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Typical teacher professional development for Tier 1 behavior support often includes a didactic, or “sit and get”, training approach. Here, teachers are provided with a brief presentation that outlines the strategy to be implemented then dismissed from the training with the encouragement to implement the strategy in their classroom. This approach often does not result in teacher implementation of the targeted strategies. A common barrier to implementation of behavior support is contextual fit, and assessment of contextual fit does not often occur in the context of Tier 1 behavior support in schools. This investigation (a) evaluated the effectiveness of asynchronous virtual training on a participant’s ability to list the action steps to implement the Good Behavior Game (GBG) and a variation of the GBG, the Caught Being Good Game (CBGG), (b) identified teacher perceived barriers to implementation of the (GBG) and the (CBGG), and (c) identified teacher preference for the GBG or the CBGG and reasons for that preference.
Results indicated that seven of the ten participants were able to correctly describe components of the GBG and CBGG. Qualitative analyses of interview transcripts revealed a variety of barriers to implementation of the GBG and the CBGG as well as a variety of actions and supports needed to neutralize barriers to implementation. Data indicated that 4 of the 10 participants preferred the GBG over the CBGG. Implications for practice and directions for future research are described.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Perceived Barriers to Implementation of the Good Behavior Game:
An Exploratory Investigation
Nicole Lovell

Typical teacher professional development for Tier 1 behavior support often involves a “sit and get” training approach. Here, teachers are provided with a brief presentation that outlines the strategy to be implemented then dismissed from the training with the encouragement to implement the strategy in their classroom. This approach often does not result in teacher usage of the strategies, such as behavior supports, presented during the training session. A common challenge to teacher usage of behavior support is the match between the critical components of the strategy and the values, skills, and available resources of those who are implementing, or using, the behavioral support. An assessment of these factors does not often occur in the context of universal, or whole class, behavior support in schools. This investigation (a) evaluated the effectiveness of a pre-recorded video virtual training on a participant’s ability to list the action steps to implement the Good Behavior Game (GBG) and a variation of the GBG, the Caught Being Good Game (CBGG), (b) identified teacher perceived barriers or challenges to implementation of the (GBG) and the (CBGG), and (c) identified teacher preference for the GBG or the CBGG and reasons for that preference. Results indicated that seven of the ten participants were able to correctly describe components of the GBG and CBGG. Qualitative analyses of interview transcripts revealed a variety of barriers to
implementation of the GBG and the CBGG as well as a variety of actions and supports
needed to address the barriers to implementation. Data indicated that 4 of the 10
participants preferred the GBG over the CBGG. Implications for practice and directions
for future research are described.
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Introduction

Tier 1, or universal behavior support, includes a variety of evidence-based classroom management strategies, such as explicit instruction of school rules, providing reinforcement for rule following and error corrections for rule violations, and group contingency arrangements (Fallon et al., 2014; Pokorski, 2019; Hagermoser Sanetti et al., 2018). Tier 1 behavior support is implemented by teachers with the goal of preventing problem behavior from developing and addressing minor to moderate levels of problem behavior that already exists in the classroom. Common Tier 1 strategies include: establishing structure and predictability through manipulation of physical environment and designating classroom expectations and routines, explicitly teaching classroom procedures, utilization of engagement strategies when delivering instruction, reinforcing appropriate behaviors, and correcting problem behaviors using a continuum of supports (Hagermoser Sanetti et al., 2018). Some group contingency arrangements can also be conceptualized as Tier 1 behavior support. One such group contingency is the Good Behavior Game (GBG).

The Good Behavior Game and Caught Being Good Game

The GBG was first used in educational settings as a classroom management strategy to address student problem behavior (Barrish, Saunders, & Wolf, 1969). Since this time, the GBG has been extensively researched with participants of varying ages and in a variety of contexts and settings. For example, the GBG has shown to produce decreased out of seat behavior and talking out in kindergarten classrooms (Donaldson et al., 2011), decreased rates of disruptive behavior in kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, and 4th grade
classrooms (Galbraith et al., 2017; Harris & Sherman, 1973; Lannie & McCurdy, 2007), and decreased off-task behavior in 3rd grade classrooms (Pennington & McComas, 2017).

The GBG is an interdependent group contingency that has four core elements: establishing and reviewing classroom rules or behavioral expectations, use of team membership, monitoring of student behavior, and teacher reinforcement of students meeting designated expectations (Bowman-Perrott et al., 2016). Implementation of the GBG in early research studies focused largely on tallying frequency of problem behavior, and more recent literature has explored a variation of the GBG where reinforcement is provided contingent on appropriate/desired behavior.

Data from more recent studies have demonstrated that reinforcement of positive behaviors yielded effective results in decreasing student problem behavior and increasing student academic engagement (Bostow & Geiger, 1976; Wright & McCurdy, 2012; Wahl et al., 2016; Tanol et al., 2010). The Caught Being Good Game, or CBGG, is the variation of the GBG where students are provided points based on displays of positive behaviors during a designated interval. When the CBGG is in effect, student on task behavior has been shown to increase and problem behavior decrease (Tanol et al., 2010; Wahl et al., 2016; Wright & McCurdy, 2012). Research has clearly documented the effectiveness of both the GBG and CBGG in improving student behavior in classroom settings. Despite the effectiveness of these Tier 1 behavior support strategies, a well-documented challenge is how to best support teachers in implementing these strategies in their classrooms without ongoing support of researchers (Collier-Meek & Sanetti, 2014; Sanetti et al., 2019).
Supporting Teacher Implementation

Staff training methods to support fidelity of implementation of behavioral interventions in applied settings include direct methods (e.g. Behavioral Skills Training; BST) where participants receive descriptions of required steps, facilitator modeling of actions, and participant practice with performance feedback until mastery criterion is reached. Direct training has been used to train teachers on GBG (Poduska & Kurki, 2014) and research indicates that direct training resulted in higher treatment integrity over alternative methods (Sterling-Turner et al., 2001).

Despite the effectiveness of direct training methods, these resource-intensive training methods are not feasible for schools. There are a variety of constraints related to time and the availability and expertise of coaches who can provide direct training which limit a school’s ability to provide such extensive training and support to teachers. In schools, the most commonly used method to train teachers is a didactic, “sit and get”, format. Characteristics of didactic training include a facilitator providing participants with critical elements of the strategy and providing examples of implementation methods (e.g. scripts, lists of resources, charts, and checklists for implementation). Didactic training methods may be employed in face-to-face training meetings as well as asynchronous or synchronous virtual professional development sessions. Regardless of the setting for the didactic training, participants may or may not be active in the training process as practice and feedback is not consistently included, especially in asynchronous virtual training sessions.

Given the current COVID-19 pandemic and health guidelines in place, the number of people who may be present in a face-to-face didactic training session in
limited. This further limits a school’s ability to provide extensive training and support to teachers because schools must use synchronous or asynchronous virtual professional development models to provide training to teachers on implementing classroom-based strategies. Therefore, additional investigation is necessary to determine how to maximize the effectiveness of virtual didactic training on teacher implementation of Tier 1 behavior support.

In addition to training methods, various contextual barriers impact a teacher’s ability to implement Tier 1 behavior support with sufficient fidelity. According to Long et al., 2016, barriers exist at different levels of implementation: a) the intervention itself (e.g. time required, materials required, rate of behavior change); b) the organizational context (e.g. coaching support, time allocated to planning implementation, communication, access to supplies); c) implementer variables (e.g. perceptions of implementer and recipient, skill proficiency, willingness to implement, perceptions of compatibility); and, d) external environmental factors (e.g. competing initiatives, stakeholder support, consistency of policies). Therefore, strategies must be incorporated that support ease of implementation in order for teachers to maintain effective levels of treatment integrity. Systematically identifying and then addressing these barriers through targeted implementation echo the concept of contextual fit, or the extent to which the intervention aligns with the skills, values, and resources in a given setting (Albin et al., 1996).

Implementation planning has been researched as a method to support teachers in implementing behavior support in their classrooms (Fallon et al., 2014; Hagermoser Sanetti et al., 2018; Long et al., 2016; Sanetti et al., 2014). Implementation planning
includes a 16-step protocol where a consultant or coach works with the teacher to identify implementation barriers then completes coping planning where the teacher and consultant determine potential modifications to the intervention in order to address the barriers listed by the implementer during the discussion (Fallon et al., 2015). The implementation planning literature provides an exciting avenue to pursue in the context of improving the implementation of Tier 1 behavior support strategies in classroom settings.

**Literature Review**

I used PsycINFO via EBSCOhost to complete a search for articles using key words for the dependent variables. First, I searched using the key words *Good Behavior Game* and *GBG* and limiting results with an age range of *childhood (birth-12 years)* and *school age (6-12 years)*, which yielded 136 articles from academic journals. These 136 articles were then screened for inclusion. Inclusion criteria included those that highlighted social validity and teacher preference of GBG in general education settings. The articles that will be cited to support the proposed study include 6 articles related to the setting of the study, 6 articles that addressed coaching and training of the GBG, and 3 articles that studied social validity of the GBG.

**Efficacy of GBG**

The GBG and CBGG have been researched in various grade levels and ages of participants. This includes kindergarten and first grades, (Joslyn et al., 2019; Tanol et al., 2010; Bowman-Perrott et al., 2016; Donaldson et al., 2011; Lannie & McCurdy, 2007) and second through sixth grade classrooms (Leflot et al., 2010; Pennington & McComas, 2017; Warner et al., 1977; Harris & Sherman, 1973; Kosiec et al., 1986). Each of these
studies indicated that implementation of GBG resulted in improvement of student outcomes. This included an increase of student academic achievement and reduction of student problem behavior while the game was in effect (Flower et al., 2014; Galbraith & Normand, 2017; Joslyn et al., 2019). Data indicate similar results are found using the CBGG (Groves & Austin, 2017), the variation of the GBG, which aligns to positive reinforcement models commonly used in school settings.

**Training Teachers as Implementers of GBG**

Prior research has focused on the use of direct training methods for implementation of the GBG in classroom settings (Fallon et al., 2019; Maag, 2019; Poduska & Kurki, 2014). And while this training method has been documented as effective, it is not common for a teacher to receive this intensive type of training in schools.

In order to complete a more comprehensive search for articles focusing on training methods commonly used in schools, a search using *didactic training* and *treatment integrity* was completed. This search yielded 367 results. Articles were eliminated based on the use of training methods not commonly used for teacher professional development of Tier 1 (i.e., universal) strategies in public school settings. Such methods included: direct training, behavioral skills training, use of video training, and motivational interviewing. Additional exclusion criteria included training methods utilized in supporting acquisition of skills for special education students, school staff members, or parents/caregivers. Based on the criterion for exclusion, four articles addressed the impact of didactic training on treatment integrity.
Fixsen et al. (2005) indicated variables to address to ensure high treatment integrity when implementing interventions. One indicator is providing effective professional development to the staff members providing the intervention. While data indicated that direct training methods facilitated effective treatment integrity outcomes (Mcphail, 2006; Rahn, 2009; Sterling-Turner et al., 2001), professional development provided to faculty and staff members to address universal strategies in classroom settings has been conducted using didactic training methods. Facilitators of training sessions provide an overview of the strategy, rationale for use, and possible resources and materials required for implementation. Optional components may include written instructions or troubleshooting guides for participants to access when implementing in his or her setting. Based on consistent use of didactic training, this is the initial option used for exposing participants to GBG implementation.

Finally, as a means to address low cost coaching tools, I accessed research articles related to Project PRIME I searched using the key words barrier identification, coping planning, barrier identification and treatment integrity, and coping planning and treatment integrity. This resulted in 167 articles. Items related to alternative fields, such as health care or psychology, were excluded. This limited the number of articles to one. To ensure a comprehensive search of articles related to effects of barrier identification and coping planning on treatment integrity, the research article from Sanetti et al. (2014) was entered in a Google Scholar search with citations of the article examined for application to the current study. There were 44 articles that cited the Sanetti et al. research study. From these sources, articles were excluded based on setting, person implementing and application to use of universal supports. There were 10 articles related
to implementation planning through identifying barriers to implementation and creating action plans to cope with the identified barriers.

**Purpose Statement and Evaluation Questions**

The purpose of this investigation was to identify perceived barriers to the implementation of the Good Behavior Game (GBG) and a variation of the GBG, the Caught Being Good Game (CBGG). Specifically, we were interested in addressing the following questions:

1. What barriers do teachers identify related to implementing the GBG and CBGG in their classrooms?
2. What is the primary barrier teachers identify related to implementing the GBG and CBGG in their classrooms?
3. What actions and resources do teachers identify as a way to overcome the aforementioned barriers to implementing the GBG and CBGG in their classrooms?
4. Do teachers prefer the GBG or the CBGG and what are their reasons for that preference?

**Method**

**Participants and Setting**

The investigation included 10 general education elementary school teachers from a school district located in an urban setting in the Intermountain Western United States. Participants were eligible to participate if they taught in a general education setting with
classroom enrollment of 15 or more students and had a minimum of two years of teaching experience (i.e. the participants began teaching on or before the first school day of the 2018-2019 school year). Nine participants were female, and one participant was male. Participants spanned elementary grade levels and included one kindergarten teacher, one 1st grade teacher, a teacher from a 2nd/3rd grade split, one 3rd grade teacher, and two teachers from each 4th, 5th and 6th grades. Class size ranged from 15 students to 34 students with an average of 21 students enrolled in participant classrooms.

Materials

Materials included two videos (one explaining the GBG and one explaining the CBGG), accompanying slides used in the video (see Appendix A), a recording device to record the interviews, a telephone (office phone or personal cell phone), interview questions in paper and electronic formats, and writing utensils to take notes during interviews.

Two videos were created by the student investigator, each approximately 12-15 min in duration. One video focused on the GBG and the other focused on the CBGG. Videos consisted of a slideshow with audio voiceover that described the GBG/CBBG and materials and steps to implement the GBG/CBBG. Material used in the training video was adapted from existing research listing implementation steps for the GBG (Maag, 2019). Participants were emailed the slides used in the video after they submitted the completed informed consent document.

See Appendix B for the semi-structured interview protocol. Participants were asked each question on the protocol by the student investigator. Follow-up questions
differed slightly given the nature of the semi-structured interview process. Questions posed by participants were answered by the investigator throughout the interview.

**Procedures**

Participants were invited to participate via email by the student investigator and included the PI on the email invitations. Potential participant contact information was found on publicly available school district websites. The invitation email (see Appendix C) contained information regarding the study purpose, time requirements, investigator contact information, etc., and an attached informed consent document (see Appendix D). If participants did not respond within one week, they were sent a second invitation email. After participants provided informed consent, the student investigator sent the participant links to the videos and copies of slides for each video via email and worked with the participant to set a date and time for the interview and confirm a phone number. One week prior to the interview, the student investigator sent a reminder email to participants about the previously agreed upon interview date and time (Appendix E). Participants were also reminded in this email that the interviews would be recorded by the investigator.

The student investigator called participants at the agreed upon date and time. The student investigator opened the conversation by thanking the participant for their time, telling them that their conversation would last approximately 40-60 min., and asked if they had any questions. After any questions had been answered, the investigator asked participants if they could begin recording their conversation. Once participants provided a verbal affirmation, the investigator began recording and then asked interview questions (Appendix B). Interviews followed a semi-structured format and lasted for approximately
20-30 minutes. After all interview questions had been asked, the investigator thanked the participant for their time. Once the participant hung up their phone, the audio recording was stopped.

Immediately following each interview, the student investigator uploaded the audio file to Box.com, saved it with a participant identification number, and deleted the audio file on the recording device. Once interviews with all participants were completed, audio files were transcribed by an affiliated student investigator who was CITI trained. All files (audio and transcriptions) were saved with participant identification numbers, and a single key matching participant names to identification numbers was saved on Box.com. The student investigator emailed each participant the transcript from their interview as a form of member checking (Charmaz, 2014). Participants were asked to read the transcript and confirm its accuracy. If participants indicated that any part of the transcription was incorrect, investigators checked the audio recording to resolve any discrepancies. Once participants confirmed accuracy, the key matching participants to identification numbers, the audio recordings, and any other identifying information was destroyed. All participants confirmed accuracy of the transcription following the first email, meaning there were no discrepancies.

**Data Analysis**

Transcripts of the interviews were reviewed using analyst triangulation (Patton, 2015), where transcripts were independently analyzed by investigators to discover themes arising from the data. The independent evaluation conducted by each investigator was completed by examining participant transcripts over multiple readings. Investigators used a checklist of implementation steps and components for the GBG and the CBGG (Maag,
2019; Poduska & Kurki, 2014). When participant responses were reviewed, components were checked if explicitly described during the interview. Next, investigators reviewed participant transcripts and listed the barriers to implementation as well as actions and supports needed to neutralize the barriers.

After the initial independent evaluations were completed by the investigators, a comparison of data was completed. Investigators discussed the data resulting from each participant response evaluation and identification of the trends identified from the transcripts of participant responses. Discrepancies were identified, and investigators reviewed participant transcripts to address the difference in data points.

Initial data analysis in the current investigation yielded varied responses to barriers to implementation of the GBG and the CBGG as well as methods necessary to neutralize the barriers indicated by participants. Research conducted on barrier identification and coping planning resulted in organizational categories for implementation barriers as well as needed actions and/or supports to neutralize identified barriers (Long et al., 2016; Sanetti & Collier-Meek, 2019). Investigators utilized organizational categories to filter data in the current investigation.

Appendix F lists the categories and defined components for each category that were associated with common implementation barriers and defined elements for common methods to neutralize barriers to implementation of strategies. According to existing research from Long et al. (2016), barrier identification categories included: organization, implementer and intervention. Examples of organizational barriers included having sufficient time to plan and/or implement the strategy as well as having support from leadership. Descriptors for barriers listed under the implementer category included a
willingness to implement, ability to remember to use the strategy and be consistent with implementation methods, difficulties managing the strategy, and incorporating the strategy with other requests for implementing programming in the classroom. Defined elements under the intervention category of barriers included not having access to needed materials and resources, intervention not matching the needs of the class or student, behavior change rates were not adequate, and the lack of ease of implementation.

Categories were established for common methods to neutralize implementation barriers of strategies. Coping planning categories included: environment, implementation and intervention. Descriptors of environmental factors used to neutralize implementation barriers included additional leadership support, modification of the classroom environment, and adjusting activities. Defined elements for implementation actions and supports were piloting the intervention with a smaller group, self-monitoring implementation steps, organizing materials, practicing steps prior to implementation, goal setting, and purposeful planning implementation. Examples of methods to neutralize barriers under the intervention category related to modifications in timing, components, format, and reinforcers, as well as reviewing intervention components, reteaching, and embedding the intervention in other activities or actions.

Results

Teacher Description of GBG and CBGG

Interview questions posed by the investigator asked participants to provide an overview of how to implement the GBG and the CBGG in a classroom. The purpose of the questions was two-fold: first, to determine if the participant was able to highlight the
critical components of the strategy based on the action steps shared in the training videos, and, secondly, to assess the participant’s ability to distinguish between the variations of the group contingencies so that they would be able to share implementation barriers specific to the two variations. Of the ten interviews completed, seven participants were able to distinguish between the GBG and CBGG. Based on the inability of three participants to correctly distinguish the GBG from the CBGG, only seven of the 10 responses were used in the qualitative data analysis.

**GBG**

There were thirteen implementation actions included on the checklist provided to participants as part of the materials in the investigation. On average, participants identified 47% of the listed action steps to implement the GBG in a classroom. See Table 1 for the percentage of participants who correctly described each component of the GBG. Commonly identified characteristics included: duration the GBG was played in the classroom, rules and expectations reviewed at the start of each game, two or more teams were established in an equitable manner, tally marks were issued to teams whose members exhibited the target misbehavior, behavior was consistently monitored by the teacher, and the teacher provided the winning team(s) the reward at the end of the game. Action steps that were not highlighted by participants included: the teacher explicitly designated both the start and the end of the game, the teacher reviewed the scores and provided feedback at the end of the game, and the teacher monitored data to determine effectiveness of the strategy in decreasing problem behavior.
Table 1

Percentage of Participants who Identified Components of the GBG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of the GBG</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules and expectations are reviewed at the start of each game</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams are established and reviewed at the start of each game</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more teams are established</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are distributed equitably</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates the start of the game</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tally marks are given for misbehaviors</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior is consistently monitored by the teacher</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher designates when the game has ended</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores are reviewed for each team</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided at the end of the game</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward is provided to the winning team(s)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game time is 10-35 minutes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher monitors data to determine effectiveness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Checklist items adapted from Poduska & Kurki (2014).

CBGG

There were fourteen implementation actions included on the checklist provided to participants as part of the materials in the investigation. On average, participants identified 44% of the listed action steps to implement the CBGG in a classroom. See Table 2 for the percentage of participants who correctly described each component of the GBGG. Commonly identified characteristics included: duration the CBGG was played in the classroom, the teacher reviewed the rules and expectations at the start of each game,
points are given for appropriate behaviors, the teacher consistently monitored student behavior, and the reward was provided to the winning team(s). Action items not highlighted by participants included: number of teams needed, equitable distribution of students on teams, the teacher indicated the start and end of the game, scores and feedback were reviewed by the teacher at the end of the game, and the teacher monitored data to determine effectiveness of the strategy in decreasing problem behavior. In addition, participants did not identify the critical component of using a fixed time interval to assess team behaviors. Of the seven participants who accurately distinguished GBG from CBGG, only three of the seven indicated the use of a fixed interval for positive reinforcement.

Table 2

Percentage of Participants who Identified Components of the CBBG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of the CBBG</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules and expectations are reviewed at the start of each game</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams are established and reviewed at the start of each game</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more teams are established</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are distributed equitably</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates the start of the game</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points are given for appropriate behaviors</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points are given at designated time intervals</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior is consistently monitored by the teacher</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher designates when the game has ended</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores are reviewed for each team</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided at the end of the game</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward is provided to the winning team(s)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game time is 10-35 minutes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher monitors data to determine effectiveness

Note: Checklist items adapted from Poduska & Kurki (2014).

**Perceived Barriers to Implementation**

*GBG*

There were varied responses to teacher perceived barriers to implementation of the GBG. The majority of the barriers identified by participants were categorized as barriers specific to the intervention. Next, participants listed barriers related to the category of implementer. Finally, there were a small number of barriers identified related to the organizational category. See Figure 1 for the frequency with which each theme was identified in the data.

Overall, the top three barriers included consistency, access to motivating rewards, and concern regarding whether the strategy was effective in decreasing problem behavior in the classroom. Consistency was listed under the category of implementer; access to rewards and effectiveness of behavior change were categorized under intervention barriers.

After primary barriers were analyzed, additional barriers were categorized into common themes. Barriers related to the implementer included participants’ concerns with his/her ability to provide a tally upon each instance of problem behavior while playing the GBG in a classroom and singling out students for misbehaviors. Potential barriers related to the intervention that were identified by participants included the need to identify sufficiently motivating rewards for students as well as needing a greater quantity of rewards based on playing the GBG on a daily basis, and, finally, having access to
ongoing data in order to assess the effectiveness of the GBG on student problem behavior.

**Figure 1**

*Perceived Barriers to the GBG*

![Graph showing perceived barriers to the GBG](image)

*Note:* Barrier categories adapted from Long et al. (2016).

**CBGG**

While there were various barriers shared by participants, there was less variation in responses when identifying barriers to implementing the CBGG in a classroom as compared to the variation in the response to barriers of GBG. The majority of the barriers identified by participants were categorized as barriers specific to the intervention which was the main category of barriers to the GBG. Next, participants listed barriers related to the category of implementer. Finally, there were a small number of barriers identified
related to the organizational category. See Figure 2 for the frequency with which each theme was identified in the data.

The primary barrier identified by participants related to pacing of instruction which matched the implementer category. Other barriers included in this category were the need of the teacher to stop academic instruction to provide behavioral feedback having a negative impact on the instructional delivery of the lesson, teacher’s ability to be consistent in implementing the components, providing an accurate rating at each fixed interval and possibly misconstruing points and feedback (e.g. rating boys differently from girls). Barriers related to the intervention category included participants’ concerns that the fixed interval and possible usage of a noise/beep to indicate the end of the interval would be difficult to maintain and need of a suitable timer (e.g., MotivAider) to use in lieu of a traditional noise timer or beep tape. Only one barrier was indicated related to the organization category which was having adequate time to gather baseline data prior to implementing the CBGG.
Participants provided an array of strategies to neutralize the barriers to implementation that were identified during the interview. Participants were asked to identify both teacher actions that would neutralize the barriers identified as well as additional supports needed. Examples of additional supports included funding, time, or personnel. Participants were asked to expand on additional needed supports indicated during the interview.

**GBG**

Participants indicated multiple teacher actions that neutralized the identified barriers. The actions were categorized as methods related to implementation as well as...
methods to alter the environment. One participant shared that “…a lot of those barriers I could probably hammer through on my own.” This mirrors the responses of participants who listed teacher actions to support the challenges to implementation. The main teacher action provided by participants was to preteach expectations to students. This included reviewing the conditions of the game as well as “teaching students how to react when somebody else gets a point.” Participants highlighted the need to provide positive reinforcement for appropriate behaviors in addition to marking tallies when the target behavior was observed. Participants also listed various resources within the classroom environment that could be used to neutralize barriers.

In addition to teacher actions, participants indicated a need for additional supports. Personnel was needed to track tallies for misbehavior, complete fidelity check of implementation steps, and take data to determine effectiveness of the strategy. This method was categorized as an environmental factor as it required additional leader support to arrange. On top of the need for personnel, participants identified methods categorized under implementation methods for coping planning. These included: organizing materials, such as having the necessary funding resources to purchase rewards to use when implementing the GBG in a classroom, and a need for additional time. Time was a necessary resource in order to plan implementation of the GBG, preteach expectations to the class and/or individual students, and to provide the reward to the winning team(s).

A small number of methods was identified by participants in the intervention category. This included identifying students whose behavior would not alter the points earned by the team as well as reviewing and reteaching the intervention. See Figure 3 for
the perceived teacher actions and supports needed to effectively implement the GBG in a classroom.

**Figure 3**

*Perceived Actions and Supports Needed to Neutralize Barriers of the GBG*

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Note: Actions and supports categories adapted from Long et al. (2016).

**CBGG**

Similar to the responses on teacher actions that neutralize barriers to the GBG, participants identified several methods to neutralize barriers to implementation of the CBGG. The actions were categorized mainly as methods related to implementation.

First and foremost, participants indicated the need to strategically plan when to play the CBGG in the classroom as well as the need for time in order to practice implementing the CBGG strategy before using it with students in the classroom. This
allowed for limited disruptions to instruction or specific planning of how to effectively interrupt the flow of instruction to share feedback. In addition, participants shared the need for preteaching expectations of how to play the CBGG in the classroom. Finally, participants listed a need to organize materials, such as using various classroom resources that were useful in neutralizing barriers related to location and tracking of points.

Similar to the additional supports needed, participants identified the need for access to personnel and funding to support implementation of the CBGG in a classroom. Personnel was needed to provide reinforcement at intervals, observing implementation to provide feedback, and to model implementation measures for teachers. Funding was required to purchase interval timers (e.g. MotivAider) as well as rewards for winning team(s). As with the organization of methods for GBG, these methods were categorized as environmental factors as both require additional leadership support to arrange.

Finally, participants listed a method categorized as an intervention modification to neutralize identified barriers. This included selection of an alternative intervention rather than using CBGG in the classroom. See Figure 4 for the perceived teacher actions and supports needed to effectively implement the CBGG in their classrooms.
**Teacher Preference**

Participant response to preference between the GBG and the CBGG were split. Three of the seven participants preferred the GBG; four of the seven preferred to implement the CBGG in a classroom. Benefits for the preference were similar regardless of which strategy was selected. Participants identified positive impact on decreasing problem behaviors in the classroom, ability to provide immediate feedback to students on behavior, and the teacher’s ability to be consistent through using a strategy that matched the methodology present in the classroom. When one participant was asked why the variation was preferred, the response was, “Because it would be easy, and more conducive to how I am as a teacher and an instructor.”
Discussion

The purpose of the investigation was to identify perceived barriers to the implementation of the Good Behavior Game (GBG) and a variation of the GBG, the Caught Being Good Game (CBGG) by teachers. We were interested in determining what barriers teachers identify related to implementing the GBG and CBGG in a classroom and which of those identified barriers were the primary challenge to implementation of the intervention. In addition, we wanted to assess what teacher actions and additional supports teachers identified as a means to overcome the barriers to implementing the GBG and CBGG. Finally, we wanted to assess which intervention teachers preferred, the GBG or the CBGG, and their reasons for that preference.

Data was gathered using a semi-structured interview process. Prior to conducting interviews, teachers were provided with brief informational training videos for each the GBG and the CBGG. After providing time to view the videos and copies of slides (see Appendix A), investigators conducted participant interviews. Transcripts of interviews were analyzed to determine trends and patterns in participant responses.

Results varied across the participants with each teacher identifying barriers to implementation associated with his/her specific setting and student need. Seven of the ten teachers indicated they preferred the CBGG over the GBG. Participants in the investigation identified common barriers to implementation. For the GBG, participants expressed concern for students who struggle to engage in appropriate behaviors and the impact the GBG would have on that student group. One participant shared the challenge of feeling that the teacher “…would be singing out or ostracizing a [student] for losing…” and expanded further to explain that this situation “…might exacerbate the
negative behavior…” if the student was already struggling to meet expectations. Another participant discussed the possibility that “…the students would work against each other to try to make one team lose over another or get more tallies than another.”

Despite identifying challenges to implementing the GBG, some participants indicated that it was preferred over the CBGG. Participants discussed ease of implementation based off giving tallies each time a team member displayed the target behavior. In addition, several participants indicated that implementation barriers of the CBGG outweighed those of the GBG. The main challenge associated with the CBGG was the consistent disruption during instruction. One participant indicated that it was difficult to “…wrap my head around the interruption every five minutes…” when the interval timer sounded.

Despite listing challenges associated with instructional pacing and teacher consistency as barriers to implementation to the CBGG, the majority of participants selected the CBGG as the preferred strategy. Participants who selected the CBGG cited the alignment between the action steps of that strategy to current school-wide positive reinforcement systems in place as well as the benefit to reinforcing appropriate behaviors in the classroom as the main benefits to the strategy. Additional investigation may be done to assess preference after implementation of the group contingency in an alternating treatment design. According to research by Wahl et al. (2016), participants who implemented both the GBG and the CBGG reported that the GBG interrupted instruction more frequently than the CBGG. Future research may be conducted to assess participant preference prior to and following implementation of the strategies.
Overall, participants indicated a preference for the group contingency aspect of each variation of the game. A common response to what benefits were present with the strategy was the fact that the classroom teacher was able to focus on one thing at a time based on the rules of the game. Participants highlighted the preference for teams to work together. However, participants also shared concern over creating effective and equitable teams while also meeting the COVID-related health constraints present in schools. One participant shared that in previous years, a change in seating would alleviate the barrier of equitable teams; however, under COVID guidelines, this was not an option.

Participants maintained commonalities when addressing how to neutralize barriers. Teacher actions included the use of evidence-based universal classroom management practices such as preteaching students. Additional investigation may be conducted to examine the effects of preteaching on student response to tallies in the GBG as well as student response to interval pacing in the CBGG. Additional actions included use of current classroom resources to address needs. Participants also identified similar needs for outside resources, including personnel to support in the classroom with fidelity of implementation, access to materials such as interval timers, and funding sources to purchase rewards for students.

Overall, the current investigation yielded information related to the perceived barriers to implementation of the GBG and CBGG, actions and resources needed to neutralize these barriers, and trends in the preferred group contingency variation selected by participants. These data provide some preliminary information as to how school administrators and behavior specialists can support general education teachers in implementing the GBG and CBGG in their classrooms.
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Appendices
Good Behavior Game

A classroom behavioral support strategy

Good Behavior Game

The Good Behavior Game (GBG) is a widely utilized behavioral intervention that supports a variety of classrooms/groups:

- Elementary and Secondary settings
- General education and special education students
- Whole group (class-wide) and small group situations
- Over varied subjects (P.E., math, language arts)

GBG is often selected because of its ease of implementation and impact on student behavior:

- Increased academic engagement (time on-task)
- Decreased problem behavior (e.g., disruptions such as talk outs or out of seat)
GBG

Overview of Components

- Implemented for a brief period of time (10-35 minutes)
  - Math
  - Language Arts
  - Science
- Utilized during whole group instruction
- Rules of the game are reviewed at the outset of each game
- Teams are established and reviewed
  - 2 or more teams
- Teacher monitors behavior throughout time period game is played
- Rewards are provided when the game ends - based on the rules of the game
  - Student selected
  - Teacher designated

Preplanning Recommendations

- “Define” misbehavior(s) in classroom
- Rather than “disruption,” describe what is happening (e.g. shouting out without raising hand; banging hand on desk/table)
- Rather than “off task,” consider what it looks like (e.g. students are having side conversations unrelated to content)

- Consider teams and members
- Determine where points will be tracked
- Brainstorm possible reinforcers/rewards
- Data tracking tool for daily tally count
  - Spreadsheet
  - Paper/pencil format
  - Calendar
Implementation Steps

Before the Game
- Review the rules of the game
  - Define the behavior you are looking for
  - Discuss how to “win” (e.g., any team with ___ or fewer points; team with fewest tallies)
- Review the teams
  - Balanced!
- Indicate start of the game

During the Game
- Mark a tally next to team name/number each time misbehavior is observed
- Maintain calm voice
- Be consistent with tally marks

After the Game
- Designate the end of the game
- Review the scores
- Provide feedback on what went well and what students need to work on
  - Explicitly review expected and unacceptable behaviors
  - Deliver rewards or prizes based on which team “wins”

Let the games begin...

To prepare for the 1st game:
- Take baseline data
- Create the “rules” of the game
  - Specify which misbehaviors will result in a tally for the team
- Decide how team(s) will “win”
  - Fewest number of tally marks
  - Any team earning ___ or fewer points
- Create the teams
  - Equitable distribution
- Determine period/subject/time for playing the game
  - Math, language arts, or science

Playing games 2 - ___:
- Review the “rules” of the game
  - Acknowledge appropriate behaviors from previous day and review of struggle spots from previous game
  - “Yesterday we struggled with using appropriate voice level. When we are using the wrong voice level, a tally mark will be given to that team.”
- Review how team(s) win the game
- Review the teams and members
- Give cue that the game has started
- Consistently mark tallies
  - Teams earn points without focus on individual student(s)
Monitoring the game

- Actively monitor class behavior while game is being played and give tallies based on defined inappropriate behaviors:
  - Voice level needs to be at a 0 during instruction. That’s a tally.
  - We raise our hands to be called on versus calling out an answer. That’s a tally.
  - We remain in our seats during _____ time. That’s a tally.
- Maintain calm voice
- Be consistent with tally marks
  - Use the same criteria for the same behavior for all teams
  - Provide tally marks for the behaviors you have defined as “inappropriate”
  - Add other behaviors to the next game as needed based on students’ actions

And the winner is...

To finish the 1st game:
- Designate the end of the game
  - Timer or verbal cue
- Review the scores for each team
- Provide feedback
  - What went well
  - What students need to work on (this is incorporated into the rule review the following school day)
  - Explicitly teach expected behaviors and review definitions/examples of misbehaviors
- Deliver rewards or prizes based on who “wins”
  - Winning team(s)
Needed Materials

- Poster of rules/expectations of game
- Designate teams and list names of team members
- Location to track tallies given during the game
- Rewards on hand
  - Edible items (e.g. Tootsie rolls, suckers, crackers, popsicles)
  - Tangible items (e.g. stickers, erasers, bouncy balls)
  - Privileges (e.g. extra recess time, art activity, P.E. class, lunch with the teacher)

A Note on Rewards

Teacher Selected
- Utilize what is available
- Share at the outset of the game or provide as a Mystery Motivator at the end of the game
  - Be consistent with method
- Alter the category of reward (e.g. tangible, edible, privilege)

Student Selected
- Engage students in an informal survey
- Provide options and assess preference (e.g. thumbs up/down, raise hand to vote)
- Share at the outset of the game or provide as a Mystery Motivator at the end of the game
  - Be consistent with method
- Assess preference at least once per week
### Component

- Rules and expectations reviewed
- Teams are established and reviewed
- Teacher indicates the start of the game
- Tally marks are given when identified behavior(s) are shown
- Behavior is calmly monitored by teacher
- Behavior is consistently monitored by teacher
- Teacher designates the game has ended
- Scores are reviewed for each team
- Feedback is provided at the end of the game
- Reward is provided based on the rules of who “wins”
- Game time is within guidelines
- Teacher monitors data frequently to determine effectiveness

### Resources


Caught Being Good Game

A classroom behavioral support strategy

Caught Being Good Game

The Caught Being Good Game (CBGG) is a widely utilized behavioral intervention that supports a variety of classrooms/groups:

- Elementary and Secondary settings
- General education and special education students
- Whole group (class-wide) and small group situations
- Over varied subjects (P.E., math, language arts)

CBGG is often selected because of its ease of implementation and impact on student behavior:

- Increased academic engagement (time on-task)
- Decreased problem behavior (e.g. disruptions such as talk outs or out of seat)
CBGG
Overview of Components

- Implemented for a brief period of time (10-35 minutes)
  - Math
  - Language Arts
  - Science
- Utilized during whole group instruction
- Rules of the game are reviewed at the outset of each game
- Teams are established and reviewed
  - 2 or more teams
- Teacher monitors behavior throughout time period game is played
- Rewards are provided when the game ends - based on the rules of the game
  - Student selected
  - Teacher designated

Preplanning Recommendations

- "Define" appropriate classroom behavior(s)
  - Rather than "being respectful," describe what is happening (e.g. students are using appropriate voice level; students are sitting in their chair at their desk)
  - Rather than "on task," consider what it looks like (e.g. students are following teacher directions; students are taking notes in journal)
- Select a point system (sliding scale or set point value)
- Decide on an interval period (2-5 minutes)
- Find an interval timing resource (MotivAider, phone timer, beep tape)
- Consider teams and members
- Determine where points will be tracked
- Data tracking tool for daily tally count
  - Spreadsheet
  - Paper/pencil format
  - Calendar
- Brainstorm possible reinforcers/rewards
Let the games begin...

To prepare for the 1st game:
- Create the “rules” of the game
  - School-wide rules: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Safe
  - Classroom expectations: Use appropriate voice level, Follow teacher directions
- Decide how team(s) will “win”
  - Most points
  - Any team earning ___ points
- Create the teams
  - Equitable distribution
- Determine timing for playing the game
  - Math, language arts, or science
  - Interval period

Playing games 2 - ___:
- Review the “rules” of the game
  - Incorporate struggle spots from previous game (“Yesterday we struggled with using appropriate voice level. In order to earn points, we need to use the right voice level. This is being respectful.”)
- Review how team(s) win the game
- Review the teams and members
- Give cue that the game has started
- Scan the room at “buzzer” and provide points to teams where all members are meeting criteria

Monitoring the game

- Praise students and provide points for following the rules:
  - “Everyone on Team A is on task by taking notes in their journal. That’s a point.”
  - “All of Team 3 is using the appropriate voice level. That’s a point.”
  - “Every person on Team 2 is following our attention signal. That’s a point.”
- Maintain calm voice
  - Ignore behaviors that are “annoying” but do not distract others from learning or you from teaching (e.g., student is out of seat, pencil/pen tapping, student is not completing task/activity)
- Be consistent with praise/points
  - Use the same criteria for the same behavior for all teams
  - Award points to any team where all members are meeting expectations
And the winner is...

To finish the 1st game:
● Designate the end of the game
  ○ Timer or verbal cue
● Review the scores for each team
● Provide feedback
  ○ What went well
  ○ What students need to work on (this is incorporated into the rule review the following school day)
● Deliver rewards or prizes based on who “wins”
  ○ Winning team(s)

Needed Materials
CBGG Implementation

● Poster of rules/expectations of game
● Designate teams and list names of team members
● Location to track points earned during the game
● Rewards on hand
  ○ Edible items (e.g. Tootsie rolls, suckers, crackers, popsicles)
  ○ Tangible items (e.g. stickers, erasers, bouncy balls)
  ○ Privileges (e.g. extra recess time, art activity, P.E. class, lunch with the teacher)
A Note on Rewards

Teacher Selected
- Utilize what is available
- Share at the outset of the game or provide as a Mystery Motivator at the end of the game
  - Be consistent with method
- Alter the category of reward (e.g. tangible, edible, privilege)

Student Selected
- Engage students in an informal survey
- Provide options and assess preference (e.g. thumbs up/down, raise hand to vote)
- Share at the outset of the game or provide as a Mystery Motivator at the end of the game
  - Be consistent with method
- Assess preference at least once per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules and expectations reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams are established and reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher indicates the start of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/points provided for following the rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior is calmly monitored by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior is consistently monitored by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/points provided for following the rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher designates the game has ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores are reviewed for each team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided at the end of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward is provided based on the rules of who “wins”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game time is within guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources
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Appendix B

Interview Protocol

1. Please give an overview of how to implement the GBG in a classroom.
   a. Based on these steps/actions, what challenges do you perceive if you were to implement the GBG in your classroom? In other words, what would prevent you from implementing, or cause challenges with implementing the GBG in your classroom?
   b. Given the challenges you just described (recite the challenges the participant identified in 1.a.), what do you think is the primary/number one challenge/barrier?
   c. What actions might you need to overcome these barriers? What support would you need (e.g. funding, personnel, time)?

2. Please give an overview of how to implement the CBGG in a classroom.
   a. Based on these steps/actions, what challenges do you perceive if you were to implement the CBGG in your classroom? In other words, what would prevent you from implementing, or cause challenges with implementing the CBGG in your classroom?
   b. Given the challenges you just described (recite the challenges the participant identified in 1.a.), what do you think is the primary/number one challenge/barrier?
   c. What actions might you need to overcome these barriers? What support would you need (e.g. funding, personnel, time)?
3. Now that you know about the GBG and CBGG, which of the two would you choose to implement?

   a. Why did you select (GBG/CBGG) over (GBG/CBGG)?
   b. What are the benefits of implementing (GBG/CBGG)?
   c. What are the drawbacks to implementing (GBG/CBGG)?

Is there anything else you would like us to know about the factors that influence your decision of which support/intervention to implement in your classroom?
Appendix C

Invitation Email

Dear ________________,

My name is Sarah Pinkelman and I’m an Assistant Professor of Special Education at Utah State University. I’m writing to see if you might be interested in participating in an investigation that I’m conducting. The purpose of the investigation is to learn about the challenges teachers identify when implementing whole class behavior supports. Your participation would involve completing the informed consent document taking approximately 10 minutes, watching two training videos each lasting approximately 10-15 minutes, and answering questions during one phone interview lasting approximately 40-60 min. The interview will be securely and confidentially audio recorded and then transcribed. You will then be asked to read the transcription for accuracy (this will last approximately 10 min.).

Participation in this investigation may directly benefit you by encouraging personal reflection about your perceived barriers to implementing behavior support strategies in your classroom. More broadly, this investigation will help the researchers learn more about the potential barriers identified by teachers when asked to implement whole class behavior supports and may help other administrators, instructional coaches, or behavior support personnel to refine the training and/or coaching process when supporting classroom teachers with implementing behavior supports.

You are eligible to participate if you are currently employed in a public school district in the Intermountain Western United States as a general education teacher for at least two years (i.e. you began teaching on or before the first school day of the 2018-2019 school year) and have a classroom enrollment of 15 or more students.

This investigation has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human research participants at USU (protocol #10929).

If you are interested in participating, please sign the informed consent document and submit it.

Thank you for considering this request! Please don’t hesitate to contact me with any questions you might have.

Warm regards,

Sarah
Sarah E. Pinkelman, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Assistant Professor - Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Utah State University
2865 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT  84322-2865
(435) 797-6371
sarah.pinkelman@usu.edu
Appendix D

Informed Consent

Barrier Planning to Examine Contextual Fit and Social Validity of the Good Behavior Game

You are invited to participate in a research investigation by Sarah Pinkelman, an assistant professor in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at Utah State University.

The purpose of this research is to learn about the challenges teachers identify when implementing whole class behavior supports. Specifically, we are interested in learning about potential barriers that a classroom teacher identifies with a behavior strategy after receiving information on implementation steps and guidelines. You are being asked to participate in this research because you are a current general education teacher in a public school setting.

Your participation in this investigation is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time for any reason.

If you take part in this investigation, you will be asked to complete the following tasks. First, participants will be asked to sign and submit the informed consent document, requiring approximately 10 minutes. Next, participants will be provided a link to 2 separate training videos to view, each lasting approximately 10-15 minutes. A phone interview will be scheduled between the participant and researcher. This interview will last approximately 40-60 minutes.

The possible risks of participating in this investigation are minimal and may include loss of time to answer questions, tired arm from holding the phone during the interview, or discomfort in answering any of the questions as part of the interview. The benefits of participating in this study include engaging in personal reflection about your perceived barriers to implementing a strategy within your classroom setting. We cannot guarantee that you will directly benefit from this study but it has been designed to learn more about a whole class behavior support strategy that may be implemented now or in the future.

We will make every effort to ensure that the information you provide remains confidential. We will not reveal your identity in any publications, presentations, or reports resulting from this research study.

We will collect your information through emails providing video links, and audio recordings of phone interviews. Online activities always carry a risk of a data breach, but we will use systems and processes that minimize breach opportunities. We will audio record phone interviews. Immediately following the interview, researchers will upload the audio file to Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system, save it with an identification number (not including your name, school, or district), and delete the audio
file on the recording device. Once interviews are completed, audio files will be transcribed using an outside researcher, and researchers will be provided with a complete written transcript of the interview. All files (audio and transcriptions) will be saved with participant identification numbers, and a single key matching participant names to identification numbers will be saved on Box.com. All materials, including transcripts and identifiers will be securely stored for 5 years and then destroyed. This form will be kept for three years after the study is complete, and then it will be destroyed.

You can decline to participate in any part of this investigation for any reason and can end your participation at any time.

If you have any questions about this investigation, you can contact the principal investigator, Sarah Pinkelman at 435.797.6371 or sarah.pinkelman@usu.edu. Thank you again for your time and consideration. If you have any concerns about this study, please contact Utah State University’s Human Research Protection Office at (435) 797-0567.

By signing below, you agree to participate in this investigation. You indicate that you understand the risks and benefits of participation, and that you know what you will be asked to do. You also agree that you have asked any questions you might have, and are clear on how to stop your participation in the investigation if you choose to do so. Please be sure to retain a copy of this form for your records.

| Participant’s Signature | Participant’s Name, Printed | Date |
Appendix E

Reminder Email

Dear ____________,

Thank you once again for agreeing to participate in our investigation! As a reminder, we are scheduled to talk with you on [insert date] at [insert time]. Someone from our research team will be calling you at [insert phone number].

Thanks again for your willingness to be a participant in this investigation and please don’t hesitate to write or call with any questions or concerns.

Warm regards,

Sarah E. Pinkelman, Ph.D., BCBA-D
Assistant Professor - Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Utah State University
2865 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-2865
(435) 797-6371
sarah.pinkelman@usu.edu

Nicole Lovell
Student Investigator
(801) 510-4577
lovelln@ogdensd.org
## Appendix F

Barrier Identification and Implementation Planning Categories

### Potential Perceived Teacher Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time for planning</td>
<td>Lack of shared decision making</td>
<td>Behavior change rate is inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for implementation</td>
<td>Willingness to try</td>
<td>Intervention complexity is high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>Difficulty implementing GBG while managing problem behaviors</td>
<td>Intervention is not easy to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: _________________</td>
<td>Competing responsibilities</td>
<td>Materials/resources are unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty remembering to implement</td>
<td>Too much time is required to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitute teacher</td>
<td>Intervention does not match the need of the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty incorporating intervention with other requests to implement</td>
<td>Other: _________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes/strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Strategies to Address Perceived Teacher Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicit additional leader support</td>
<td>Pilot implementation with smaller group</td>
<td>Embed intervention in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify environment</td>
<td>Self-monitor implementation</td>
<td>Modify timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust other activities</td>
<td>Organize materials</td>
<td>Modify components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practiceimplementation steps</td>
<td>Modify format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate prompts</td>
<td>Modify reinforcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set an implementation goal</td>
<td>Review intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Reteach intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>