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Positive educational outcomes often include success in reading, math, and writing, which are beneficial skills that will assist students in school and beyond. However, in education it is important that the classroom focus not only on subject and content-specific learning, but also on behavior and societal expectations for following rules. When rules are not followed, students are not able to attain the needed educational goals set forth by federal and state education departments. Consistently not following rules leads to behavioral excesses, such as off task behaviors, talking out, and out of seat behavior. Often these excesses are a direct result of inappropriate or ineffective classroom management techniques.

Wentzel (1993) noted that maladaptive behaviors must be assessed and corrected as quickly as possible to prevent the loss of academic skills and future need for academic remediation. Heightened behavioral concerns in the classroom are directly and positively correlated with a high frequency of office referrals and school suspensions. A high frequency of office referrals and school suspensions decrease the amount of time the student has within an environment conducive to learning (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010). In an effort to combat the troubles caused by behavioral excesses, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 1997) federal legislation requires school districts to assist students who display problematic behaviors that could potentially negatively impact their own learning, as well as other learners within the class. IDEA noted that school districts should have interventions, strategies, and supports that are positive in nature to address the problematic behaviors often seen within classrooms across the nation. Due to the extant literature linking poor classroom management to increased problematic behaviors, teachers’ over-reliance on office referrals, and a decrease in levels of academic achievement (Bradshaw et al., 2010), the IDEA legislation of 2007 was directly aimed at enhancing proactive classrooms by creating an environment conducive to learning and nonconducive to inappropriate behaviors.

Teachers’ Classroom Needs

In a 2006 study in an elementary school setting, teachers reported that disruptive classroom behaviors were the largest problem within the school and classroom, and their lack of knowledge and training on how to decrease these disruptive classroom behaviors were preventing academic achievement for all learners (Walter, Gouze, & Lim, 2006). Teachers in the Walter et al. study also mentioned that a lack of time to implement classroom interventions potentially added to the increase in maladaptive classroom behaviors exhibited by students. Based on these findings, it seems that teachers are requesting more effective classroom interventions that do not consume too much instructional time. In response to this need, a number of notable classroom interventions designed to decrease negative behavior have been proposed and studied. These interventions include such practices as token economies, response cost lotteries, and mystery motivators. Few interventions, however, have been researched as much, as often, and across as many diverse settings as the Good Behavior Game (GBG; Barrish, Saunders, & Wolf, 1969).

Good Behavior Game

The purpose of the Good Behavior Game is to decrease maladaptive and disruptive classroom behaviors (e.g., talking out, roaming or out of seat, disrespectful behaviors) through assisting students with adapting to school rules, understanding the consequences of inappropriate behavior, and helping students understand the impact of their behavior on the classroom environment. The GBG also assists students with learning self-regulatory skills that will benefit them in all settings.

The GBG is an easy-to-implement, class-wide intervention that works on the concept of group reinforcement contingency. Students work together to obtain the reward, and in the process learn to self-regulate due to social/peer reinforcement and interaction. One way that the GBG differs from many reinforcement-based programs is that the negative behaviors are “tracked” in the GBG instead of positive behaviors, and the goal is to have the fewest number of points at the end of the day. The teacher explains the game to the students, sets rules and guidelines for the game, divides the classroom into two teams, and allows students to choose an appropriate reward for winning the game. Teachers can establish some form of reinforcer for the daily winning team, but also build in an additional reward for the weekly winner (the team with the fewest points for the week); this portion of the GBG only takes about
15–30 minutes. At this stage, the teacher defines the negative behaviors, or rule violations, that will earn a team a “check mark.” In typical applications of the GBG, the teacher explains that the winning team is the team with the fewest points at the end of the session, but also that if both teams stay under a preset criterion, then both teams earn the reinforcer (e.g., if both teams receive less than five check marks, then both teams win).

The GBG is then initiated at a time when the teacher typically notices a high frequency of maladaptive classroom behaviors. The GBG typically lasts 30 minutes per session. The teacher simply monitors the students’ behaviors while continuing to teach. The teacher does not stop the lesson to redirect unwanted behavior. Instead, the teacher makes a tally mark on the scoreboard as a visual reminder each time a rule is violated. If any student displays a negative behavior (rule violation), he or she “earns” a point for their team.

Research to Support GBG

The Good Behavior Game has been utilized across many classroom settings, with numerous age groups, and with differing student strengths and needs. For example the GBG has been replicated in a preschool setting (Swizy, Matsu, & Box, 1992), in upper elementary classes (Barrish et al., 1969; Johnson, Turner, & Konarski, 1978; Maloney & Hopkins, 1973; Warner, Miller, & Cohen, 1977), first- and second-grade classrooms (Bostow & Geiger, 1976; Lannie & McCurdy, 2007), with adolescents with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) (Salend, Reynolds, & Coyle, 1989), and with students identified as having developmental and intellectual disabilities (Phillips & Christie, 1986). All of the previously mentioned replication studies of the GBG indicate that it is an effective classroom management technique for decreasing unwanted classroom behaviors. Not only is it important for an intervention to work across settings to show generalizability, it is also important for the intervention to work across and within diverse populations. Many researchers in many areas, both within and outside of the United States, have utilized the GBG in replication studies. The GBG was replicated in Germany (Huber, 1979), the Sudan (Saigh & Umar, 1983), and within both rural and urban settings across the United States (Darveau, 1984; Salend et al., 1989) with much success. All of these studies replicated the positive effects of the GBG, which increases the likelihood that the GBG will work in almost any setting, with any age group, and with any population. However, the impact of the GBG on teacher behavior—the reciprocal effects of the GBG—have yet to be studied extensively.

The one study to date that has examined the effects of the GBG on teacher behavior was reported by Lannie and McCurdy (2007), who looked at the effects of the GBG on student and teachers’ behavior in an urban school district. The study replicated the positive effects of the GBG on increasing student on task behavior while decreasing the maladaptive behaviors that were targeted, but demonstrated that there was very little impact on teacher behavior (e.g., praise statements to students with the implementation of the GBG).

Thus, the literature is sparse in terms of evidence-based interventions to address maladaptive classroom behaviors of students that also have a direct and reciprocal effect on teacher behavior (either in reducing teachers’ negative statements or increasing teacher praise). This reciprocal effect is important as research indicates that teacher disapproval statements for inappropriate social behaviors occur at a much higher rate than teacher praise statements for appropriate social behavior in grades 1 through 12 (e.g., Beaman & Wheldall, 2000; Merrett & Wheldall, 1990; White, 1975). Previous research has also shown that inappropriate teacher responses to student maladaptive behavior can actually be counterproductive and detrimental to the outcomes desired (Kodak, Miltenberger, & Romaniuk, 2003).

Purpose of Current Study

The primary purpose of this GBG replication and extension was to investigate the reciprocal effect that an increase in student appropriate behavior has on the teacher’s behavior. This study is unique in the following ways: (a) the primary focus was teacher-related variables resulting from student appropriate behavior; (b) treatment integrity was emphasized and monitored preintervention, during baseline, and during intervention via direct observation and checklist; (c) teacher data were collected during each interval of the partial interval observations; and (d) the teams consisted of student versus teacher, with students earning points back for displaying unprompted appropriate behaviors observed by the teacher.

The rationale for emphasizing treatment integrity in the form of pretraining the teacher to a set level of competency, creation of a GBG manual, and providing scripted instructions during the class introduction to the GBG was derived from the research of Lane, Beebe-Frankenberg, Lambros, and Pierson (2001), who noted “Failure to implement an intervention as designed may compromise intervention outcomes, thus, threatening the internal and external validity of a study” (p. 371). Thus, without high levels of treatment integrity, it would not be possible to draw adequate conclusions about the direct relationship among the intervention, the change in the student behavior, and, ultimately, the reciprocal effect on the teacher behavior.

In addition to treatment integrity, treatment acceptability was also assessed, due to the fact that the more
acceptable an intervention is perceived, the more likely the intervention is to be carried out correctly (Lane et al., 2001).

**Method**

**Participants and Setting**

Participants in this study included one first grade teacher (Ms. T) in a general education, inclusive classroom in an urban public school district with 20 first-grade students. The classroom was considered an inclusive classroom with a several students identified with exceptionalities. These include four students identified as gifted, two students with Learning Disabilities (LD), one student receiving speech and language services, and one student diagnosed with attention-deficit-hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

Criteria for selection of the class included: (a) multiple referrals to the school social worker to assist in creating Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) for at least one identified student, and (b) student office referrals for exhibiting behavioral excesses that were decreasing the effective educational outcomes for the individual student as well as other learners within the classroom. The GBG was implemented the same time each day during classroom instruction in Reading, followed by an independent work activity related to the topic.

**Consent**

Teacher and participant permission was obtained prior to conducting the research. Parent or guardian permission was also obtained for each student in the classroom. In addition, permission from the school’s director, the teacher and personnel, as well as the director of the Mental Health Center for the school district were also obtained prior to the implementation of the research study. The study received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

**Materials**

Materials needed to conduct this GBG replication and extension and to ensure a high level of treatment fidelity included the following items, all of which were included in the GBG manual for the teacher to reference if needed: (a) preparing for the GBG tips, (b) daily point sheets for teacher completion following the completion of each game, (c) weekly point sheets for cumulative points (see Figure 1) (d) posted game rules and expectations on poster board visible to the entire classroom, (e) a timer, (f) a treatment integrity checklist (Figure 2), and (g) selected reinforcers identified by the students weekly, listed on an approved reward list provided to each teacher (Figure 3).

**Target Behaviors**

**Student behaviors.** The target behaviors for students were identified as talk outs, out of seat and disrespectful behaviors. Talk out was defined as talking without teacher permission (e.g., talking that is not in response to a question posed by the teacher, talking that did not precede raising hand and obtaining teacher permission to talk). It did not include responses made during choral responding or direct questioning by the teacher. Out of seat behavior was defined as leaving seat without teacher permission, and this did not include simply standing up or getting up briefly to collect needed materials. Disrespectful behavior was defined as peer-to-peer frustration or aggression (verbal or physical). This included making inappropriate comments to each other, yelling, hitting, name-calling, grunting, talking under breath about other students, and isolating others due to their behaviors during the GBG intervention. Disrespectful behaviors did not include accidental physical contact or interactions of students during the GBG intervention.

**Teacher behaviors.** The first target behavior was behavior-specific praise statements. The behavior-specific praise statement was counted as occurring only if it included all three of the following components: (a) teacher gained student attention, (b) teacher identified the appropriate student behavior displayed, and (c) teacher used a praise statement including the identified appropriate behavior. For example an appropriate behavior-specific praise statement would be, “Jill, I like how you raised your hand to answer the question! Thank you!” The second target behavior was a disapproval statement. A disapproval statement was any verbal statement to the student that did not include behavior-specific praise and was in the form of a reprimand or a verbal warning about possible redirection. For example, “Max, if you bother Mary one more time you are going to the office.”

**Data Collection**

A frequency count recording procedure was used to gather data. The researcher observed the room during each GBG session, and made a hash mark every time an occurrence of any student or teacher target behavior was observed within the one-minute interval. The observation period was thirty minutes in duration, and one-minute intervals were noted on the data sheet to make data collection less cumbersome.

**Research Design**

This study used an A-B design (see Riley-Tillman & Burns, 2009). This design was selected because the desired outcome was to evaluate changes from baseline to intervention using a design that would be easily replicated in the classroom setting. The design allowed for the visual comparison of level, variability, and trend in data points both across and between sessions and from the baseline to the intervention phase.

**Reinforcer Assessment**

A reinforcer survey with teacher approved select items was distributed to all students prior to the implementation of the study. Directions were provided for each
**Figure 1 Weekly Point Sheet**

---

**GBG Total Daily Points Earned/Weekly Points**

**Week 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S) Total: ____

(T) Total: ____

**Week 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S) Total: ____

(T) Total: ____

**Week 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S) Total: ____

(T) Total: ____

**Week 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S) Total: ____

(T) Total: ____

**Week 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S) Total: ____

(T) Total: ____
Figure 2 Observer Treatment Integrity Checklist

Treatment Integrity Checklist for GBG

1) Score Board/ Chalkboard set up to collect points.

2) Game Rules reviewed. Teacher makes a point to remind students of poster board “rule reminders” for the GBG.

3) Announcement made that game is beginning. Teacher reminds students of already determined reinforcer (picked week before). Teacher will start timer. Timer will go off every 15 minutes to indicate a condition change.

4) Teacher scans room for rules violations. Points lost are noted on the board for each behavior violation noted.

5) Teacher scans room for positive behaviors, teacher will praise these noticed behaviors, and then add a point to the student team for exhibiting positive behaviors.

6) Game will last 30 minutes.

7) End of game will be announced to students after timer goes off.

8) Total points will be noted on data sheet and chalkboard.

Total steps completed
% of steps completed

Notes:_____________________________________________________

X= occurrence

student to rank order their choices for rewards. The reinforcer with the most student votes was chosen for that given week.

Procedures

Baseline. During baseline, the teacher continued her regular academic day and students continued to have access to built-in reinforcers already established in the classroom. Data collected during baseline consisted of teacher variables and student variables.

Teacher training. The teacher was trained during a brief planning session over a one-week period prior to the implementation of the GBG. Each training session lasted until the teacher reached 100% integrity on providing the scripted instructions and successfully demonstrated her ability to follow the daily teacher script at 100% fidelity. During the initial phase of the training the teacher was supplied with a GBG Teacher Manual that included all needed procedural and protocol materials. The training session included direct instruction on background about the GBG, purpose, previous research, and a discussion about the GBG implementation and protocol. The discussion of the implementation of the GBG consisted of didactic training covering all of the steps necessary for a high level of procedural integrity. Following the review of the teacher script for accurate implementation, the teacher was instructed on procedural issues and data collection during the game. Procedural issues were directly taught and the teacher then role-played with the primary researcher until 100% integrity was reached according to the daily GBG implementation script. If at any point the students questioned any portion of
List of Sample Rewards

Rewards to be earned:
The teacher can adapt this reward list as needed in order to make sure that the reward is successful and accessible within the classroom.

- **Social Rewards**
  - Verbal praise
  - A hand clap
  - Nod
  - Wink
  - 1:1 time with teacher for 5-10 minutes
  - Tap on shoulder
  - Visual praise (sign)

- **Recognition**
  - Trophy
  - Certificate
  - Ribbon
  - Token
  - Sticker
  - Photo recognition
  - Note from teacher
  - Phone call, e-mail, letter from teacher

- **Privileges**
  - Leadership activities
  - Teacher helper
  - Reading or helping in another class
  - "No Homework" pass
  - Peer/social time
  - Free time
  - Extra computer, art, reading time
  - Sensory box (each student gets to decorate and have access to a sensory box filled with liked items)
  - Student teaches class
  - Eat lunch with teacher or administrator

- **Class wide rewards**
  - Extra recess
  - Student choice rewards
  - Popcorn party
  - Pizza party
  - Eat lunch outside
  - Reading outside
  - Extra PE or recess time
  - Dancing to music
  - Classroom game or activity
  - Movie in class
  - Field trip
  - Book read aloud by teacher
  - "Spotlight" time (all students get to perform their favorite activity in front of classmates)

- **School Supplies**
  - Pencils
  - Pencil toppers
  - Erasers
  - Paper
  - Crayons or markers
  - Scissors
  - Bookmarks
  - Stencils
  - Coloring books
  - Certificate to school bookstore

- **Toys and Trinkets**
  - Stickers
  - Temporary tattoos
  - Silly bands or bracelets
  - Marbles
  - Balls
  - Bubbles
  - Balloons
  - Capsules that turn into objects when placed in water
  - Silly Putty
  - Play-Doh

- **Token economy system**
  - A book store gift certificate
  - Movie pass or rental
  - Puzzle
  - Book
  - Stuffed animal
  - Free time
the GBG intervention, the teacher was trained to refer to the teacher script in order to maintain the treatment integrity of the study.

Preintervention GBG instruction training and student readiness.
Following the teacher training, which required the teacher to read the script with 100% accuracy, the teacher reviewed the GBG teacher script with the students. This review included direct instruction of the rules, how the teams were divided, and how to earn points. The teacher was instructed to say the following and was observed to assess her ability to read the script with 100% accuracy during the preintervention instruction session:

Class, today we are going to discuss a game that I think would be fun to play. The game will help us all with being better listeners, help us with following directions, and help us with being kind to each other and you can win a reward at the end of each week. The way the game works is as follows: in the afternoon at 1:00 during our afternoon work, we will play a game of teacher versus students for 30 minutes every day. A timer will be used for the 30-minute game. You (the class) will start off with 0 points each day. If I notice any of the following: Talking out behaviors, out of seat behaviors, or disrespectful behavior towards peers or others during the 30-minute game by any student, the teacher will earn a point. If any student responds negatively to a lost point (tantrum, yelling, or getting upset with a peer) then an additional point will be added to the teacher’s points. The class can earn points by displaying positive behaviors that can include using manners, listening appropriately, sitting appropriately, raising hand before talking or getting out of their seat, showing respect, and good citizenship. We will keep a daily log of the winning team and post it daily. Whichever team has the most points at the end of the week will win a reward. Every Friday the winning team (you or I) will receive the reward. On the following Monday the class will choose another reward for the week, the game starts over for the week, and all points return to 0 (teacher and student).

Following the GBG introduction, the teacher reviewed the rules by stating them directly, and then having the students use choral responding to ensure understanding. The instructions for teaching the rules were as follows and were read verbatim:

Now let’s talk about the rules of the game. Rule 1 is: We will raise our hands before talking. Rule 2 is: We will ask permission to get out of our seats by raising our hands, obtaining teacher attention, and getting teacher approval before moving. Rule 3 is: We will treat each other with respect (keep hands, feet, and unkind words and actions to ourselves). By appropriate demonstration of these rules, you will earn points for your team. If you do not follow these rules, I will get a point. Now that we all understand the rules and how we earn and lose points, let’s start off by creating some poster boards with these three rules so we can post them in the room.

Intervention. The GBG started the same way each day as the teacher followed a treatment integrity checklist (see Appendix B). The checklist consisted of the following:
(a) creating a scorecard on the chalkboard to record points for each team, (b) reviewing the game rules and reminding students of the poster board “rule reminders,” (c) announcing that the game is beginning and reminding students of already determined reinforcer (picked the week before), (d) teacher starting timer, (e) teacher scanning room for rules violations (points lost are noted on the board for each behavior violation and added to the teacher column), (f) teacher scanning room for positive behaviors and adding a point to the student team for exhibiting positive behaviors, (f) teacher concluding game after 30 minutes, (g) teacher announcing end of game to students after timer goes off, (h) recording total points on data sheet and chalkboard or scorecard, and (i) announcing winner and setting daily goals. Each of these items on the script served as the treatment integrity checklist for GBG implementation.

Treatment Integrity
Treatment integrity is defined as the extent to which an intervention or treatment is implemented as planned, designed, or intended with accuracy and consistency (Peterson, Homer, & Wonderlich, 1982). Procedural integrity was enhanced by providing the teacher with a teacher script to utilize during the student readiness training session. During the GBG game initiation, procedural integrity was monitored by observing the teacher during the initial training phase with the students. Results showed that the teacher was successful at providing the scripted instructions with 100% accuracy.

Interobserver Agreement
Interobserver agreement (IOA), the degree to which two or more independent observers report the same values for the same identified and measured event (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2007) was assessed by using the frequency within interval IOA formula ([No. of intervals with 100% / total No. of intervals] × 100%). IOA was collected for both target behaviors of the teacher and the students. Table 1 presents the interobserver agreement results for each target behavior.

Treatment Acceptability
Treatment acceptability was defined by Kazdin (1980) as judgments about treatment procedures by nonprofessionals, laypersons, clients, and other potential consumers of treatment. Both teacher and student acceptability of the GBG were measured. Teacher acceptability was measured pre- and postintervention, and student
Table 1. **Interobserver Agreement for Target Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target behavior</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher praise statements</td>
<td>90 – 99.66%</td>
<td>94.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher disapproval statements</td>
<td>99.66 – 99.66%</td>
<td>96.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student talk out</td>
<td>99.66 – 100%</td>
<td>98.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student out of seat</td>
<td>100 – 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student disrespectful</td>
<td>99.66 – 100%</td>
<td>98.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acceptability was measured upon completion of the GBG.

**Teacher.** A researcher-created survey was adapted from the Intervention Rating Profile-15 (IRP-15) created by Martens, Witt, Elliot and Darveaux (1985). The survey had 11 items that used a Likert scale system (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5). A higher score on the survey indicated positive teacher perception, with an overall possible score of 55.

**Student.** The students were supplied with a Likert scale survey adapted from the Children's Intervention Rating Profile (CIRP) created by Turco and Elliot (1986). The survey had 11 items that used a Likert scale system of (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5). Higher scores on the survey indicated the student’s positive perception and acceptability of the GBG intervention within the classroom, with an overall possible score of 35.

**Results**

**Teacher Data**

During baseline, Ms. T's frequency of praise statements was variable (M = 3.5; range of 1 to 9) and disapproval statements were on an ascending trend (M = 13.2; range of 6 to 16). Implementation of the GBG resulted in praise statements increasing (M = 7.85; range of 4 to 10) and disapproval statements decreasing (M = 1.5; range of 0 to 3).

**Student Treatment Acceptability**

The scores for the teacher pre- and postassessment of treatment acceptability were 40 and 43, out of a maximum of 55, respectively. Further review of these data suggest that the overall opinion of the teacher surveyed in this study was positive, and that she believed that research is needed, wanted, and valued, but that time may be an issue when actually implementing research-based practices in the school setting.

**Discussion**

The results of this replication and extension verified that the GBG produces significant improvement in the behaviors of the students within the classroom. The GBG is an effective tool to implement as a means of decreasing unwanted classroom behaviors of students. Although previously researched and past GBG replications noted that teacher behavior-specific praise statements did not increase with the use of the GBG, in this replication and extension there was a noted increase in teacher behavior-specific praise statements to students within the classroom. This improvement in teacher verbalization of behavior-specific praise statements may be attributed to the way the point system for this replication was calculated. For example, in this study, in order for the students to earn back lost points, the teacher had to notice an unprompted appropriate behavior and verbalize that specific behavior prior to giving the students a point. The teacher's initial perception of data collection and research use within the classroom was not overwhelmingly positive, but when supplied with all needed materials to conduct the intervention study, including direct training and the GBG Teacher Manual, the teacher was very receptive, as indicated by her treatment acceptability ratings. The posttest in particular showed an increase in her belief that research and data collection is appropriate and needed within the classroom setting.
Limitations
While this replication was a success and did show reciprocal effects of student behavior on teacher behavior, there were some noted limitations in this study. It would be beneficial for future research to use a reversal or multiple baseline design to strengthen the argument that a functional relationship exists between the independent and dependent variable. A design option to demonstrate generalization may be a multiple baseline across classrooms.

Another limitation to this study was the fact that data collection may not have always been accurate. For example, there were times during data collection that students did engage in unprompted appropriate behaviors, but the teacher did not see these behaviors, note the behaviors, or verbalize specific praise statements. This inability to monitor all behaviors was evident when the teacher turned her back, or when she was engaged in verbal instruction or lecture. To combat the inaccuracies of data collection, in future studies it may be beneficial for the researcher to train another staff member (assistant) to be the data collector for the teacher during the GBG in order to get a more accurate depiction of scores during the GBG.

Practical Implications
This GBG replication and extension is applicable to the classroom setting due to its ease of implementation, minimal effort by the teacher, minimal preparation before initiating the intervention, and accessibility of the intervention for all teachers in all areas of the world.

The GBG is a cost- and time-effective intervention that has been proven to modify one of the most concerning problems for teachers within the academic class setting: student displays of inappropriate behavior. The unexpected positive effects of the GBG as a classroom intervention on improving teacher behavior (behavior-specific praise statements to students) warrants the continued use of such an effective classroom intervention that will increase successful outcomes for all participants, both teachers and students.
Figure 5  Frequency of Student Behaviors During Baseline and Good Behavior Game (GBG) Phases (TO = talk out, OS = out of seat, and DB = disrespectful behavior)

Ms. T’s Classwide Behavior

Good Behavior Game
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