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ABSTRACT

Years of research on various forms of goal setting interventions, specifically assigned versus participative, continue to yield inconclusive results. While many articles indicate that assigned goals produce results comparable to or even better than participative goals, others argue that even minute increases in employee satisfaction suggest that participation is worth any extra effort or time. Efficacy of classroom interventions developed to assist children with emotional handicaps is almost surely a result of how cleanly the interventions are applied. Token economies, with very specific reinforcement and correction procedures should be implemented with precision and consistency. In an attempt to increase the precision and consistency with which reinforcers, specifically prosocial points, were delivered by Instructional Aides, a further variation on goal setting was implemented. Classroom aides and the teachers to which they were assigned were formed into teams. These teams were given instruction in goal setting, and then asked to set collaborative goals, or goals that could be met with combined effort. Team members worked together to deliver prosocials in order to meet the goal they set together. Effects of collaborative goal setting were examined within a multiple baseline research design. Results indicate that increases in prosocial delivery were accomplished by all subjects. Supplementary measures indicate that improvements in prosocial delivery also made small improvements in student engagement in inappropriate behaviors. Finally, all subjects reported that collaborative goal setting was an intervention that they might use again, even for a different aspect of their jobs.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Increasing appropriate classroom-related and social behaviors in any classroom is sometimes viewed by teachers as secondary to teaching the three “R”s. However, student engagement in inappropriate behaviors frequently inhibits a teacher’s ability to teach academic skills. These behaviors are often incompatible with “paying attention” or completion of academic tasks.

Reinforcement in the Classroom

As early as the 1960s, research in education and behavior analysis demonstrated that implementation of reinforcement contingencies in classrooms resulted in higher rates of appropriate student behaviors and decreased rates of inappropriate behaviors (Becker, Madsen, Arnold, & Thomas, 1967; Hall, Lund, & Jackson, 1968; Hall, Panyan, Rabon, & Broden, 1968; Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968; Thomas, Becker, & Armstrong, 1968). Appropriate behaviors that were measured included “studying”, commonly operationalized as on-task or engaged, or other behaviors relevant to the classroom tasks at hand. Inappropriate behaviors that were targeted for reduction included a wide variety of disruptive, aggressive, and passive off-task behaviors, all of which were incompatible with learning activities.

Forty years of research in this area has continued to demonstrate that delivery of reinforcers, frequently simply praise or attention, in classroom settings provides benefits to students with increases in academic scores, functional skills acquisition, and social skills to name only a few (Durand, Crimmins, Caufield, & Taylor, 1989; Gillat & Sulzer-Azaroff, 1994, Kazdin & Klock, 1973).

Token Economies

When students have learning or behavioral difficulties, more sophisticated behavior management is often a necessity in classrooms in order for learning to take place. Token economies, which may include both reinforcement and punishment contingencies, have been shown to be very effective when dealing with a population of students who are atypical for one reason or another. For example, Robinson, Newby, and Ganzell (1981) utilized a token economy
with a group of hyperactive and underachieving third graders to increase performance in reading. McLaughlin and Malaby (1972) utilized a token economy with both reinforcement and response cost procedures to increase academic related behaviors and decrease problem behaviors with fifth and sixth graders. Additionally, token economies have been shown to be successful with students with learning disabilities (Cavalier, Ferretti, & Hodges, 1997), adolescents with behavior disorders (Foxx, 1998), and delinquent juveniles living in residential settings (Hobbs & Holt, 1976; Phillips, 1968).

The importance of effective application of these more complex behavioral management systems is obvious: these programs repeatedly have been shown to be effective, therefore careful implementation is crucial. Research in effective training methodology has been conducted across several types of human service settings, including day treatment programs for the developmentally disabled, residential placements and, less often, school settings. Several staff training and maintenance approaches will be discussed below.

**Organizational Behavior Management**

Organizational Behavior Management (OBM) is a subspecialty in the field of Applied Behavior Analysis. “The focus of OBM is the use of behavior analytic principles and procedures to enhance performance in the workplace. From the point of view of applied behavior analysis and human services, OBM focuses on improving the operation of human service activities by maximizing the quality of staff work performance” (Reid & Parsons, 2000, pg 276.).

*Staff Training.* Reid and Parsons (2000) provide a thorough review of the data-based literature on training staff to engage in behaviors ranging from delivering reinforcement to correct feeding procedures to training consumers in daily living skills. They identify the main training techniques utilized in the published literature as verbal or written instruction, performance modeling, performance practice, and performance feedback.

Verbal and written instructions are perhaps the most commonly used means of training staff. Staff in-services which include a vocal presentation of job expectations and, sometimes, more thorough descriptions of each job skill are common. Often, written manuals accompany in-service training. In OBM literature, this aspect of training is often called task clarification. That is, trainers are clarifying for the employee all aspects of the job to be completed. Verbal or written instruction has been used in conjunction with other training and consequence techniques to increase appropriate staff interactions at a residential facility for the developmentally disabled
(Burgio, Whitman, & Reid, 1983), improve the quality of staff interactions with children in a psychiatric unit (Delamater, Conners, & Wells, 1984), and to promote staff engagement in self-care training of clients with developmental disabilities (Ducharme & Feldman, 1992). In each of these three instances, written or verbal instruction was secondary to more intensive training. In fact, Delameter (1984) and colleagues demonstrated that in-service training alone was not effective in improving the quality of staff interactions. Performance practice in the form of role modeling was required before actual performance increases were observed.

Performance modeling is also often used as part of a multi-component training package. However, Gladstone and Spencer (1977) were successful in increasing staff use of praise after a staff training that involved modeling only. In the following studies, modeling was used in conjunction with performance practice, in role play and in-situ. Ducharme and Feldman (1992) compared the effectiveness of training staff with simulated clients or actual clients under differing conditions. They found that training was most effective when many examples of client situations were described and staff practiced training self-care skills with simulated clients. Jones and Eimers (1975) utilized role-playing in conjunction with modeling, instructions, and feedback to increase teacher use of behavior management skills including differential reinforcement and prompting with elementary school students.

Performance feedback has been shown to be very effective in training programs. It is “probably the most critical procedure incorporated within multifaceted approaches to staff training” (Reid & Parsons, 2000, pg 278). Performance feedback is used to provide information to the staff members on the skill level of each behavior performed during training. Performance feedback can be delivered in many forms, but is often delivered in vocal or written format. Performance feedback has been used as part of training packages in child psychiatric units (Delameter, Conners, & Wells, 1984), state residential facilities for the developmentally disabled (Greene, Willis, Levy & Bailey, 1978), in day treatment programs (Green & Reid, 1994) and schools (Inge & Snell, 1985).

**Generalization and Maintenance.** Once trained, teachers and direct care staff must generalize skills learned to the classroom or other applied settings and then continue to practice them post training. This extension and continuation of skills to the applied setting has been the topic of much research in OBM. Interventions designed to maintain behaviors in the applied setting often include another form of feedback. In contrast to feedback in training, feedback as a
maintenance or reinforcement technique is simply a verbal, written, or graphic reporting of rates or occurrences of the target behavior. Feedback in this form becomes a reinforcer for the teacher or staff member because it has been paired with another reinforcing stimulus like praise (Demchak, 1987, Reid & Parsons, 2000). Increases in staff interactions and decreases in off-task behavior of staff were evoked when supervisors provided feedback plus verbal praise statements (Brown, Willis, & Reid, 1981), increases in quality of staff training sessions was also increased under similar feedback and praise conditions (Realon, Lewallen, & Wheeler, 1983).

In addition to feedback, monetary reinforcement contingencies and lottery systems have been utilized with some success. Iwata, Bailey, Brown, Foshee, and Alpern (1976) utilized a performance lottery to improve staff performance of self-care and functional skills training activities in an institutional setting. While effective, lotteries and monetary incentives are more time and cost intensive than social reinforcement contingencies.

One OBM application that has been shown to be effective in increasing staff engagement of targeted behaviors in a variety of settings is goal setting. “Goal setting entails specifying a level of performance toward which the individual or group should work” (Fellner & Sulzer-Azaroff, 1984, pg 33). Research in the area of goal setting has examined the impact of goal specificity and difficulty, the effects of feedback on goal attainment, and differences in effectiveness of goal setting depending on the level of participation of the individuals targeted.

Goal Setting. Fellner and Sulzer-Azaroff (1984) explain goal setting as an antecedent strategy that gains control over targeted behaviors because it has been paired with a reinforcer. In this way, setting a goal acts as a discriminative stimulus for the targeted behavior (i.e., a goal now ‘sets the occasion’ for engaging the target behavior). Once the individual meets his goal and gains access to a reinforcer (such as supervisor praise), the goal also becomes a conditioned reinforcer.

Fellner and Sulzer-Azaroff (1984) continue their discussion of goal setting by addressing the factors that influence the effectiveness of goal setting. First, an individual’s history with goals is important. If, in an individual’s history there has never been a pairing of meeting a goal with reinforcement, current goal setting strategies will be ineffective. In addition, an individual’s experience with rules plays a role in whether goal setting alone can be effective. For example, even if an individual has no history of reinforcement with goal setting, he may still be successful with current goal setting strategies if he has a history of reinforcement for following rules. Rule
governed behaviors may not need to come into contact with actual contingencies in order to be maintained. However, research in this area indicates that in the absence of any type of reinforcement, certain types of rule governed behavior may not continue.

Goal difficulty has been examined in relation to effectiveness of the goal setting process. Specific, difficult goals lead to more performance improvement according to Latham and Baltes (1987). They found that “do your best” was much less effective than the assignation of a “hard” goal such as increasing weight of lumber on logging trucks from an average of 60% net weight to an average of 94%. Supervisors praised increases in performance in this study, so exact effects of the change in goal type cannot be parcelled out.

An individual’s participation in the goal setting process, either by setting the goal or acknowledging goal achievement by peers appears to make goal setting somewhat more effective (Fellner & Azaroff, 1984; Latham & Yukl, 1975). In the education field, data suggest that children increased academic performance when allowed to self-select goals vs. having them chosen (Brownell, Colletti, Ersner-Hershfield, & Wilson, 1977; Dickerson & Creedon, 1981; Lovitt & Curtis, 1969). In addition, research in a work setting, French, Kay and Meyer (1966) compared effects of assigned vs. participative goal setting for employees in an engineering company. They measured employee satisfaction with the process and examined goal attainment. Though they found that employees improved in performance and reported higher satisfaction rates when using the participative goal setting, the study was limited by a lack of direct observation of target behaviors.

These results have failed to replicate in several studies (Fellner & Sulzer-Azaroff, 1984; Latham & Yukl, 1976; Latham, Mitchell, & Dossett, 1978). For example, a comparison of assigned goal setting with participative goal setting was conducted by Fellner and Azaroff (1985). They examined the effectiveness of assigned and participative goal setting procedures after a feedback condition had already been conducted and found that neither goal setting procedure resulted in significant increases in safe behavior of workers in a paper mill. Ludwig and Geller (1997) compared participative goal setting with assigned goal setting with respect to safety of pizza delivery drivers. Specifically, they allowed drivers to set a goal for percentage of complete stops or assigned the same level of goal to drivers at a separate store. They found that no differences were found between groups, but that both groups increased complete stops. Interestingly, the subjects who participated in goal setting demonstrated increases in other safety-
related behaviors, such as seat-belt wearing and use of turn signals. The group of subjects whose goals for stopping were assigned showed either no increase or a decrease in seat-belt and turn signal use.

Although these results are inconclusive, Fellner and Sulzer-Azaroff (1984) state that the main benefits of using participative goal setting over assigned goal setting may be consumer satisfaction and maintenance of behavior change.

More recent examinations of goal setting have demonstrated that assigned goal setting in combination with training and feedback (Langeland, Johnson, & Mawhinney, 1998) was effective in increasing staff performance of administrative duties in a mental health setting, and that assigned goals and feedback were successful in increasing data entry, filing, and credit evaluation by staff in a university admissions office (Wilk & Redmon, 1998).

Goal setting research in the educational environment, specifically concerning teacher or instructional behaviors, is limited. Sharpe, So, Mavi, and Brown (2002) showed that use of goal setting in addition to feedback at a teacher training site was successful in increasing teacher-trainees rates of instructional behaviors. In addition, data collected on student behaviors yielded overall improvements. The authors of that study did not describe the goal setting process in enough detail to determine to what extent the teacher-trainees participated in the goal setting.

Gillat and Sulzer-Azaroff (1994) demonstrated that both teachers and principals could use goal setting to improve student performance in classrooms. Principals set goals with students on individual academic tasks during visits to classrooms throughout the day. Although it was not a part of the experiment, one principal reported that she began to set goals for herself and her staff after observing its effectiveness with the students. In addition, teachers were taught to set goals with their students, and improvements in student reading were noted. In both cases, the principal and teacher praised student achievement of goals.

Participative Management. Ludwig and Geller (2000) discuss employee involvement in development of interventions in organizational settings. Their discussion included assigned and participative goal setting as well as feedback interventions in a variety of combinations. They report that, “…involvement in an intervention may allow individuals to arrange an environment to support the maintenance of the targeted behavior. Employee involvement can shape rule-governed behavior that is self-reinforcing and maintained not only by the intervention but by the
occupational setting itself. Therefore, we expect involvement to be a critical factor when considering response maintenance and response generalization.”

Other researchers hypothesize that allowing staff members to participate in development of staff behavior management systems improves the acceptability of those programs, hence enhancing staff engagement and “buy-in”. Burgio, Whitman, and Reid (1983) examined the effectiveness of one such program. Staff members were taught several self-management techniques such as self-monitoring, goal setting, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement. The authors found that staff-resident interactions improved during the participative management program. These improvements maintained for several of the subjects during the follow-up as well. Corollary measures of resident behaviors showed that some improvements in resident behaviors were made as well. Finally, the authors examined staff views of treatment acceptability and effectiveness by means of a questionnaire. They found that self-management scored very high on both measures. A second study examined the effectiveness of participatory management by staff in a university housing cooperative (Johnson, Welsh, Miller, & Altus, 1991). The authors evaluated a staff implemented program of prompts, self-reports, spot checks, and contingent rent reductions for effectiveness, acceptability, cost, and maintenance. When the participatory management system was in place, the percent of relevant behaviors completed ranged from 75-100%. When the management system was removed, performance quickly decreased to less than 60% of tasks completed. Workers rated the system favorably and follow-up data indicated that it maintained quite well.

Although there is not yet a body of literature addressing this topic, school administrators, school-based consultants, and county personnel all have first hand experience of the problems that can arise in classrooms when teachers cannot effectively manage their instructional aides. Instruction for teachers seldom, if ever, addresses the demands of providing supervision for another person. Instructional aides receive little instruction on how to work with teachers, especially teachers who are often younger than the aide who has been assigned to them. In preparing for this study, the experimenter interviewed several local principals and vice-principals. In every case the school administrator had a story to tell of how an entire class of students was affected by poor communication and lack of respect between a teacher and his/her aide. This study seeks to impact the relationship between teachers and aides in ways that will be meaningful and long lasting. The ability to collaborate and work together toward one goal may
generalize to other aspects of the class environment with beneficial effects for the teacher, the aide, and most importantly, the students.

The purpose of this study was to increase and maintain Instructional Aide delivery of prosocial points (reinforcement points in a token economy) with a collaborative goal setting intervention. This study incorporated several components of well-researched applications of organizational behavior management, but sought to extend the literature as well. No research could be found which examined goal setting of team behavior when one member of the team is a supervisor and the other is a subordinate. In this study, a teacher and his or her instructional aide served as the supervisor and the subordinate. That is, most goal setting literature, even participative goal setting literature, examines goal setting as an intervention where the supervisor assists the subordinate in setting a goal and only the subordinate engages in behaviors towards fulfilling the goal. This extension of participatory goal setting sought to replicate the effects of other participative management research. In addition, decreases in rates of inappropriate behavior by students were expected when the goal setting intervention was implemented. It was hypothesized that reductions in student engagement in disruptive and dangerous behaviors would form a “behavior trap”, naturally maintaining the behavior in the absence of either reinforcement or punishment contingencies. The final and most important hypothesis was that goal setting would result in an increase in delivery of “prosocials” by instructional aides.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants were two Instructional Aides (IAs) in behavior-based classrooms for high school aged students with severe emotional handicaps. Secondarily, two classroom teachers participated as part of the intervention. IA 1 was a 36-year-old male with some college education; IA 2 was a 28-year-old male with a high school education. IA 1 had been working at the school for more than 10 years. IA 2 had been working at the school for 5 years. Both teachers were females with master’s degrees, Teacher 1 was 34 years old, Teacher 2 was 39 years old. Teacher 2 had been teaching at the school for 15 years, Teacher 1 had been teaching at the school for 9 years. Each IA rotated through several classrooms throughout the day. In order to maintain consistency for the study, Teacher-IA teams were determined based upon times of day. A 30-minute period during the third class rotation (approximately 11:18-11:48) was chosen as the targeted period. The teacher that the IA was naturally assigned to for that period was the assigned partner for the duration of the study. Teams will hereafter be identified as either Team 1 or Team 2.

Setting

The experiment took place in two classrooms at a specialized school for children with severe emotional handicaps. This means that the entire school was comprised of students with behavior problems. Each classroom consisted of 5-9 students, however varied attendance rates actually resulted in 3-6 students attending on a regular basis. A certified special education teacher and one classroom aide were present at all times in every classroom. However, the targeted IAs did not remain in the classroom for the entire day due to scheduled breaks, lunch duty, emergencies, etc. Classrooms at the school consisted of freestanding trailers or “portables.”

The school in which this study took place utilized a school-wide behavior management system. In this system students earned points (or tokens) for engaging in appropriate behaviors (e.g., completing work, engaging in socially appropriate behaviors, asking for help, etc.) and lost points for engaging in maladaptive behaviors. Additional consequences for inappropriate
behaviors included Chair and Room Time Out and loss of privileges. All points earned were exchanged for items in a token store and activity time each Friday.

**Dependent Variables**

Data were collected via direct observation. Primary observers were the experimenter and undergraduate students in psychology from Florida State University. Observers were first trained using flashcards that listed examples of all behaviors that may be exhibited by the subjects of the study or students in the classrooms. Observers were required to identify the behavior described on the flashcard within 3-seconds. Twenty opportunities were provided in each training session. When observers were able to correctly identify the behaviors to be scored 100% of trials for three consecutive trials, training was moved to the experimental setting. The observer watched as the experimenter recorded data on the first day. On following days, the observers scored data independently. Data collected by the observers in training were reviewed and discussed after each observation. Observers collected data independently after two consecutive observations at or above 80% inter-observer reliability.

Appropriate delivery of pro-social points by IAs was the primary dependent variable. Appropriate delivery of a prosocial was considered to have occurred when an adult (the IA or teacher) named the student and the type of prosocial aloud. For example, the IA must say, “Mark, good ignoring provocation” or another similar statement in order for a prosocial to be recorded as having been delivered. Prosocial points were points earned by individual students for engaging in targeted appropriate behaviors. Prosocial behaviors were divided into several categories: ignoring provocation, appropriate peer-related behavior, special engagement in academic tasks (i.e., not just completing work, but answering teacher questions, etc.), and “other” appropriate social behaviors (e.g., holding door open for a teacher, saying “good morning” at appropriate times, picking up litter, etc.) The formal operational definitions used by the school for each prosocial are provided in Appendix A. However, the operational definitions used for this study are somewhat more limited due to reliability issues (e.g., it is difficult to determine if a student is “working” quietly as opposed to being passively off-task). The differences in definition used for data collection are emphasized in italics within Appendix A.

Observers also recorded opportunity for prosocial delivery. One reason for this was to determine if a session should be included in the study. Data from days in which two or fewer prosocial opportunities occurred were discarded. The second reason for collecting these data was
to examine to what extent the teams were recognizing a certain percentage of prosocial behaviors. In other words, when teams delivered low numbers of prosocials, we needed to determine whether the low number was a function of low opportunity or simply no delivery. Opportunities were recorded based upon the operational definitions for prosocial behavior in Appendix A. If a student engaged in one of the behaviors described, an observer recorded that an opportunity for delivery occurred. If that opportunity was followed by a prosocial the observer changed the mark to indicate that a prosocial had been delivered. For example, an opportunity was marked with a “/”. If an IA followed that opportunity with a prosocial, the “/” was modified to form an X. If no prosocial delivery followed, the slash (“/”) remained.

Social validity measures were rates of student engagement in maladaptive behaviors (Appendix B) and teacher and IA ratings of intervention acceptability and usefulness (Appendix C). In order to avoid impinging on the individual confidentiality of the students in the class, rates of maladaptive behavior were calculated as a mean per student in the class. Mean rate was used due to varied student attendance. In this way, no individual student was identified and decreased rates of maladaptive behavior due to low attendance were controlled for. Observers recorded actual occurrence of five targeted maladaptive behaviors (teasing, noncompliance, repeated noncompliance, inappropriate verbalizations and threats) as well as school staff acknowledgement or response to any student maladaptive behavior. The five behaviors chosen for recording were identified by the administration as the ones that occurred most often, namely threats, teasing, noncompliance, repeated noncompliance, and inappropriate verbalizations. Staff acknowledgement of maladaptive behavior occurred in a manner similar to prosocial delivery. The teacher or IA named the student and inappropriate behavior, “Paul, you have a teasing.” Maladaptive behaviors called by the teacher and IA included, but were not limited to the ones named above.

Implementation of the goal setting process was measured via completion of daily forms to be filled out at each meeting between the teacher and IA (Appendix D). These forms were generated using a three-part no carbon required (NCR) format. This allowed the teacher-IA teams to keep a copy of their forms each day to refer back to if needed.

Inter-observer Reliability. Reliability observations were conducted on approximately 30% of total observations. Reliability observations were conducted with two observers seated approximately 2 feet apart at a long work table. The percent reliability was calculated by
dividing the smaller number of recorded events by the larger number of recorded events between observers and multiplying by 100. This calculation was used for prosocials delivered by teacher and IA, the number of prosocial opportunities observed, and the number of maladaptive behaviors observed.

Research Design

A multiple baseline design across IA-Teacher teams was used (Bailey & Burch, 2002). IA Training did not begin for IA 2 until several days of stable responding were observed in the Team 1 class. Goal Setting did not begin with Team 2 until Goal Setting had been in place for several days of consistent data with Team 1.

Procedures

Baseline. Baseline data were collected in 30-minute observation periods. Baseline data consisted of the number of actual prosocials delivered and opportunity for prosocial. (A plan to exclude observations in which two or fewer opportunities for prosocial delivery existed was made, however the situation never presented itself and all data were used.) Data on student engagement in the five, targeted maladaptive behaviors were recorded using the methods described above. Baseline lasted for 21 observations in the Team 1 classroom and for 17 observations in the Team 2 classroom. Although only 17 sessions of baseline data were collected in the Team 2 classroom, baseline lasted for 4 school days longer than in the Team 1 classroom. The long length of baseline in general was due to many absences of either teacher or IA in both classrooms, with significantly more absences occurring with Team 2.

Training. Refresher training was conducted via fluency training techniques similar to those already utilized at the school. The training consisted of each IA and the experimenter reviewing the school training manual, which includes the operational definitions of each of the prosocial behaviors that the IAs were expected to identify and reinforce. Then, the IA was asked to identify the most appropriate prosocial “call” when presented with a brief one-to-two sentence scenario on a flashcard. Twenty flash cards were presented to each IA, five for each prosocial category. The fluency component of refresher training was concluded when the IA could correctly identify all twenty prosocials within one minute. Multiple trials were conducted using the same set of 20 scenarios shuffled into a different order. This training goal was commensurate with the one in place at the school. Refresher training was complete in one session for each IA.
Training Follow-Up. Once refresher training was complete, the IA was asked to identify prosocial behaviors while watching a videotaped performance of classroom behaviors. “Students” in the videotape were research confederates. Confederates in the videotape were undergraduate students at Florida State University who were taking an introductory class in Applied Behavior Analysis. Confederates were given loose scripts that identified the frequency and type of behaviors that should occur during the 30-minute session. For example, one script instructed the confederate to engage in two peer prosocials such as loaning a needed item and complimenting a peer. Approximately 45 total opportunities occurred during the tape (including scripted items as well as un-scripted academic engagement). “Approximately” because of the definition used for Academic prosocial for the purposes of this study. In the study, one Academic prosocial opportunity could be recorded per minute for any given student. During Video Training if an IA observed and “called” multiple Academic prosocials for a single student in one minute, the calls were considered to be appropriate for the purposes of video training. This resulted in different numbers of prosocial behaviors being recognized and “called” by the different IAs.

Each IA watched the tape with the experimenter. The IA made prosocial “calls” while watching the tape. Training was complete when the IA correctly identified 80% of the prosocials engaged in during the video. Each IA identified 80% or higher of possible prosocials on the first viewing of the tape. The entire session lasted approximately 40 minutes. The purpose of this follow-up was to demonstrate empirically that the IA was able to recognize and deliver prosocials in a more naturalistic setting. After the IA met the training criterion, data were collected in each classroom, Team 1 and Team 2, in a manner similar to baseline for seven and eight sessions respectively. If the IA had not met the 80% criterion in the first video session, further training and video assessment sessions would have been conducted until the criterion was met.

Goal Setting. When the Training Follow-Up condition was concluded, a short meeting (approximately 30-minutes) was held with each Teacher-IA team. The experimenter explained goal setting as a behavior change procedure to each team using the script and role-plays described below. A sample script of the Goal Setting role-play can be viewed in Appendix E.

The experimenter and a staff member from the school who was not a participant as a subject in this project modeled “collaborative” goal setting using the scripts in Appendix E. A member of the team was instructed to complete a question-and-answer form (Appendix D) during every Goal Setting session. This form served as a reminder of the Goal Setting steps and
served as a means of ensuring and measuring intervention integrity. During intervention, though setting a goal was monitored by collection of these forms, no feedback was delivered on the completeness of the form. During training the teams were instructed that completely filling out the form might be beneficial to them, but that the extent to which they wrote their responses down would not be monitored. The Teacher-IA teams practiced looking at data, setting collaborative goals for specific times of day, and completing the Goal Setting monitoring sheet during training. Data were provided to the teams by the experimenter. Both Teacher-IA teams demonstrated competence on the use of the Goal Setting forms in one session. Competence was defined as 100% of the goal setting steps completed independently according to a task analysis of steps based upon the Goal Setting worksheet. At the end of the meeting, each team set their first goal, and completed a Goal Setting form with data from the most recent observation.

The collaborative goal setting process includes four steps. First, the Teacher-IA team was instructed to review the number of pro-socials delivered by the team during the previous day. On the first day, the experimenter supplied this number based on data collected. Second, the teacher and IA were instructed to set a “team” goal. They were told that this goal need only be higher than the previous day’s frequency by at least one delivered prosocial if the goal was met; the goal may be higher if the team chooses. Once the first goal was set, the teams were not given feedback on their goal (i.e., too high, too low, etc.), however, any direct questions were answered by the experimenter. With collaborative goal setting, the sum total of prosocials delivered should meet the set goal however individual team members did not have to contribute equally. Third, the IA (or teacher as needed) was instructed to continue to record each prosocial delivered on the regular school point sheet. Fourth, after the class period, the teacher and IA were asked to meet again to review the data from that day. After each data collection session in the classroom, the experimenter left a record of prosocials delivered with the teacher or IA. The number of prosocials delivered by the teacher, the IA, and the team was recorded on the Goal Setting form. The experimenter kept a copy of the form for each session.

This process was repeated for each school day that both the teacher and IA were in attendance. Initially goal setting was set to end when each Teacher-IA team consistently delivered at least 12 prosocials per session for four consecutive sessions (this number was chosen based on a study by Hall et al (1968) in which teacher praise during 30-minute sessions was successful when it ranged from 9-14 statements per session). However, Team 1’s baseline data
indicated that a higher team goal would be more appropriate. A discussion was held with the team members and they chose to work toward a final goal of 20 prosicals delivered on a consistent basis. Team 2, which demonstrated a much lower baseline rate, decided to keep the 12-prosocial goal. The experimenter helped to direct this conversation, but the eventual decision was made by the team. Though Team 1 met their goal after the first four Goal Setting sessions, Team 1 remained in the Goal Setting condition slightly longer to allow for Goal Setting to begin with Team 2. The experimenter reviewed the classroom and experimental data daily and notified each Teacher-IA team when the goal-setting phase was complete. Goal setting lasted for nine sessions for Team 1 and four sessions for Team 2.

Choice and Aide Alone. Two final conditions were implemented to assess some level of maintenance of behavior change for Team 1 and individual (without a team member) prosocial delivery for IA 2. In the Team 1 classroom, the team was instructed that prosocial delivery was significantly improved and that they no longer needed to set goals, however they could set goals if they chose to. Procedures for this follow-up were identical to the Goal Setting condition except setting a goal became a choice for the team. Two days of this Goal Setting Choice condition occurred. In the Team 2 classroom, Teacher 2 did not attend work during the last week of school. This allowed a modified return to Baseline condition; modified, because a substitute teacher was present. One day of this modified return to baseline condition occurred for IA 2. This condition will be referred to as “Aide Alone”. These conditions began for both teams on the same day.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Data are reported for delivery of prosocials by teacher and IA for both teams and mean rate of maladaptive behaviors per student for each classroom. Additional data are reported for team delivery of prosocials during intervention and follow-up as well as goals set by each team. Inter-observer reliability data are reported for each measure as are the results of the social validity questionnaire. Finally, the data are reported for student engagement in prosocial behaviors as well as percentage of appropriate behaviors followed by a prosocial.

Prosocial Delivery

Baseline. Frequency of prosocials delivered for each subject is depicted in Figure 1. Baseline data for IA 1, the Team 1 IA, and IA 2, the Team 2 IA, were very stable. In one session IA 1 appropriately delivered one prosocial. IA 2 did not appropriately deliver any prosocials during baseline. Though teachers were not targeted subjects, their baseline data are also reported. Data for Teacher 1 were variable, ranging from 1 to 23 (mean=8) prosocials delivered in a given session. Data for Teacher 2 were relatively stable, ranging from 0 to 5 prosocials delivered (mean=.5).

Training and Post-Training. Refresher training for IA 1 was divided into two sessions due to illness and the school administrator’s inability to find coverage for IA 1 to be out of class for any extended period of time. It took IA 1 two attempts to correctly identify 100% of the twenty prosocial scenarios in one minute. During video training, IA 1 met criteria in the first viewing. He appropriately identified 92% of the prosocial opportunities on the video. All training data for both IAs are shown in Table 1. Fluency training is indicated within Figure 1 with an arrow. After the flashcard fluency training was conducted, IA 1’s delivery of prosocials did not increase significantly. He delivered 1 prosocial three days after fluency training occurred, and then returned to 0 deliveries. After training with the video, IA 1’s prosocial delivery increased immediately to 33 during the next session, and then returned to 0 for four days. On day five of that condition, IA 1 delivered 4 prosocials, but once again returned to 0 until Goal Setting began.
During this condition, Teacher 1’s delivery of prosocials remained variable, ranging from 3 to 16, with a mean of 9.8.

Refresher training was conducted in one session with IA 2. IA 2 required four trials to correctly identify prosocials for all twenty scenarios in one minute. During video training IA 2 met the training goal in his first viewing, correctly identifying 82% of prosocials in the video. Prosocial delivery for IA 2 increased from 0 to 1 in the first session after training, but returned back to 0 again until Goal Setting. Teacher 2’s delivery of prosocials did not change during this condition, with 0 occurrences on most days. Mean delivery of prosocials for IA 2 and Teacher 2 for this condition was .25 and 1 respectively.

_Goal Setting_. During Goal Setting, IA 1 slept during the majority of the first two sessions. A minor intervention in the form of presentation of a diet soda occurred for sessions three and four. No further diet sodas were presented as IA 1 began to engage in behaviors that naturally competed with sleeping (e.g., standing up). From session three through the completion of the Goal Setting condition IA 1 delivered 4, 11, 13, 12, 5, 4, and 6 prosocials for the remaining seven Goal Setting sessions. Teacher 1’s delivery of prosocials also increased during Goal Setting. In addition, at the beginning of the Goal Setting condition, Teacher 1’s prosocial delivery became much more stable than during baseline. Overall, mean delivery of prosocials during Goal Setting for IA 1 and Teacher 1 was 6.2 and 17.3 respectively.

IA 2’s appropriate delivery of prosocials increased immediately to 24 in the first day of Goal Setting. He continued to deliver high rates of prosocials for the remaining three days of the condition with 19, 21, and 14 delivered. Teacher 2’s delivery of prosocials during this phase increased as well. She delivered 11, 9, 6, and 5 prosocials for the four days of Goal Setting. Mean rates of prosocials delivered for IA 2 and Teacher 2 were 19.5 and 7.75 respectively.

Table 1
_Training Data for each Instructional Aide_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IA 1</th>
<th>IA 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Correct</td>
<td>Trials to Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Training</td>
<td>90%, 100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Training</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Depicts the number of prosocials delivered by each classroom teacher and instructional aide across conditions. The horizontal line present in Goal Setting and Choice conditions represents the goal set by the team. The plus "+" sign represents the total number of prosocials delivered by the team for each session.
Goal Setting Choice. IA 1 and Teacher 1 (Team 1) were exposed to the Goal Setting Choice condition. The team opted to set a goal for both days. Prosicals delivered during that condition remained at rates above baseline. IA 1 delivered 10 prosicals on the first day and 6 on the second, for a mean of 8 prosicals delivered. Teacher 1 delivered 5 and 13 prosicals for a mean of 9 prosicals delivered.

Aide Alone. IA 2’s teammate did not work the last week of school. This allowed for a modified return to baseline condition. One session of baseline occurred. During this session IA 2 delivered 5 prosicals, which was a decrease from rates occurring in the Goal Setting condition.

Mean rates of teacher and IA delivery of prosicals for all conditions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Rates of Prosocials Delivered for each Subject Across all Four Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Choice/Aide Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(one session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Maladaptive Behavior

Baseline. A graphic depiction of mean rates of maladaptive behaviors across conditions is shown in Figure 2. Overall means per condition are shown in Table 3. Students in the Team 1 classroom engaged in an average of 1.17 inappropriate behaviors per student per session. Individual session data ranged from 0 to 2.25 inappropriate behaviors per student. When analyzing the graphic data, a slight downtrend can be seen in rates of maladaptive behavior for students in the Team 1 classroom, however data were quite variable. Students in the Team 2 classroom engaged in an average of .25 inappropriate behaviors per student per session. Individual session data ranged from 0 to 1.2 inappropriate behaviors per student. These data were very stable throughout the baseline condition. The number of students in class varied, especially in Team 2’s classroom. As few as four and as many as nine students attended class on the days
for which data were collected. Team 1 had only four students registered for the class during baseline and attendance varied much less. On most days three or four students were in attendance.

**Post Training.** After training was completed for IA 1, student maladaptive behavior decreased slightly for Team 1 students. Mean maladaptive behaviors per student occurred an average of .5 per student during this condition. Maladaptive behaviors occurred at a high rate during the first session after video training and then decreased to rates closer to zero for the rest of the condition. For students in the Team 2 classroom, maladaptive behaviors occurred more variably than during baseline; however the mean was only slightly higher at .38 per student.

Note that as prosocial delivery did not actually increase during this condition, student maladaptive behavior in this condition could be grouped with the maladaptive behavior data from baseline. Therefore, the mean decreases between this extended baseline and the Goal Setting condition were smaller. The extended baseline maladaptive behavior mean was .9 per student, compared to .59 per student in Goal Setting for Team 1. Team 2’s rates of maladaptive behavior are slightly higher in the extended baseline condition, .3, than the initial baseline and decreased to .04 during Goal Setting.

**Goal Setting.** During the Goal Setting condition, student rates of maladaptive behavior in the Team 1 classroom occurred at lower rates than during baseline, but at rates that were comparable to the Post-Training condition. The overall mean for the condition was .59 maladaptive behaviors per student. Team 2 students engaged in much lower rates of maladaptive behavior during Goal Setting, with no maladaptive behavior occurring on three of the four days. The condition mean for students in the Team 2 class was .04.

**Choice and Aide Alone.** Mean rates of maladaptive behavior per student in the Goal Setting Choice condition for Team 1 were .85 per student. Zero maladaptive behaviors occurred on the first day in this condition, 1.7 per student occurred on the second day. Only three students were present that day, two of whom were upset about missing a field trip. All five maladaptive events that occurred that day were engaged in by the two students. No maladaptive behaviors occurred during the single Aide Alone session for IA 2.
Figure 2. Depicts mean maladaptive behaviors engaged in per student for each session day.
Table 3

*Depicts Overall (condition) Means of Student Maladaptive Behaviors for each Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-Training</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Choice or Aide Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals and Team Behavior**

Figure 3 depicts Team 1 behavior for the Goal Setting and Choice conditions during the 30-minute period on which the study focused as well as the entire academic section of 3rd period. The reason why these data are presented separately is that the teams requested that they be able to set goals for an entire academic period as opposed to the 30-minute period the experimenters chose. The initial rationale for focusing on the 30-minute period was that student transitions and other special activities often changed the length of 3rd period. In order to find a consistent time, data collection began approximately 4 minutes into 3rd period (to allow for long transitions) and ended approximately 4 minutes before the end of 3rd period. These data are reported separately because, on three occasions, the team did not meet their goal during the 30-minute “scheduled” observation block, but did meet their goal during 3rd period. In fact, on only one occasion did Team 1 not meet their goal (Goal Setting session 8). Team 1 set a moderate goal to begin the Goal Setting condition, but quickly increased their goal to a rate that became difficult for them to maintain given the end of the school year activities, such as final exams (which were taking place for the last two Goal Setting sessions and for both Choice sessions). When viewing these data as a whole, a visible downtrend in prosocial delivery is seen. However, as the team experienced Goal Setting for longer periods of time, their prosocial delivery began to come closer to the actual goals that they set. This is also true for Team 2.
Figure 3. Depicts goals set by Team 1 and team, or total, delivery of prosocials during the 30-minute observation period as well as 3rd period as a whole, which was, on average, 12 minutes longer than the experimental session.

Team 2 behavior is shown in Figure 4. Team 2 set very low goals and met their goal for all four days of the Goal Setting condition. In fact, Team 2 increased their daily goal by only one prosocial each time, which was the recommended limited increase on the Daily Goal Setting Form.

Figure 4. Depicts goals set by Team 2 and team, or total, delivery of prosocials during the 30-minute period and 3rd period as a whole.
Social Validity

Each of the four participants completed a questionnaire (Appendix C). The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the extent to which Goal Setting was viewed as an acceptable intervention and whether or not the participants felt that Goal Setting made a positive impact in the classroom. Responses on the questionnaire were generally positive. Table 4 shows mean responses for each question for teachers, IAs, and an overall mean. Both teachers strongly agreed that goal setting improved their delivery of prosocials. One IA agreed that goal setting improved prosocial delivery, the other responded neutrally. In regard to the impact of the intervention on student behavior, one teacher reported that she was neutral when asked if goal setting made no difference in student engagement in prosocial behavior, one did not agree that goal setting made no difference in student prosocial behavior. One IA agreed that goal setting resulted in no difference to student prosocial behavior, the other reported the opposite. The final question asked the participants if, as a result of goal setting, no difference was noted in student engagement in maladaptive behavior. One teacher and one IA agreed that no difference was seen in student maladaptive behavior. The second IA disagreed that no difference could be seen and the second teacher was neutral with respect to the statement. As responses were anonymous, no conclusions can be drawn with respect to observed differences in student behavior and the participants’ responses.

Inter-Observer Reliability

Inter-observer reliability measures were collected for 30% of total observations, 31% of observations in Team 1’s classroom, and 29% of observations in Team 2’s classroom. Data collected on opportunities for prosocial delivery were 75% reliable, ranging from 25% to 100%. Data collected on teacher delivery of a prosocial were 85% reliable, ranging from 0% to 100%. Data collected on IA delivery of a prosocial were 98% reliable, ranging from 92% to 100%. Finally, data collected on student engagement in maladaptive behavior were 80% reliable, ranging from 0% to 100%. For measures where data collected were 0% reliable, the maladaptive behavior measure only had one day in which the data were 0% reliable. On that day only two opportunities for recording occurred. For teacher delivery of prosocial, two sessions of 0% reliability occurred. On the first occasion, only one teacher delivery occurred and on the second occasion, eight teacher deliveries occurred. The reliability observer on that day was not familiar with the classroom, which may have contributed to the low reliability.
Table 4
Participant Responses to Social Validity Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Teacher Responses*</th>
<th>IA Responses*</th>
<th>Overall Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goal setting process improved my delivery of prosocials in the classroom.</td>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The goal setting process took too much time out of my day.</td>
<td>5, 4</td>
<td>4, 4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The goal setting process was uncomfortable to use.</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would like to continue using goal setting for delivery of prosocials.</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would like to use goal setting with a different aspect of my job.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As a result of goal setting I see no difference in the students’ prosocial behavior.</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>4, 2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. As a result of goal setting I see no difference in the students’ maladaptive behavior.</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td>4, 2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All Ratings, 1= Strongly Agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neutral, 4= Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree

Student Prosocial Behavior

Figures 5 and 6 depict student prosocial behaviors for Teams 1 and 2. The graph actually shows student behaviors that were reinforced with a prosocial and student behaviors not followed by a prosocial. In the Baseline and Post-Training conditions for both teams, rates of behavior followed by reinforcement were low. This clearly coincides with the prosocial delivery data presented previously. In both classrooms, prosocial behaviors that were not reinforced decreased during the Goal Setting condition and behaviors that were appropriately followed by prosocials increased. These data were compiled using actual delivered prosocials. Remember, if a teacher or IA acknowledged quiet working with a prosocial, the prosocial was recorded for as an appropriate delivery even though it would not have been recorded as an opportunity.
Figure 5. Prosocial behaviors of students in Classroom 1. Depicts behavior followed by prosocials as well as those not followed by the delivery of a prosocial.

Figure 6. Prosocial behaviors of students in Classroom 2. Depicts behavior followed by prosocials as well as those not followed by the delivery of a prosocial.
In order to evaluate whether increasing prosocial deliveries would make a negative impact on the classroom, and to determine if it would be possible to make conclusions regarding what percentage of appropriate student behavior should be reinforced, opportunities for prosocial behavior were recorded in addition to actual prosocial deliveries. Figure 6 depicts the percentage of prosocial opportunities followed by prosocial delivery by Teacher 1 and IA 1. A steady increase in percent of opportunities followed by prosocials was demonstrated across conditions. Teacher 1 continued to follow prosocial behavior with prosocials more frequently than IA 1; however the disparity between the two decreased significantly by the Choice condition. During the Choice condition, Teacher 1 and IA 1 as a team delivered prosocials for almost 100% of prosocial behavior.

Figure 7 depicts the same type of data for Teacher 2 and IA 2. During Baseline and Post-Training Teacher 2 delivered more prosocials per opportunity, however once Goal Setting began, IA 2 surpassed Teacher 2 and followed 61% of prosocial behavior with an appropriately delivered prosocial. In final Baseline condition, IA 2 delivered 5 prosocials, which followed 36% of all prosocial behaviors occurring during the session.

Figure 7. Depicts percentage of prosocial behavior followed by correct delivery of a prosocial by Teacher 1 and IA 1.
Figure 8. Depicts percentage of prosocial behavior followed by correct delivery of a prosocial by Teacher 2 and IA 2.
The present study examined the effects of collaborative goal setting on prosocial delivery by instructional aides. The intervention was designed to increase prosocial delivery by developing a cooperative framework within which IAs and teachers could work. In addition, as prosocials should function as positive reinforcers for appropriate student behavior, the intervention sought to decrease inappropriate student behaviors. The results indicate that collaborative goal setting was effective in increasing delivery of prosocials by IAs as well as the teachers in each team. These data are consistent with literature on the effectiveness of both assigned and participative goal setting and they provide the first steps toward examining collaborative goal setting, especially when teamwork is a crucial aspect of a working relationship.

As noted previously, both IAs were able to demonstrate competence in recognizing prosocial behaviors. If the lack of appropriate delivery was not a result of lack of knowledge, why then were prosocials not being delivered prior to intervention? Several possibilities come to mind. First, the IA does not like to talk aloud (e.g., might be shy). This was not demonstrated to be the case with regard to inappropriate behaviors. Second, the IA does not want to interrupt a class activity. This also does not appear to be the case, as both IAs made several “calls” of maladaptive behavior for the duration of the study. Third, the IAs assume the students already know when their behavior is appropriate. This last explanation may be the most likely. IAs do write down prosocial points on the student’s point sheets (that behavior occurred throughout the study) even when they don’t tell the student that the point has been awarded. Several IAs and teachers at the school (not just subjects) reported that once a student has been at the school for a while, they just “know” that they are earning prosocials.

One possible explanation for the downtrend in prosocial delivery during the Goal Setting conditions might be the fact that no social reinforcement was delivered. However, the participants were told that they would receive no reinforcement from the experimenters or school
administrators, and prosocial delivery did not increase following training, during which the IAs received lots of positive attention from the experimenter.

Overall student maladaptive behavior decreased somewhat in Teams 2’s classroom after Goal Setting, and occurred at slightly lower rates than baseline in the subsequent three conditions for students in Team 1’s classroom. Evaluation of student behavior with respect to a singular aspect of a token economy (such as delivery of points for appropriate behavior) is difficult given the many other factors involved in the success of such systems. In this study, several variables may be responsible for the relatively small decrease in student behavior change. For example, Team 1’s classroom experienced an additional student in the second session of Goal Setting. New students, especially in classrooms where behavior problems already exist, often influence the behavior of students who were present before. In addition, as previously mentioned, IA 1 was ill throughout the study. Absences due to his illness resulted in substitute IAs, which also may have impacted the balance in the classroom. IA 1 suffered from sleep apnea, and frequently dozed off. Students in the Team 1 classroom were aware of this, and actually engaged in teasing or other inappropriate behaviors when they observed IA 1 to be asleep. In Team 2’s class, so few maladaptive behaviors occurred during baseline, that there was little room for a decrease. Despite all of those possible confounds, slight improvements were observed.

Student engagement in prosocial behavior also increased somewhat throughout the course of the study. Team 1’s student mean rates of prosocial behaviors (followed or not followed by reinforcement) increased from an average of 44 for Baseline and Post-Training to 50 in Goal Setting. Team 2’s student mean rates of total prosocial behaviors increased from an average of 25 in Baseline and Post-Training to 35 in Goal Setting. While these data provide a convincing argument in this situation, caution should be used when forming assumptions about what effects this intervention may yield in other settings. However, these data support other researchers who report improvements in student or client behavior after improvements are made in program or instructional performance (Sharpe, So, Mavi, & Brown, 2002, Greene, Willis, Levy, & Bailey, 1978). This is interesting given the general opinion of the participants that goal setting made no difference in maladaptive behavior and only small differences in prosocial behavior.

Training was generally ineffective for both IAs. Each IA was trained by school staff at the beginning of the year, observed by the school administrator and re-trained as needed until the beginning of the study. Further training was conducted before Goal Setting to strengthen the
conclusions of this study. Only after goal setting was implemented did the delivery of prosocals change measurably. The school year limited the length of this study, and further research should be conducted to determine the extent to which Goal Setting would result in both meaningful and lasting behavior change. It is interesting to note that both IAs demonstrated competence in prosocial delivery from the beginning of training. Initial training is clearly important, especially in situations where so many operational definitions need to be learned by staff. However, once aptitude is demonstrated, further training is likely a misuse of what are usually limited resources. These findings support those of Delameter, Conners, and Wells (1984) who demonstrated that in-service training alone was ineffective in improving the quality of staff interactions. In that study role plays were needed to maintain behavior. The current study demonstrated that training resulted in no long term change in behavior (rates of prosocial delivery actually returned to zero on the second day of that condition) and that planned antecedents (Goal Setting) and incidental reinforcement (self-and-team praise of goals met) were needed increase the behavior. This type of intervention may be most appropriate for settings in which budgets are tight, and expensive reinforcement strategies are not an option.

If this study were to be conducted again, an additional feedback condition could be inserted after training. During the Goal Setting training session, three of the four subjects reported that they were surprised at the low number of appropriately delivered prosocals (Teacher 1 did deliver prosocals, and felt that the number reported to her was correct). Data from a feedback condition could then be compared with the Post-Training and Goal Setting data. This would more closely mimic other OBM studies involving training and Goal Setting.

Though there was a target goal decided upon by the teams in conjunction with the experimenter’s input, each team responded very differently to that objective. Team 1 set very high goals initially and surpassed them. Anecdotally, when these data were reviewed with Teacher 1 at the end of the study, she reported that she was concerned about her team member, so she delivered many more prosocals than usual in order to “beat” the goal. She continued to say that as her teammate became involved she delivered fewer prosocals. It seemed that in the beginning of the Goal Setting condition her greatest concern was meeting the goal, rather than developing teamwork. However, as her partner began to actually deliver prosocals, she allowed him to participate more in the class. For example, during the first few days of Goal Setting, Teacher 1 was literally jumping to deliver prosocals before the behavior she was trying to
reinforce was even complete (e.g., a student gets up to offer another student a pencil and she delivered the prosocial as soon as the student rose from his seat). Had IA 1 been awake on the first day, he would have had little opportunity to deliver prosocials. Those types of deliveries by Teacher 1 decreased and almost disappeared by the end of Goal Setting. Team 2 surpassed their goals as well, but set goals in strict adherence to the rule on the goal setting form (that is, “if we met our goal, we need to try for at least one more today!”). The phrase was intended to be a suggestion to the teams to help them make progress towards their final goal. Interestingly, after several days of goal setting, both teams’ prosocial delivery behavior appeared to be trending toward the actual goal set, with less extreme differences between team behavior and goal. Since the Daily Goal Setting Form suggested an increase of one instance each goal setting session, the group that responded by adding one per day may have responded most logically to that contingency. Of further interest is the general understanding that behavior under goal setting contingencies is rule governed, however in the case of Team 2, goal setting itself appeared to be rule governed.

There is one final point to discuss regarding the teams’ goal setting behavior. When Team 1 was informed that they could cease Goal Setting for the Choice condition, both members of the team reported that they would probably not choose to set a goal because it was finals week and that they may have difficulty with prosocials. The experimenter made no direct comment except that they would still get a form should they choose to use it. Then, Team 1 actually did set goals for both days. When asked, Teacher 1 reported that it was mostly her idea, but they both felt that the final exams might be difficult for the students and that prosocial delivery might help them remain on task. During the initial meeting with both teams, the school administrator and the experimenter explained why immediate and vocal delivery of prosocials was important. Encouragement of academic attempts was one rationale discussed. The team’s decision to set a goal in order to impact student behavior was exactly the type of response the study hoped to evoke. Remember the IA and teacher opinions that students “knew” they were earning prosocials, which would clearly decrease the need to deliver them vocally. This report by Team 1 may indicate a slight change in the opinions of those two subjects.

The social validity questionnaire indicated a fairly positive response to the goal setting process. Initial concerns regarding how well a “team” goal would be accepted by school staff who generally viewed their jobs to be very different from each other were dispelled by the
responses. While none of the responses were overwhelmingly positive, neutral and slightly positive responses were common. Additionally, one teacher and IA each agreed that they would like to use goal setting with other aspects of their job or were neutral to the statement. Only one participant disagreed that goal setting should be continued with respect to prosocial delivery. The other responses were favorable or neutral. These results lend support to Fellner and Sulzer-Azaroff’s (1984) conclusions that possible benefits of using participative goal setting over assigned goal setting may be consumer satisfaction.

When reviewing how prosocial delivery and student prosocial behaviors were connected throughout the course of the study, the most interesting findings occurred between the Goal Setting and the Choice/Aide Alone conditions. During Goal Setting, it was clear that prosocial delivery increased in frequency. If there were simply more opportunities for prosocial delivery during the Goal Setting condition, these results would hold much less weight. Therefore an analysis of opportunities for delivery was conducted. Both teams recognized a higher percentage of appropriate behaviors in the Goal Setting condition. Team 1 followed 18% and 25% of appropriate behavior with prosocials during Baseline and Post-Training. During Goal Setting and Goal Setting Choice, Team 1 followed 54% and 98% of appropriate behavior with prosocials. Similar results were seen in Team 2 (2% and 9% in Baseline and Post-Training followed by 84% in Goal Setting). The lower inter-observer reliability (75%) for this measure may bring into question the validity of these conclusions; however more than 1/3 of inter-observer reliability data were well over 80%.

The author of the study at first assumed that some recommendations for teachers regarding praise or token reinforcement could be derived from the results of the study. However, when examining the student prosocial and percentage of delivery data, it was determined that any rule of thumb for prosocial delivery would have to take into account several other classroom variables. A sliding scale for reinforcement delivery would have to be developed. For example, higher rates of reinforcement should be delivered on hard tasks or new situations such as final exams or the presence of a new student. Lower rates of reinforcement may suffice when tasks are common or hold high interest to the student.

The greatest limitation of this study is the short length of both the Goal Setting, Choice and Aide Alone conditions. This was due mostly to the multiple absences of all subjects and the school calendar (e.g., spring break, field trips, etc.). The experiment was designed with Goal
Setting and Choice conditions lasting approximately two weeks (Aide Alone was not planned for at all). A replication of this study should most definitely include provisions for longer Goal Setting and follow-up conditions. A second limitation is the very specific nature of the behavior under study. It is not known whether collaborative goal setting could be used to increase other relevant team and classroom behaviors such as incidental teaching, implementation of individual behavior plans, or student supervision. These data are further limited by the subjects themselves. Multi-gender teams where the female is leader are a combination, that while certainly possible, are rare. Generalization of these findings to other situations given the setting, target behavior, and subjects is certainly less likely than initially hoped. IA 1 presented several challenges for generalization of these results. The addition of a “diet soda” intervention certainly impacts the study. Even a simple presentation to the IA of a soda could have been construed by the IA to be a form of feedback from the experimenter. In a study where teams are less emphasized and outside intervention less important, the soda may not have mattered, however in this study, the soda presentation could have been a turning point.

This study extends existing goal setting literature in several ways. First, collaborative goal setting can now be added to the more general literature addressing applications of goal setting. New research in this area has been scarce since the 1980s or early 1990s and the use of collaborative goals may bring fresh viewpoints and research questions. Additionally, examination of how staff in classrooms can work together to create environments conducive to academic success and appropriate behaviors is much needed. This study examined one aspect of improving a classroom environment by encouraging teachers and IAs to work together. Several other areas can and should be examined. Some were mentioned previously and may bear repeating, such as student supervision, implementation of individual behavior improvement plans, and improvement in quality and quantity of academic-based interactions. Finally, examination of maintenance of behavior change under similar collaborative goal setting conditions should be conducted.
APPENDIX A

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS: PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR
Peer Prosocial: This category is comprised of cooperative and positive interactions between students.

Examples:
1. A student volunteers to help another student with a task or share materials.
2. A student engages in social conversation with another student with appropriate affect, tone, and content
3. A student greets another with appropriate words, gestures, and affect
4. A student plays cooperative with another student during a board game or Nintendo
5. Prompting another student to do the “right thing” such as telling a student to ignore a situation or walks him back to class without problems.

Academic Prosocial: Student who is observed by staff being actively engaged in the classroom assignment.

Examples:
1. A student is working quietly in his seat
2. **Student raises hand and answers the teacher’s question correctly**
3. **Student continues to work during Social Practice when he is not required to**
4. Student completes his work with quality

** This definition was modified for this study to only include examples 2 and 3 for data collection.

Ignoring Provocation: Student shows observable response to a communication from other student or disruptive situation

Examples:
1. Continuing to read as another student teases or engages in disruptive behavior
2. Sitting quietly after a fight as another student yells derogatory names
3. Continuing to talk to another as a third person is teasing the talkers
4. Ignoring the apparent accidental elbow in the ribs while standing in line
5. Walking away from a person who is provoking or insulting him/her
6. Not responding to a student who is having difficulty with the teacher or staff
*Other Prosocial:* The Other Prosocial category is comprised of any and all prosocial behaviors that are emitted by a student, but are not included in the operational definition of any other prosocial category.

Examples:

1. Volunteers to help a staff or teacher with an assignment or task
2. Appropriately greets a visitor to the school
3. Contributes to problem solving by providing task-related statements, which assist in resolving group or individual conflicts.
4. Complies with a request made by an adult

Note: These are the exact definitions and examples used by the school where the study was conducted.
APPENDIX B

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS: MALADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR
**Threat:** Any physical gesture or verbal statement expressing intention of physical harm towards another (with the ability to follow through).

Examples:
- Statements like, “I’ll beat the crap out of you,”
- Shaking a fist at another.

**Name Calling/Teasing:** Calling a name or giving a gesture that evokes distress from another student.

Examples:
- Calling another student a whore, cracker, or “sh**head,
- Flipping a bird at another student,
- Saying “your mama”,
- Laughing while another student loses a point.

**Noncompliance:** Failure to comply with a direct instruction to either stop engaging in an inappropriate behavior or to start engaging in an appropriate behavior (not academic)

**Repeated Noncompliance:** Failure to comply with an instruction, which has been issued directly to an individual immediately after a noncompliance, has been called for that instruction.

Example: A student fails to stop engaging in a rude behavior after being issued a noncompliance.

**Inappropriate Verbalizations:** Includes any verbal or nonverbal response which disrupts an ongoing conversation or activity, speaking to someone using an irritated or sarcastic tone, not responding when spoken to, or saying any word that is commonly considered to be profane but that is not directed at another person.

Note: These are the exact definitions and examples used by the school where the study was conducted.
APPENDIX C

SOCIAL VALIDITY QUESTIONNAIRE
Questionnaire to Assess Acceptability of Goal Setting Procedures

Instructions: Please identify whether you are a Teacher or an Instructional Aide. Please rate your agreement with the sentences below. Indicate strong agreement with numbers closer to “1” and strong disagreement with numbers closer to “5”. Please seal and return this questionnaire in the envelope provided. There is a box in the office. Thank you for your assistance.

Are you a teacher or an instruction aide? (Please circle which)

1. The goal setting process improved my delivery of prosocials in the classroom.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. The goal setting process took too much time out of my day.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

3. The goal setting process was uncomfortable to use.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4. I would like to continue using goal setting for delivery of prosocials.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

5. I would like to use goal setting with a different aspect of my job.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

6. As a result of the goal setting I see no difference in the students’ prosocial behavior.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

7. As a result of the goal setting I see no difference in the students’ maladaptive behavior.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
APPENDIX D

DAILY GOAL SETTING FORM
Daily Goal Setting Form

Date: ____________________________

Instruction Aide: ____________________________  Teacher: ____________________________

1. We delivered ________ (number) prosocials yesterday.

Did we meet our goal?  Yes  No

If not, were there any events or activities that may have hindered our performance? ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

2. What went well yesterday? What did we do right? ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Today we will try to deliver ________ (number) prosocials today. (If we met our goal, we need to try for at least one more today!)

3. Are there any issues or difficulties that we can think of that might make this difficult? If yes, what are they? What is one thing that we can do to overcome this hindrance? _______________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Cumulative Prosocial Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Goal Setting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosocials Delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

TRAINING SCRIPT
Training Script

**Trainer:** The purpose of goal setting is to help you increase the number of prosocials that you deliver to students as a team. We know that dealing with student engagement in maladaptive behavior, assisting individual students in work completion, and other daily tasks may seem more important than prosocial delivery. However, we know that delivering prosocials works. Students will engage in more appropriate behaviors when we reinforce those behaviors with prosocials. The school has identified prosocial delivery as an important aspect of the school-wide behavior management plan and we are here to help you accomplish the school’s objectives, which will improve classroom operation as well.

During this training we will be teaching you a specific goal setting process using several examples and asking you to practice goal setting here while we are here to make suggestions and provide feedback.

Goal setting actually involves more than just establishing an objective. It works best as a team process that involves problem solving and self-reinforcement as well.

The first thing we will be showing you is an example of how you would set a goal when you have met your goal on the previous day. Please follow along on the handout so that you can see how each step on your daily morning meet sheet matches what we are doing.

**Role Play of Goal Setting- Goal Met**

**IA:** It’s time for our morning meeting. Let’s look at yesterday’s point sheet.

**Teacher:** OK, we delivered 15 prosocials and we made our goal. We were actually over by one.

**IA:** I can believe it. Remember how we were able to de-fuse that situation with Tony when we delivered all those ignorings. Let’s set a goal of 17 today. I feel good about today.

**Teacher:** Yes, you were very quick with that situation.
**Teacher**: Can you think of any problems that might happen today?

**IA**: No, like I said, I am feeling good about today.

**Teacher**: Okay, let’s do it.

Here is what we would consider to be a not-so-good example of a goal setting for a day when you met your goal.

### Role Play of Goal Setting- Goal Met

**IA**: It’s time for our morning meeting. Let’s look at yesterday’s point sheet.

**Teacher**: OK, we delivered 15 prosocials and we made our goal.

**IA**: Let’s set a goal of 17 today.

**Teacher**: Can you think of any problems that might happen today?

**IA**: No.

**Teacher**: Okay, fine.

Next, we will show you an example of goal setting on a day when the goal was not met.

### Role Play of Goal Setting- Goal Not Met

**IA**: It’s time for our morning meeting. Let’s look at yesterday’s point sheet.

**Teacher**: OK, we delivered 12 prosocials. We missed our goal by 1 prosocial.

**IA**: I remember that Tony had a bad morning. I think that we may have focused all of our attention on him. I think we missed some opportunities for ignorings.

**Teacher**: You’re right. When you were dealing with Tony, everyone really did a good job of trying to stay on task. I think that I missed some academics as well. I always forget to deliver them during direct instruction.

**IA**: Today, we should set our goal at 13 again.

**Teacher**: Can you think of any problems that we should consider for this goal?

**IA**: No, Tony ended up fine yesterday, and everyone else is close to making their weeks. We shouldn’t have any episodes. Besides, this is quiz day. There should lots of academic prosocials today.
Finally, we want you to watch a goal setting that we would consider to be not a good example of what you should do.

**Role Play of Goal Setting- Goal Not Met**

**IA**: It’s time for that meeting. Where’s the point sheet?

**Teacher**: We delivered 12 prosocials.

**IA**: It was a crazy class yesterday.

**Teacher**: Yeah, you’re right. No one deserved any prosocials. We spent the whole morning prompting them to get back to work. Everyone was really noncompliant.

**IA**: I was stuck sitting next to Sarah all morning, too. She couldn’t do any of that work. And, remember, Kiki was off the chain all morning.

**Teacher**: They were rotten, I’m not really looking forward to today.

**IA**: Today, we should set our goal at 13 again.

**Teacher**: Can you think of any problems that we should consider for this goal?

**IA**: I bet we’ll have a hard time today. We might as well get started.

Now that you have seen what we think are good and bad examples of goal setting sessions, can you identify what makes a good session and what makes a bad session?

*Look for or prompt answers related to: lack of complaining, reinforcing each other, being specific, following along with the form, etc.*

Now, we want you to try it yourself. We will be watching you and giving you suggestions on what to look for when reviewing your data.

The End
APPENDIX F

TRAINING SCENARIOS
Refresher “Fluency” Training Scenarios and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRONT of Card</th>
<th>BACK of Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jake raises his hand during a test to clarify instructions</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul looks back in a story to find an answer instead of just guessing</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry is the only one in class who doesn’t just call out answers to questions</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake raises his hand to answer a question that a teacher asked during math class</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally reads a passage of a story out loud to the class</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Marco gets teased about being too short, he laughs instead of becoming angry</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn continues talking to Paul, even though Rufus has started making cracks about Paul’s mother</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe walks away when Paul calls him a loser during a ball game</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake encourages Sarah to walk away when Lacey teases her about her pants being too short</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Rufus laughs at Joe’s wrong answer, Joe simply tries again</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco is the only student to come inside during Earned Time the first time the students are asked</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe says both please and thank you when given assistance from</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his art teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary gives a visitor directions to the art building</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex opens the door for Mrs. Blackwell when her hands are full</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shay remembers to take his hat off when he enters the classroom,</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even though he usually forgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul is the only one who doesn’t laugh when George answers a</td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question wrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufus gives Jose information on a web site he found about Joe’s</td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favorite basketball team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah tells Macey that she likes her new braids</td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John gives a pencil to Mark when Mark can’t find one</td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe picks Adrian for his ball team, even though he knows</td>
<td>Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian can’t play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Video Discrimination Training Scripts

Students were given 3” by 5” index cards with one instruction typed on the face of the card. The video was made for 45 minutes of a 75-minute lecture in Applied Behavior Analysis. The lecture format was test “review” to encourage student participation. Students who were not given specific instructions were asked to participate in the lecture by raising their hands and answering and asking questions**. Instructions are listed below.

1. Offer to assist teacher with handouts
2. Drop book/pen/paper from your desk
3. Respond to dropped book/pen/paper appropriately (with assistance)
4. Thank student who assists with book/pen/paper drop
5. Throw paper airplane at student to your left
6. Ignore paper airplane
7. Break a pencil and complain about it
8. Offer pencil to student who needs it
9. Answer question “very” incorrectly (not silly, just wrong)
10. Laugh at student who answers question incorrectly
11. Ignore being laughed at
12. Complement a student’s response, “good answer”
13. Raise hand to ask for help
14. Tell teacher thank you for help
15. (lightly) Hit student to your right
16. Raise hand and tell teacher when you are hit

When the video was scored for prosocial opportunities, this occurred at least once per minute for the entire video.
APPENDIX G

HUMAN SUBJECTS AND CONSENT DOCUMENTS
Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 6/16/2004

To: Dawn Bailey
1741 Kay Ave
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dept.: PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

From: John Tomkowiak, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
   The use of collaborative goal setting to improve staff implementation of a school-wide
   behavior management system

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal
referred to above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human
Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b) 2 and has been
approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to
weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential
risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which
may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 6/15/2005 you must request renewed approval for
continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the
project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing,
any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is
reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human
subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to
insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The
Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Jon Bailey
HSC No. 2004.391
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research project entitled "The use of collaborative goal setting to improve staff implementation of a school-wide behavior management system".

Dawn Bailey, BS, who is a student of Applied Behavior Analysis in the Psychology department at Florida State University, is conducting this research. I understand that the research project is supervised by Jon Bailey, Ph.D who is a Professor of Applied Behavior Analysis in the department of Psychology at Florida State University. I understand the purpose of the research project is to better understand how to improve staff behavior in classrooms for students with disabilities. I understand that if I participate in the project I will be asked questions about my thoughts on the success of the research project and general information about myself and education.

I understand I will be asked to participate in a training session and follow-up observations in the classroom. I will also be asked to participate in goal setting sessions with the teacher or Instructional Aide to whom I am assigned. The total time commitment will be about 15 minutes per day. This time commitment will be made while I am working with the approval of the school administration. If I participate in the study my questions will be answered by the researcher or research assistant either at the time or immediately following the completion of the research study.

I understand my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at anytime. If I decide to stop participating it will not be held against me by the researcher or school administration. All my answers to the questions and data on my behavior will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and identified by a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results.

I understand there are benefits for participating in this research project. First, my own awareness about my classroom behavior may be increased. Also, I will be providing behavior analysts with helpful ideas on how to improve the classroom behavior of other instructional assistants at public elementary schools. This knowledge can assist them in providing valuable training and services to public schools. Finally, my participation will likely improve student behavior in the classrooms in which I am working.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I have been given the right to ask and have answered any inquiry concerning the study. Questions, if any, have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that I may contact Dawn Bailey or Dr. Jon Bailey, Florida State University, Psychology Building 107, (850) 644-6443, or Program Monitoring and Evaluation Services at (850) 488-7007, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. Graphic results will be sent to me upon my request. In addition, you may contact the Florida State University Human Subjects Committee at 644-8673.

I have read and understand this consent form.

(Subject) ____________________________ (Date) ____________________________

(Witness) ____________________________
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