work together to meet a common goal of reducing inappropriate behavior have been shown to achieve reduction in inappropriate behavior as well as being less ‘costly’ in terms of time and implementation. For example, Barrish, Saunders, and
Wolf (1969) successfully demonstrated a reduction in childrens' inappropriate behavior by using the Good Behavior Game. Children were rewarded based on how well they were able to meet criteria for reducing unwanted behavior. The advantages to groups working together to meet common goals are numerous; increased opportunities to develop leadership skills, increased desire to work as 'teams,' increased opportunities to develop positive peer relations, and increased opportunities to develop positive teacher student relations.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of the Good Behavior Game using an interdependent contingency system on the mealtime social behavior of preadolescent school students.

Summary

Children with learning disabilities face challenges acting appropriately in social situations like school lunch time. Educators are continually seeking proactive ways to encourage students to act appropriately. Shaping students’ responses through reinforcement has been shown to be a powerful tool in eliciting desired behavior. While direct instruction can be highly effective in helping subjects to emit desired social behavior, teacher time and energy to implement such programs is often costly.

There is much literature that supports the idea that contingency systems are not only effective in helping subjects emit desired social responses, but they are less costly to implement than direct instruction.
Most literature comparing no contingencies with independent, dependent, and/or interdependent contingency systems found that interdependent contingency systems are equal to or slightly more successful than the other systems in eliciting desired behavior for subjects. Due to the nature of interdependent contingency systems, the entire class is likely to benefit from an intervention (e.g., emitting desired response as well as increased teamwork).

Research Questions

1. What are the effects of the Good Behavior Game on decreasing inappropriate mealtime behaviors (e.g., staying in seat, inappropriate verbal behavior) of 10 students with Specific Learning Disabilities?

2. How will the students view the effects of the Good Behavior Game?

3. How will the lunchroom monitor view the effects of the Good Behavior Game?
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This section contains five sections. The subjects, setting, and experimenter are described. Next, the dependent variables are defined. Procedures to ensure accuracy and believability are discussed. Fourth, materials used in the study as well as the experimental design are presented. The procedure, which included: a lunchroom monitor questionnaire, a student pretest, baseline, the intervention (Good Behavior Game) and student posttest is discussed.

Subjects

Participants in the study included 10 children ages 9 to 12 with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) that participated in a resource room program at an urban elementary school. Subjects for this study were chosen based on the classroom teacher and lunchroom monitors' recommendation of which students need to improve two mealtime behaviors (out of seat and inappropriate verbal behavior). These verbal recommendations came as a result of informal observation of the class during lunch time.
Setting

The study was conducted in a large urban elementary school in Ohio. Due to the fact that over 500 children attend the school, lunch was served four times during the day at half hour intervals beginning at 11:30 a.m. Lunch was served in a cafeteria that measures approximately 80 square meters. Approximately one hundred and twenty students children sat in assigned cafeteria style tables, (according to room number) although no seating assignments per table exist. There were 10 rectangular bench style lunch tables. The target students always ate at the same table of the cafeteria at 1:00 p.m. daily. So as not to create a confounding variable, students in the study sat in assigned seats. Each rectangular lunch table measured approximately one meter across and four meters long. The students who were the targets of this study sat near a corridor that led to a main hallway. The corridor measured approximately four feet across and four meters. A stage stood approximately one meter away from the head of the table where the students sat. Two chairs were placed adjacent to one another 2.5 meters away from the edge of the stage. The curtains were kept open to allow for clear viewing of each team member (see Figure 1).

Experimenter

The experimenter is a masters student in specific learning disabilities at The Ohio State University with a bachelors degree in International Relations from the University of Southern California. Prior to
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applying to The Ohio State University, she volunteered at a private school
for children with learning differences and worked there as a substitute in
grades K-12, although she had no teaching certificate. She has since
worked as a Lead Teacher in that school’s summer writing program. She
has taught high school students with learning disabilities in a suburban
setting as well. During Spring 1996, she was a volunteer for a pilot
research study that involved teaching social skills to urban elementary
students. Most recently, she completed her student teaching in a resource
room for students with learning disabilities at an urban elementary school.

Definition of the Dependent Variables

This study examined the number of inappropriate mealtime
behaviors that the group makes during their regularly scheduled lunch
period Monday through Friday for 10 weeks. There were two dependent
variables in this study: staying in seat and inappropriate verbal behavior.

Staying in seat. The students shall sit facing the tray placed on the
table in front of them with their buttocks touching the bench at all times.
Twisting of the torso (in the context of buttocks touching the bench at all
times) is ‘permitted’ when turning to talk to the person to the immediate
right or left of the student or if the student needs to recover an accidentally
dropped object [e.g., change, utensil, wallet (said torso out of position
while buttocks remain planted on the bench; recovery period should last no
more than 1 second or a check for ‘out of seat’ will be scored)]. Finally,
students who ask (hand raised and teacher acknowledged) and/or are
permitted to get out of their seats by an adult will not be scored for being
out of seat.

**Inappropriate verbal behavior.** Inappropriate verbal behavior
consists of any verbally emitted oral language that is not allowed in a
school setting (e.g., cussing, mimicking) or talking at such a volume as to
be asked by the lunchroom monitor, other adult, and/or peer to say or
signal (e.g., index finger over closed lips, ‘shhh’ et cetera) “be quiet”. Any
noise emitted by a team member audible to the observers will be counted as
well.

**Procedures to Ensure Accuracy and/or Believability of Data**

**Observers**

The experimenter was the primary observer in this study. A
partial-interval based recording sheet was used to score the occurrence or
nonoccurrence of the dependent variables. That is, within any given
interval a behavior was recorded as having occurred if it was observed at
any time within the interval.

The classroom teacher, who earned her Master’s degree in Special
Education, served as the secondary observer. She observed and recorded
the number and accuracy of student responses by using the above
mentioned interval recording sheet. Though she had experience with
observing/recording behavioral data, she underwent a brief training period.

Training before baseline consisted of verbally discussing (and where
appropriate) modeling examples/nonexamples of dependent variables. The
taped procedure along with directions for filling out the data sheets were discussed, followed by a trial observation period. The trial observation period involved observing students at lunch given the taped cues and recording sheet. Training ended when the secondary observer matched the primary observer with an accuracy of 85% or higher for 2 consecutive sessions. Only data gathered post-training was recorded and used to determine interobserver agreement.

With one exception, observation commenced and ended at exactly the same time each day. As behavior tends to be ‘worse’ at the end of the lunch period, observation began during the last 15 minutes of lunch (1:15 p.m.). A recording sheet was used to score the number of inappropriate behaviors that occurred or did not occur in a given interval. Specifically, the sheet had 15 columns (alternately labeled A, B, A, B, etc.). Every column consisted of six boxes that each represent 10 seconds. Each box contained three dashes that represented the absence of the target behaviors. Each dash corresponded to abbreviations that matched target behaviors (talking out, TO; out of seat, OS). The observers made a perpendicular mark through the appropriate dash to indicate the occurrence of behavior (see Appendix A).

During the observation period, the observers used tape recorders with prerecorded cues to facilitate observation. Specifically, the cassettes had prerecorded tones that indicate the beginning of each 10 second interval. Watches were calibrated to insure accuracy. At exactly 1:14
p.m., the observers pressed the play button. One minute of silence ensued. The observers recorded pertinent data on the interval sheet (e.g., date, condition, observer, IOA). The observers had six consecutive 10 second intervals to observe and score the occurrence or nonoccurrence of the three behaviors for team A (half of the class). The observers then used the same procedure to monitor and score the occurrence or nonoccurrence of the three target behaviors for team B (the other half of the class). The observers continued to alternate scoring behavioral intervals between teams (marking six 10 second intervals per team) for the remainder of the observation period.

Procedural Integrity

Each day, a check list was used to ensure the procedure was the same and conducted in the same order (see Appendix B). Ten items were on the checklist. First, the students were reminded which team they belong to and to work as a team to earn the reinforcer. Second, the students were informed that each team has the opportunity to be rewarded with 10 minutes of free time contingent upon the team achieving its goal of appropriate behavior. Third, goals of behavior were related to participants orally, (Specific appropriate mealtime goals were determined after baseline has been established for each target student. Goals were determined on a weekly basis and each team was responsible for at least a 5% decrease in undesired behaviors.) Fourth, children sat and remained in assigned seats in the cafeteria. Fifth, other lunchroom staff were given no information
regarding the nature and/or participants of the study (e.g., data from data sheets), thus reducing the probability of her trying to 'help' the children. Sixth, no Direct Instruction of the target goals took place by either of the observers. Seventh, no information regarding the study was supplied to lunchroom staff. Eighth, reinforcement was always the same: free time immediately following lunch. Ninth, no other reinforcers were used to influence the behavior of any student participating in the study. Finally, team members were reminded that they needed to remain on the same team. Each day a procedural integrity check list was paired with that day's data collection sheet. Only those data recorded under conditions that the elements of procedural integrity stated above were used as actual data.

Believability of Data

With the exception of one condition, interobserver agreement was conducted at least one time per condition of the study with an average of 1.5 data points per Monday through Friday. On those days, the observers began the tape at a predetermined time. As scoring was cued by means of individual tape recorders, this startup strategy helped insure that the data collected by both observers was representative of the target behaviors emitted by each student.

Materials

- three mini tape recorders
- three sets of earphones
- three prerecorded/cued tapes
• batteries
• three watches with second hands
• interval recording sheets
• pencils
• 2 clipboards
• procedural integrity sheets
• interobserver agreement sheets
• pre/post student test
• pre/post lunchroom monitor survey

Experimental Design

A changing criterion design was used to analyze the data for this study. “The changing criterion design can be used to evaluate the effects of reinforcement or punishment contingencies as they are applied in a graduated or stepwise fashion to a single target behavior (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 1987 p. 219).” Cooper, Heron, and Heward (1987, p. 219) cited Hartman and Hall’s (1976) description of the operation of the changing criterion design:

The design requires initial baseline observations on a single target behavior. This baseline phase is followed by implementation of a treatment program in each of a series of treatment phases. Each treatment phase is associated with a step-wise change in criterion rate for the target behavior. Thus, each phase of the design provides a baseline for the following phase. When the rate of the
target behavior changes with each stepwise change in the criterion, therapeutic change is replicated and experimental control is demonstrated (p. 527).

Though data were collected on two behaviors, each behavior was graphed separately. For the purpose of this study, the design consisted of a baseline phase, in which the observers recorded the children’s mealtime behavior using the data sheet. Aside from the information given that was required for the daily procedural checklist, the children received no special instruction prior to, during, or after their regularly scheduled mealtime; an intervention condition, during which time the Good Behavior Game was implemented to gradually reduce the percentage of intervals of allowable disruptive behavior. Initially following baseline, the next condition was based on the behavior criterion, not the reinforcement payoff (e.g., Fixed ratio = 1 each day at criterion = 5% reduction of percentage of intervals of inappropriate behavior for teams A and B). Reinforcement (10 minutes of bonus free time after the regularly scheduled recess/lunch period) remained the same. Once a steady state was achieved at this behavioral criterion, subsequent phases consisting of the same intervention/reinforcement ensued relative to the behavior emitted by each team.

**Team A**

Once a steady state was achieved for team A during the first intervention, the same intervention (Intervention II) continued in a new condition with a behavior criterion of 72%, or 4% lower than the last
criterion level. After three sessions where behavior was emitted substantially below the criterion level, a subsequent condition was initiated with a behavior criterion of 40%, or 32% lower than the level in the previous condition. During the fourth condition of the intervention, the criterion level for inappropriate mealtime behavior was set 20% lower than the previous condition. Unlike the other interventions, the fifth condition required that free time be contingent upon an increase of inappropriate mealtime behavior (50%). In the final condition, free time was once again contingent upon the students emitting fewer inappropriate mealtime behaviors. The criteria set for the final condition was 20%.

Team B

During the second intervention, the criterion level for inappropriate mealtime behaviors was reduced to 70%, or 4% less than in the previous condition. In the next two conditions, the criterion level was set at 40%, or 30% less than the previous condition. The conditions were distinct because one team member's data was kept separate as it was skewing team performance). During the fifth condition, when reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting more (not less) inappropriate mealtime behavior, the criterion was set at 70%, or 30% higher than the previous condition. In the last condition, the contingency for earning reinforcement was enforced as originally planned and the criterion was set at 40% or fewer inappropriate mealtime behaviors.
Procedure

Lunchroom Monitor Questionnaire

The lunchroom monitor completed a questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of one set of three questions that asked the lunchroom monitor to rate her perception of each target student’s past performance as well as her perception regarding each target student’s ability to perform each target behavior (see Appendix C).

Student Pretest

All students in the class took 10 minutes to complete a written pretest containing a total of 6 questions. The questions were read orally and the children marked the appropriate answer (the answer choices will be read orally as well). The pretest consisted of 6 multiple choice questions that asked students to characterize their performance (e.g., sometimes, always, never) of stated target behaviors (see Appendix D).

Baseline

During baseline sessions, the children received no special instruction prior to, during, or after their regularly scheduled mealtime. Baseline was collected for 30 minutes each day during the students’ normally scheduled lunch time (1:00 p.m. through 1:30 p.m.). The observers recorded student behavior from a stage three meters from where the students were eating. During mealtime, the observers used the data sheets to record the occurrence or nonoccurrence of the two target meal behaviors (not staying in seat and inappropriate verbal behavior).
Observers ignored both pro social and/or antisocial behaviors directed toward them.

**Intervention: Good Behavior Game**

The day before The Good Behavior Game was implemented, the primary observer read the students a script to familiarize them with the intervention (See Appendix E). Each day, the researcher reminded the students which team they are on and share the goals of behavior for each target behavior. There was always a total of two randomly selected teams and team membership remained constant. The observer explained to the students that their reinforcement (10 minutes of contingent free time immediately following lunch) was contingent upon the team meeting a designated and decreasing percentage of intervals of inappropriate target behaviors (based on an average number of inappropriate mealtime behaviors recorded during baseline).

The observer reminded the students that each team has a greater chance to earn freetime if teammates help each other by emitting appropriate behavior during lunch. For example, teammates that ‘helped’ each other behave well during lunch would be more likely to score at or near the set goal; thereby increasing the probability of the team earning reinforcement. The observer also reminded the students that both teams can earn the reinforcer each time that the game is played. For example, if both teams scored a percentage of intervals of inappropriate behavior that
was at or under the designated percentage of intervals of inappropriate behavior, then each team could win.

Students always had their regularly scheduled recess from 12:30 to 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Recess time (12:30 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) was not extended or reduced as a result of playing or not playing the Good Behavior Game. Bonus free time referred to an extra 10 minutes of free time immediately following lunch contingent upon one or both teams having met the goals the Good Behavior Game.

If both teams earned bonus free time, they returned to their class and sat at a designated area and engage in free time activities (e.g., talking quietly, drawing, and/or playing games that do not require them to leave the designated area; See Figure 2). If only one team earned bonus free time, team members returned to their class and sat at a designated area and engaged in the previously mentioned free time activities Members of the team that could not meet that day’s good behavior goal sat in their assigned seats with the option of doing homework or finishing in-class assignments (any work that students do will apply to the entire class).

Social Validity

Lunchroom Monitor Questionnaire

The lunchroom monitor was given questionnaires in identical format to the questionnaire that she completed prior to the implementation of The Good Behavior Game (See Appendix C).
Student Posttest

Students were given a posttest identical in format and test taking conditions (e.g., to be read orally) to the pretest (See Appendix D).
Figure 2: Free time setting during the Good Behavior Game
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. Specifically, the information in this section includes: (a) interobserver agreement scores, (b) use of the procedural checklist, (c) each teams’ scores for the dependent variables emitted within the lunchroom setting, (d) data from the pre and post surveys submitted by the lunch monitor, (e) data from the pre and posttests submitted by the target students, and (f) a summary.

Interobserver Agreement

Interobserver agreement was checked eight times throughout the study. Interobserver agreement checks made up 28% of the total data collected. Table 1 displays the percentage of complete agreements recorded by the primary and secondary observer across each criterion condition. Interobserver agreement for inappropriate mealtime behavior for team A was 88%. Interobserver agreement for inappropriate mealtime behavior for team B (talking out and out of seat) was 69%. The combined interobserver agreement for inappropriate mealtime behavior for both teams A and B was 79%, range 68% to 93%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Percent for Team A</th>
<th>Percent for Team B</th>
<th>Percent for Teams A and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Percent Agreements 88 69 79

Table 1: Interobserver Agreement Scores for the Dependent Variable
Procedural Checklist

Each day that the experimental conditions were in effect, the experimenter used a procedural checklist to ensure that the independent variable was being implemented. In other words, the list was used to confirm that when The Good Behavior Game was claimed to be in effect, it was actually in effect (See Appendix B). The checklist contained 10 items: students were told: which team they were on, to remain on the same team, the contingent reinforcer, the goal of the behavior, and to remain in assigned seats. Other items on the checklist included, no other reinforcers were used, reinforcement was the same, staff were not given information regarding the study, data was not shared with the staff, and no Direct Instruction of target behaviors took place. Unfortunately, interobserver agreement data was not able to be collected on the independent variable over the course of the study.

Team A Results for Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Talking Out Behavior and Out of Seat Behavior)

Figure 3 shows Team A’s results across all conditions of The Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team A’s median percentage of intervals where the target behavior occurred was 79%, range 31% to 98%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 7%, range 7% to 14%. This represented a 72% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 14%, range 7% to 22%. This represented a
Figure 3: Total Percentage of Intervals of Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Talking Out and Out of Seat) for Team A
65% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 12%, range 7% to 19%. This represented a 67% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 8%, range 7% to 12%. This represented a 71% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 91%, range 82% to 100%. This represented a 12% increase in inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 14%, range 7% to 21%. This represented a 65% decrease compared to baseline.

Figure 4 shows the average number of intervals for talking out and out of seat behaviors for Team A across all conditions of The Good Behavior Game. During baseline, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 33, range 13 to 41. During GBG1, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 3, range 3 to 6. This was 11 times less the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 2, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 6, range 3 to 9. This was 5.5 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 3, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 5, range 3 to 8. This was 6.6 times less than the median
number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline.

During GBG 4, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 3, range 3 to 5. This was 11 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 5, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 21, range 34 to 42. This was 1.57 times less than the median number of inappropriate behaviors compared to baseline. The median number of inappropriate behaviors during GBG 6 was 6, range 3 to 9. This was 5.5 times less than the median number of inappropriate behaviors compared to baseline.

**Team A Talking Out**

Figure 5 shows Team A’s results across all conditions of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team A’s median percentage of intervals was 12%, range 11% to 34%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 5%, range 0% to 6%. This represented a 7% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 7%, range 2% to 17%. This represented a 5% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 12%, range 6% to 14%. This represented no change compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 6%, range 6% to 12%. This represented a 6% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting
Figure 5: Total Percentage of Intervals of Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Taking Out) for Team A.
inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 12%. This represented no change of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 6%, range 5% to 21%. This represented a 6% decrease compared to baseline.

Team A Out of Seat Behavior

Figure 6 shows Team A's results across all conditions of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team A's median percentage of intervals was 74%, range 24% to 99%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 7%, range 0% to 7%. This represented a 67% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 7%, range 5% to 10%. This represented a 67% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 1%, range 0% to 10%. This represented a 73% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 2%, range 0% to 5%. This represented a 72% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 78%. This represented a 12% increase in inappropriate behavior compared to baseline.
Figure 6: Total Percentage of Intervals of Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Out of Seat) for Team A.
When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 5%, range 2% to 36%. This represented a 69% decrease compared to baseline.

**Team B Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Talking Out and Out of Seat)**

Figure 7 shows Team B’s results across all conditions of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team B’s median percentage of intervals was 74%, range 98% to 60%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 42%, range 30% to 50%. This represented a 32% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 45%, range 29% to 60%. This represented a 29% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 41%, range 19% to 67%. This represented a 33% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 25%, range 21% to 38%. This represented a 49% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 87%, range 76% to 98%. This represented a 13% increase in inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 21%, range 15% to 34%. This represented a 53% decrease compared to baseline.
Figure 7: Total Percentage of Intervals of Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Talking Out and Out of Seat) for Team B.
Figure 8 shows the average number of intervals for talking out and out of seat behaviors for team B during all conditions of the Good Behavior Game. During baseline, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 31, range 25 to 41. During GBG1, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 18, range 13 to 21. This was 1.72 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 2, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 19, range 12 to 25. This was 1.63 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 3, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 17, range 8 to 28. This was 1.82 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 4, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 11, range 9 to 16. This was 2.81 times less than the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. During GBG 5, the median number of intervals of inappropriate behavior was 32, range 32 to 41. This was .96 times less than the median number of inappropriate behaviors compared to baseline. The median number of inappropriate behaviors during GBG 6 was 9, range 6 to 14. This was 3.44 times less than the median number of inappropriate behaviors compared to baseline.
Figure 8: Average Number of Intervals of Talking Out and Out of Seat Behavior for Team B.
Team B Talking out Behavior

Figure 9 shows Team B’s results across all conditions of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team B’s median percentage of intervals was 38%, range 14% to 63%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 29%, range 29% to 41%. This represented a 9% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was in introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 44%, range 26% to 44%. This represented a 4% increase compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 36%, range 12% to 64%. This represented a 2% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 17%, range 17% to 21%. This represented a 21% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 50%. This represented a 12% increase in inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 14%, range 6% to 24%. This represented a 24% decrease compared to baseline.

Team B results for Out of Seat Behavior

Figure 10 shows Team B’s results across all conditions of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). During baseline, Team B’s median percentage of
Figure 10: Total Percentage of Intervals of Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior (Out of Seat) for Team B.
intervals was 45%, range 98% to 9%. During GBG 1, the total median percentage of inappropriate behavior fell to 2%, range 0% to 21%. This represented a 43% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 2 was in introduced, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 12%, range 0% to 14%. This represented a 33% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 3 was in effect, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 6%, range 2% to 14%. This represented a 39% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 4 was implemented, the median percentage of inappropriate behavior was 10%, range 5% to 17%. This represented a 35% decrease compared to baseline. When GBG 5, a condition where reinforcement was contingent upon students emitting inappropriate behavior, was introduced, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 68%. This represented a 23% increase in inappropriate behavior compared to baseline. When GBG 6 was implemented, the median percentage of intervals of inappropriate mealtime behavior was 17%, range 2% to 21%. This represented a 28% decrease compared to baseline.

**Lunchroom Monitor Questionnaire**

The lunchroom monitor completed identical questionnaires regarding her perceptions of the childrens’ ability to stay in their seats before and after the implementation of the Good Behavior Game. Table 2 shows the results of the questionnaire that the lunchroom monitor completed prior to the inception of the Good Behavior Game.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The child is capable of doing this task. 100
2. The child knows that this is a rule that should be followed. 100
3. The child performs this task consistently. 90 10

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
N = Neutral
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 2: Results of the Monitor Pre/Post Survey: Percent of the Lunchroom Monitor's Perception of the Students' Ability to Stay in Seat Prior to and after the Implementation of the Good Behavior Game.

The lunchroom monitor believed that 100% of the subjects were capable of remaining in their seats and that 100% of the subjects knew that staying in seat was a rule to be followed. Furthermore, she believed that 90% of the students followed the rule consistently. The results of the questionnaire that the lunchroom monitor completed following the study are shown in Table 2. The lunchroom monitor indicated that 90% of the subjects were capable of remaining in their seats, representing 10% less
than the initial questionnaire. She thought that 100% of the subjects knew that staying in one's seat was a rule to be followed. She believed that 80% of the subjects followed this rule consistently, a 10% decrease compared to her response to the initial questionnaire.

Children's Pre and Posttest

Eight of the ten subjects completed identical pre and posttests with regard to their perceptions of how they performed target behaviors. Each question asked the subjects to rate their behavior in a given situation one of three ways: sometimes, always, or never. Table 3 shows the results of the subjects' responses prior to and after the implementation of the Good Behavior Game.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Talking Out</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Seat</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Talking Out</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talking Out</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Out of Seat</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Out of Seat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Percent of Students’ Perceptions of their Ability to Perform Target Behaviors Before and After the Implementation of the Good Behavior Game.

The first question was related to talking out behavior. The results in Table 3 show that, for the first question, 25% of the students believed that they used clean language sometimes and 50% of the students believed that they used clean language all the time. This is in contrast to the posttest, in which 38% of the students said that they used clean language sometimes and 13% said that they used clean language all the time. The difference between subjects who said they never used clean language before and after the study was 25%. That is, when the second test was administered, 2 times as many students reported that they never used clean language.
The second question was related to in seat behavior. For the second question, 75% of the students remarked that they remained in their seats sometimes and 25% of the class said that they always remained in their seats during lunch. This is in contrast to the posttest, which indicated that 63% of the students believed they stayed in their seats sometimes, a 12% drop in appropriate behavior compared to the pretest. Moreover, 13% of the class completing the posttest confirmed that they remained seated all the time, which represented a 12% drop in appropriate behavior compared to the pretest answer to the second question. The number of responses that indicated the children never remained in their seats during lunch rose 25% compared to the pretest.

The third question related to talking out behavior. Of those responding, 25% mentioned that they sometimes yelled when yelled at, 13% said that they always yelled when yelled at, and 63% said that they never yelled when yelled at. The results of the posttest for this question reveal that 50% of the respondents shared that they sometimes yelled when yelled at, indicating a 25% rise in unacceptable behavior. Twenty-five percent of the students mentioned they always yelled when yelled at, an increase of appropriate behavior 12% compared to the pretest. The results of the posttest revealed that the percentage of students who believed they never yelled when yelled at was 38% less than during the pretest.

The fourth question was related to talking out. Results from the pretest indicate that 50% of the students sometimes verbally retaliated
when verbally assaulted. Results from the posttest indicate that 63% of the students sometimes say mean things back to classmates, a 13% rise in unacceptable behavior. The children's' answers to the fourth question on the pretest indicates that 13% always retaliate, which is 12% more appropriate responding compared with the identical question on the posttest. Thirteen percent of the children said that they never, 'say mean things back.' Data for the fourth question of the pretest show that 38% of the children believed they never verbally retaliated when mean things were said to them. Thirteen percent of the respondents to the posttest for question four indicated they never said mean things back to their peers when provoked, indicating a 12% drop in appropriate behavior.

The fifth question is related to out of seat behavior. During the pretest, 38% of the subjects indicated that they sometimes waited until the teacher gives permission to get out of their seats. This is in contrast to the responses from the posttest, which indicated that 63%, or 25% more students sometimes wait for the teacher to give them permission to get up before they actually leave their seats. Fifty percent of those students responding to the pretest believed that they always waited until they were allowed to get out of their seats. This is in contrast to responses from the posttest, which indicated that 25% of the class believed that they always waited until they were given permission to leave, showing a 25% drop in the appropriate response.
The sixth question was related to out of seat behavior. Data from the pretest indicate that 13% of the students sometimes left their seats when verbally provoked. Compared to the posttest results for the identical question, the results indicate a 12% rise in unacceptable behavior. Data for both the pre and posttest indicated that no students always left their seats when verbally provoked. Eighty-eight percent of the students who responded to the sixth question of the pretest indicated that they never left their seats when verbally provoked, compared to 75% of students responding to the posttest. This finding indicates a 13% drop in appropriate behavior.

Informal discussion with the students after the study was complete with regard to how the children felt about being watched revealed that the children unanimously did not like being observed while they ate. One child described it as ‘creepy.’ However, all the participants shared that they enjoyed earning free time as a result of playing the game. On several occasions, the teacher noted that the students looked forward to playing the Good Behavior Game. The teacher believed that the children were improving their lunchroom behavior as well.

Summary

Results of this study indicated moderate to low levels of interobserver agreement for individual and combined teams (Team A, 88%; Team B, 69%; Combined, 79%). Each day, the primary observer used a procedural checklist containing ten items to ensure that when the
independent variable was in effect, that it was actually in effect. Interobserver agreement for the independent variable was not obtained.

Data for talking out and out of seat behavior for team A indicated an average decrease in inappropriate mealtime behavior of 68% below baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6. During the brief reversal condition (GBG 5), inappropriate behavior rose 12%. Data for the average number of intervals of talking out and out of seat behavior for team A indicated an average 7.92 intervals less of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6. During the brief reversal period, unacceptable behavior rose 1.57 times compared to baseline. Data for talking out behavior for Team A show an average decrease of 4.8% during conditions 1-4, and 6. No change compared to baseline was found during the brief reversal in condition 5. Compared to baseline, data for out of seat behavior for Team A shows an average decrease of 69.6% in inappropriate behavior across conditions 1-4, and 6. During the reversal condition, condition 5, out of seat behavior rose by 12% compared to baseline.

Across conditions 1-4, and 6, data for talking out and out of seat behavior for team B indicated an average decrease of 33.4% in inappropriate mealtime behavior. During the brief reversal condition (GBG 5), inappropriate behavior rose 13%. Data for the frequency of talking out and out of seat behavior for team A indicated an average 2.28 intervals less of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6. During the brief reversal period, unacceptable behavior rose .96 times
compared to baseline. Data for talking out behavior for Team B showed an average decrease of 13.3% during conditions 1, 3, 4 and 6. Inappropriate behavior rose slightly in the second condition and increased by 12% compared to baseline during the reversal condition. Compared to baseline, data for out of seat behavior for Team B shows an average decrease of 35.6% in inappropriate behavior across conditions 1-4, and 6. During the reversal condition, condition 5, out of seat behavior rose by 23% compared to baseline.

Social validity was measured by administering a survey to the lunchroom monitor and administering pre and posttests of target behavior to the subjects of the study. Information from the lunchroom monitor survey indicated that she believed out of seat behavior was not a problem for the majority of the subjects. Data from the students’ pre and posttests revealed that many students viewed their behavior as worse than before the Good Behavior Game was implemented. Results of the posttest revealed that two times as many children believed they never used clean language during lunch. Twelve percent more respondents than those who took the pretest believed that they ‘never’ remained in their seats. Thirty-eight percent fewer subjects than took the pretest said that they never yelled back when verbally provoked. In responding to a similar question, 12% fewer students that took the pretest ‘never said mean things back’ when mean things were spoken to them. Compared to the data on the pretest, 25% fewer children who took the posttest believed that they waited for
permission to leave their seats during lunch. Finally, 13% fewer children
who took the posttest responded that they never left their seats when
verbally provoked.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This chapter contains five sections. First, the research questions will be answered. Second, limitations of the study will be presented. Next, implications for practitioners will be discussed. Recommendations for further research will be noted. Finally, a summary of the research is presented.

Research Question One

What are the effects of the Good Behavior Game on decreasing inappropriate mealtime behaviors (e.g., staying in seat, inappropriate verbal behavior) of 10 students with Specific Learning Disabilities?

Data for talking out and out of seat behavior for team A indicated an average decrease in inappropriate mealtime behavior of 68% below baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6 of The Good Behavior Game. Data for the frequency of talking out and out of seat behavior for team A indicated an average of 7.92 fewer intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6. Results of the Good Behavior Game on decreasing the amount of talking out behavior for team A were more robust for out of seat behavior compared to talking out.
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Team A’s results showed a 69.6% and 4.8% decrease in inappropriate behavior, respectively. When reinforcement was contingent upon an increase in inappropriate behavior (GBG 5), inappropriate behavior either remained the same or rose 12% compared to baseline.

Data for talking out and out of seat behavior for team B indicated an average decrease in inappropriate mealtime behavior of 33.4% below baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6 of the Good Behavior Game. Data for the frequency of talking out and out of seat behavior for team B indicated an average of 2.28 fewer intervals of inappropriate behavior compared to baseline across conditions 1-4, and 6. Both out of seat behavior and talking out were reduced for team B. The results of the Good Behavior Game on decreasing the amount of talking out behavior for team B revealed a 13.4% decrease in talking out for conditions 1,3,4, and 6 and a 35.6% decrease in out of seat behavior. When reinforcement was contingent upon an increase in inappropriate behavior (GBG 5), inappropriate behavior increased by an average of 13%, and 23%.

Overall, these data suggest the claim of a functional relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Specifically, when the Good Behavior Game was implemented across conditions and when the desired behavior changed in response to the change in the criterion, a functional relationship existed. Furthermore, when the contingency was reversed, inappropriate mealtime behavior changed in response to the change in criterion, indicating a functional relationship.
This study confirms results of other Good Behavior Game studies (i.e., Barrish, Saunders, & Wolf, 1969; Saigh & Umar, 1983; Fishbein & Wasik 1981; ) insofar as desired behavior changing in response to the implementation of the Good Behavior Game.

When Barrish, Saunders, and Wolf (1969) implemented the Good Behavior Game, a functional relationship was established between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Specifically, when the game was implemented across conditions, a decrease in disruptive behavior (e.g., talking out, out of seat etc.) in a class of fourth grade students occurred. In the present study, a similar result was attained with respect to talking out and out of seat behavior. Unlike this study, which used a changing criterion design, Barrish, Saunders, and Wolf (1969) used a design that included parts of both multiple baseline and reversal designs.

Saigh and Umar (1983) noted the effects of the Good Behavior Game on the disruptive behavior of Sudanese elementary school students. The researchers cited data that showed significant decreases in target behaviors (out of seat, talking without permission, aggression) for a class of rural Sudanese second grade students across conditions of the Good Behavior Game. Although this study did not gather data on aggression and talking without permission, similar results across conditions for the Good Behavior Game for decreasing out of seat behavior were achieved.

Fishbein and Wasik (1981) studied the effects of the Good Behavior Game on disruptive library behavior (noise making) of fourth
grade students. They noted that, "...winning the game occurred with a high frequency for both teams during each experimental phase (p.93)."

Similar results with respect to winning the game occurred with team A in the present study. Unlike the present study, the researchers reported that, "no examples of peer harassment were observed toward children who prevented their team from winning (p. 93)."

**Research Question Two**

**How will the students review the effects of the Good Behavior Game?**

According to Wolf (1978), social validity refers to whether an intervention is socially significant, and it is determined by soliciting evaluative data from participants in a given study. One aspect of social validity that Wolf (1978) discussed was whether the individuals involved in the intervention viewed the method as appropriate. Based on informal discussion with the students, this researcher found that the subjects did not view a key component of the method as appropriate (being observed while eating).

A second aspect of social validity that Wolf (1978) discussed relates to whether the participants were satisfied with the outcome. Across all behaviors and situations contained in the pre and posttests, the data indicated that the children did not believe that their in-seat and talking out behavior improved. In fact, many respondents thought that their behavior was actually worse than what they believed prior to the
implementation of the Good Behavior Game. One may infer from these results that the subjects were not satisfied with the outcome of the study.

Curiously, the subjective data on increasing appropriate mealtime behavior did not match the objective data, which clearly showed marked improvements for in seat and talking out behaviors for both teams. However, the primary observer noted several students giggling as the posttest was administered. One may speculate that several of the children did not take the posttest test seriously.

**Question Three**

**How will the lunchroom monitor view the effects of the Good Behavior Game?**

According to Wolf (1978), one important aspect of social validity is the “...social significance of the goals (p.207).” In other words, do the goals match what individuals actually desire? The goals of this study were to improve students lunch time behavior with regard to two behaviors: out of seat and talking out. A second aspect of social validity Wolf mentions relates to the, “social importance of the effects,” or are the participants ‘satisfied’ with the outcome (Wolfe, p. 207, 1978).

Because the monitor was the person most likely to observe the children during lunch, this question is best answered by referring to the results of the lunchroom monitor questionnaire. Both pre and post questionnaires ask the monitor to judge target students’ ability to remain in their seats during lunch. The presurvey indicates that, for over 90% of the
students, the lunchroom monitor believed that the students stayed in seat on a consistent basis. The post survey data revealed the monitors’ belief that 80% of the students were performing in seat behavior on a consistent basis. Based on these results, one may conclude two things. First, the lunchroom monitor did not view staying in seat as a desirable goal for the subjects. Moreover, one may infer by the decrease in the lunchroom monitor’s perception of the students’ consistency with regard to staying in seat on the final questionnaire that she was not pleased with the results of the study.

Practitioners of Applied Behavioral Analysis rely on objective to one’s perception of behavior because ‘observable’ perceptions devoid of data may be unreliable. Therefore, the monitor’s speculations, although well intended from her perspective, may have not been an accurate reflection of the students’ behavior.

Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations to this study. The first limitation is the lack of interobserver agreement for the independent variable. Due to exigent circumstances, interobserver agreement on the independent variable could not be obtained, although a check list was developed and used regularly.

Another limitation to the study with regard to social validity was that no data were obtained from the lunchroom monitor with regard to her perception of students’ talking out behavior. It is difficult to determine if
her perceptions would have matched her perceptions for talking out but data are not available to confirm her reactions.

Another factor that may have confounded the results of the study was that the location of the observers needed to be moved due to the need for traffic to flow freely through the hall next to the lunchroom. The observation was conducted from the stage in plain view of the students. This location may not have been ideal as some team members may have felt inhibited due to the placement of the observers. A more accurate unbiased record of student behavior may have been attained from a different location.

A second factor with regard to observing from the stage was that due to school activity, the curtains to the stage were closed, which meant that observation could not always take place from the same place, although careful attention was paid to observing from the same distance of the teams.

Another factor that may have confounded the results was that the teacher acted as the second observer. Though the teacher agreed not to 'punish' the students for inappropriate behavior witnessed during the observation periods, the students may have modified their behavior on days that she observed due to her authority as a teacher. Thus, the free time may not have been the only variable in effect when the class teacher was present.
Finally, during the course of the study, several students complained that they would ‘never win’ due to a disproportionate amount of inappropriate mealtime behavior exhibited by a particular team member. This particular team member often blatantly occasioned inappropriate behavior despite attempts by classmates for her to ‘be quiet,’ or to ‘sit down.’ In an effort to prevent the team members from becoming discouraged, her behavior was recorded, but it was not used to calculate whether or not the team had earned their reinforcement. So as not to ‘punish’ the child, it was decided that the student would earn the reinforcer if her team earned the reinforcer - despite her behavior. This caused confusion among the students.

Implications for Practitioners

The Good Behavior Game has been shown to be beneficial to several students in the study. The Good Behavior Game appears to be a positive approach to helping some children with learning disabilities decrease the amount of talking out and out of seat behaviors. This study had several implications for day-to-day operations of a lunchroom, for teachers who staff them, and for opportunities for generality.

One person, usually the lunchroom monitor, is responsible for enforcing rules of behavior during lunch time. The use of the Good Behavior Game is significant because its implementation distributes the responsibility of acting appropriately to the intended audience, the students themselves. That is, students are encouraged to work together to meet
positive behavioral goals. As a result, one could speculate that less time and attention could be spent resolving conflicts with students and imposing traditional consequences (e.g., lost recess, standing on the wall) on students for inappropriate lunch time behavior. Moreover, valuable transition time may be saved. For instance, lunchroom monitors sometimes admonish an entire group because of excessive cafeteria noise. The implementation of The Good Behavior may sharply reduce such occasions.

A second implication of the Good Behavior Game relates to the training of cafeteria aides and/or teachers. Traditionally, lunchroom monitors have been taught to focus most of their attention on problem behavior. Consequently, negative relationships often develop between staff and students who display inappropriate lunchroom behavior consistently. If the Good Behavior Game was implemented, then the staff would be trained to ‘catch children being good.’ That is, the focus on behavior would shift from catching students breaking rules and imposing punishments to acknowledging appropriate behavior and reinforcing it. One may speculate that positive interactions with lunchroom monitors and students would increase as a result of retraining teachers to ‘catch children being good.’

A final implication of the Good Behavior Game is the opportunity to teach social skills in settings other than the cafeteria. For instance, the game could be implemented in resource rooms, general education settings, or rooms that promote full inclusion. Besides giving students the
opportunity to hone target social skills, one may speculate that children might develop other important social skills (e.g., cooperation, leadership) as a result of playing the Good Behavior Game. This could prove especially valuable in full inclusion settings, as it might provide a first step toward positive interactions among students with and without learning disabilities.

Recommendations for Further Research

One recommendation for researchers intending to replicate this study would be to observe the children from a less direct vantage point. Also, the observer should be someone other than the classroom teacher as he or she may unknowingly be a factor with regard to children occasioning target behaviors.

A third recommendation relates to the challenge of dealing with an individual who may emit a disproportionate amount of inappropriate behaviors. The script should include a provision that states that individuals who purposely ‘ruin’ the game for their teammates will not contribute to their teams’ score but will need to meet different criterion to earn the reinforcer for themselves.

Finally, this researcher recommends that the time allotted for study be extended by several weeks to allow for maintenance and generality probes. For instance, it would be advisable to conduct the study in the beginning of the school year when students are more likely to be present and/or the school schedule has fewer changes due to special school events.
(e.g., field trips, assemblies, class celebrations). Further, data could be collected over a longer period to ascertain maintenance.

Summary

Research has shown that children with learning disabilities often have challenges displaying appropriate social behavior. Teachers are continuously seeking positive ways to help children to improve their behavior. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of the Good Behavior Game on reducing the amount of inappropriate mealtime behavior for a group of fourth and fifth grade students with Specific Learning Disabilities.

Baseline was taken on out of seat and talking out behavior of the target students in the lunchroom setting. The lunchroom monitor completed a questionnaire regarding her perceptions of each students’ ability to perform out of seat behavior. The students completed a pretest containing two sections (knowledge of appropriate situational behavior and to rate their actual lunchroom behavior).

The Good Behavior Game was implemented during the students’ normally scheduled lunch time according to the procedures on the procedural integrity list. The Good Behavior Game was in effect for approximately six weeks four to five days per week. Interobserver agreement was taken approximately 1.5 times per week. During two reversal sessions, the Good Behavior Game was implemented with
reinforcement contingent on the teams emitting greater amounts of inappropriate mealtime behavior.

After the Good Behavior Game was discontinued, the children were given a posttest. The posttest contained the same content and was administered in the same fashion (orally) as the pretest. The lunchroom monitor completed post questionnaires identical to the ones she completed prior to the implementation of The Good Behavior Game.

Despite objective data that show out of seat and talking out behaviors were reduced for both teams, the children believed that their behavior had worsened after the study had ended. The lunchroom monitor believed that at least one of the target behaviors, out of seat, was being performed consistently by the majority of the students prior to the implementation of the Good Behavior Game.

The objective results of this study suggest that the use of the Good Behavior Game may be an effective tool for helping children improve their social skills. Serious limitations (e.g., lack of interobserver agreement for the independent variable) affect the generalization of this study. Moreover, results from the students and lunchroom monitor indicate surprising social validity insofar as the data showed the students’ improvement but neither the students nor the lunchroom monitor noticed it or preferred it to baseline.
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Interval Recording Sheet for

Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior
## Interval Recording Sheet for Inappropriate Mealtime Behavior

Date: ____  Phase: ____  Observer: ____  IOA y/n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
<td>OS to TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Daily Checklist to

Ensure Procedural Integrity
Daily Checklist to Ensure Procedural Integrity

Date: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students were reminded which team they are on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students were informed of contingent reinforcer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals of behavior were related to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children will be reminded to sit/remain in assigned seats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The lunchroom monitors received no data from daily observation sheets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No Direct Instruction of target behaviors took place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No information regarding the study (except the teacher questionnaire) was supplied to the staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reinforcement (free time after lunch) was the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No additional reinforcers were used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team members were reminded that they will remain on the same team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Lunchroom Monitor

Pre/Post Survey
### Lunchroom Monitor Pre/Post Survey

**Directions:** Circle the response that best matches your opinion.  

**Date:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior 1: staying in seat during lunch.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The child is capable of doing this task.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child knows that this task is a rule that should be followed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child performs this task consistently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
N = Neutral  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree
Appendix D

Student Pre/Posttest
Student Pre/Posttest on Perception of Mealtime Behavior

1. I use clean language during lunch.
   S  A  N

2. I stay in my seat during lunch.
   S  A  N

3. When someone yells at me during lunch, I yell back at them.
   S  A  N

4. When people say mean things about me during lunch, I say mean things back.
   S  A  N

5. I wait until the teacher tells me to get out of my seat before I leave my seat.
   S  A  N

6. When people say mean things about me during lunch, I get out of my seat.
   S  A  N

S = Sometimes
A = Always
N = Never
Appendix E

Training Script for the

Good Behavior Game
Script

Good morning/afternoon!

We know that lunch time in the cafeteria is a time where we are supposed to relax and enjoy our meal with our classmates’ company. But lots of times, we end up getting stressed out because people do not always follow directions or get along.

Starting tomorrow, we’re going to learn how to play a game that will help us to get along better at lunch time. It’s called the Good Behavior Game.

Here’s the way it works. The game will be played every day at lunch. There will be two teams. Each day, both teams have the chance to earn up to 10 minutes of free time after lunch. This free time is called bonus free time. The free time is called bonus free time because it is time that you would earn after your recess and lunch period. You will never have to give up your regular recess for playing this game.

The goal for each team member will be to do two things while you sit at the table: stay in your seats and speak appropriately. Let me explain.

First, each person while eating needs to stay in his/her seat the whole time. That means your bottom stays on the cafeteria bench until the teacher says it is O.K. to get up. Second, each of you cannot cuss, yell, or talk loudly.

To repeat: the two things are: stay in your seat and speak appropriately.

Please remember, you are not competing against each other. Instead, you will be trying to match or beat a score that represents your team’s past
performance. Past performance means the score that you earned before. Your scores will be based on how your team does, so be sure to encourage your teammates to do a good job!

Now, you’re probably wondering who will keep track of all of your good behavior. Another thing that the teacher and I are going to be observing you and keeping track of each team. Even though you’ll see us, we’ll be unable to talk to you or help you. That’s to keep things fair.

The team that meets the daily goal can earn up to 10 minutes of bonus free time after lunch. Since you are not competing with each other, that means both teams could win the 10 minutes of bonus free time each day!!
Appendix F

Letter Explaining Study to Parents
February 12, 1997

Dear Parent or Guardian:

My name is Kathryn Adorno, and I am a masters candidate in Special Education at The Ohio State University. I am in the process of planning my master's research, which I hope to carry out at Fairwood Alternative Elementary School. I will be conducting the research under the supervision of Dr. Timothy Heron, a faculty member in the School of Physical Activity and Research at The Ohio State University. I am writing to you to explain my research and ask your permission to collect data on your child. The following is a description of the study, along with an explanation of your rights.

The entire class (Room 205), has been selected for this study based on informal recommendations from the class teacher, Mrs. Penn-Scott. Recommendations were based on informal discussions with the teacher and lunchroom monitor regarding the student's performance in the lunchroom. Appropriate lunchroom behavior is not only necessary for easing lunchroom management challenges faced by the lunchroom monitor, but also an important social skill that promotes positive student-teacher and student-to-student relations.

Successful research has been conducted that shown the positive effects of the Good Behavior Game on group behavior. In other words, children have been rewarded based on how well they were able to meet criteria for reducing unwanted behavior. The advantages to groups working together to meet common goals are numerous; increased opportunities to develop leadership skills, increased desire to work as 'teams,' increased opportunities to develop positive peer relations, and increased opportunities to develop positive teacher-student relations.

Specifically, my research aims to reduce the amount of three undesirable lunchroom behaviors: inappropriate verbal behavior, staying out of seat, and
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throwing objects. Your child will be assigned to a team with the goal of working together during lunch to reduce undesirable behaviors to earn reinforcement called ‘bonus’ free time. ‘Bonus’ free time refers to 10 minutes of time the children will spend engaged in free time activities (e.g., drawing, board games) in addition to their normally scheduled recess and lunch periods (12:30 and 1:00 p.m., respectively). Your child will not be asked to give up any part of his/her normally scheduled recess/lunch periods for the purpose of this study. If your child does not earn free time, he/she will have the opportunity to finish homework or board work during the ‘bonus’ free time period. The homework and/or board work will be the same for all the children; no extra work will be given as punishment for not winning the game.

A secondary goal is to determine to what extent reinforcement can be reduced and still produce appropriate behavior. Therefore, the amount of days that the children must wait to earn their ‘bonus’ free time will be extended on a gradual basis. The study will be conducted during the last 10-12 weeks of the school year. The first eight weeks, your child will participate in the study. Follow-up probes to measure whether or not the children continue to maintain their behavior will be conducted in the last 2-4 weeks of school. Your child will be observed during lunch and no instructional time will be needed.

If your child becomes upset at any time while participating in research activities, I will talk to the child about why he/she is upset. The school counselor will also be notified of the problem. If your child does not wish to participate, he/she may be withdrawn from the research study without any consequences.

You are not obligated to grant permission for the researchers to collect data on your child. Your child will not be punished in any way if you choose not to grant permission for the researchers to collect data on your child. You have the
right to withdraw consent for the collection of data on your child at any time without prejudice. Your child’s name will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, video tape, photograph, computer storage or any other form of report or presentation developed from this research.

If you are interested in granting permission for the researchers to collect data on your child for this research, please inform your child’s regular classroom teacher and sign the attached consent form.

Also attached is a release of information consent form. Permission to obtain access to each (participating) child’s school record will be necessary to obtain information regarding academic abilities, and various demographic information (see attached form). This information will be kept confidential and only used for this study to determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of this intervention for the children. If you grant permission for the collection of data on your child, please sign the release of information consent form and check which records you grant permission to disclose.

If you have any question regarding this research or the rights related to participation in this research, feel free to contact me at (614) 854-9676, or Dr. Timothy Heron at (614) 292-7632.

Sincerely,

Kathryn S. Alonso
Masters Candidate
The Ohio State University

Dr. Timothy E. Heron
Professor
The Ohio State University
Appendix G

Consent for Data Collection

in Social and Behavioral Research Form

for Parents
CONSENT FOR DATA COLLECTION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to data collection of my child in the research entitled: The Effects of a Systematic Reinforcement Schedule for Reducing Inappropriate Mealtime Behaviors.

Dr. Heron and his authorized representative, Kathryn Adorno, masters student, have explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of the data collection process. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that my consent extends only to this study and I am free at any time and to discontinue the collection of data on my child in the study without prejudice to me or my child.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: 3/5/47
Name: ____________________________
(Participant)

Signed: ____________________________
(Investigator)

Signed: ____________________________
(Parent or Guardian)

Witness: ____________________________
Appendix H

Release of Information Form
RELEASE OF INFORMATION FORM

I __________________ hereby authorize ____________________________

to release the following information to Dr. Heron and Kathrym S. Adorno,
Department of Educational Services and Research, The Ohio State University,
for the purpose of providing descriptive information for educational research.

___ Medical records/Current medication ___ Social History

___ Information on past services ___ Educational evaluations

___ Educational treatment information ___ Psychological
evaluations

The doctrine of informed consent has been explained to me and I understand the
contents to be released and the need for the information and that there are statutes and
regulations protecting the confidentiality of authorized information. I understand that I
may withdraw my consent for the collection of data on my child at any time by
contacting a school administrator or one of the investigators. If I choose to withdraw
my child from this study any demographic or other identifying data will be removed.

______________________________
Child's Name

______________________________ Date
Parent/Guardian Signature

______________________________ Date
Investigator

______________________________ Date
Witness

Sections
Special Education 292-9148
Sport & Exercise Sciences 292-6887
Wellness & Human Services 292-9183
Workforce Education & Lifelong Learning 202-5037

College of Education
Appendix I

Consent for Data Collection

in Social and Behavioral Research

for the Lunchroom Monitor
CONSENT FOR DATA COLLECTION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to voluntary participation and data collection of my responses to written questionnaires in the research entitled: The Effects of a Systematic Reinforcement Schedule for Reducing Inappropriate Mealtime Behaviors.

Dr. Heron and his authorized representative, Kathryn Adorno, masters student, have explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of the data collection process. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that my consent extends only to this study and I am free at any time and to discontinue the collection of data on my responses to written questionnaires in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: 3/5/97

Name: ____________________________

(Signature)

Investigator

Witness: ____________________________