2021

"Positive" Student Behavior: Investigating Educator Perceptions of Student Behavior in Terms of Willingness to Reward and Magnitude of Reward

Kelsey Stangler
Minnesota State University, Mankato

“Positive” Student Behavior: Investigating Educator Perceptions of Student Behavior in Terms of Willingness to Reward and Magnitude of Reward

Kelsey Stangler

Minnesota State University, Mankato

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctorate

In

School Psychology

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

March 18th, 2021

March 18th, 2021

"Positive" Student Behavior: Investigating Educator Perceptions of Student Behavior in Terms of Willingness to Reward and Magnitude of Reward

Kelsey Stangler

This dissertation has been examined and approved by the following members of the student's committee.

_____
Kevin Filter, Advisor

_____
Shawna Petersen-Brown, Committee Member

_____
Jeff Buchanan, Committee Member

_____
Sean Wachsmuth, Committee Member

“Positive” Student Behavior: Investigating Educator Perceptions of Student Behavior in Terms of Willingness to Reward and Magnitude of Reward

KELSEY STANGLER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTORATE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, MANKATO
MANKATO, MINNESOTA
March 18th, 2021

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

PBIS is a universal, school-wide framework that is designed to increase student's positive behaviors by teaching and acknowledging them when they occur while at the same time decreasing negative behaviors. Despite SWPBIS having positive behavior in its name, formal measure of positive behaviors have been elusive. There is no uniform definition for positive behavior but, drawing on definitions from various scholars, positive behavior appears to be behavior that follows the teacher's directions, is socially accepted by peers and adults, and is rewarded by teachers (Ebsen & Filter, 2013; Epps et al., 2005; Geisel, 1944; & Hearron and Hildebrand, 2009). The purpose of this study is to determine what behaviors that teachers find to be worthy of giving a reward and how large of a reward they are willing to give, according to the logic that higher magnitude of rewards indicates higher degree of positivity of the behavior. Participants were recruited from the winter 2016 Southern Minnesota SWPBIS regional trainings. Participants completed a survey in which they rated their willingness to reward a range of student positive behaviors derived from PBIS behavior expectation matrixes and their beliefs about what level of reward each behavior should receive. Overall results indicate that staff are low on willingness to reward most behaviors that are included in lists of student behavior expectations. However, staff are in agreement on when they would be more or less willing to reward behaviors. Behaviors that were rated high on willingness to reward were also rated high on level of reward.

Chapter 1

Literature Review

No Child Left Behind (NCLB; 2001) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004) mandates that schools engage in the use of research-based programs that have proven to be effective in increasing student achievement and managing disruptive behavior; programs such as School Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS; Sugai et al., 2000). Most of the research that is currently available in the area of student behavior focuses on decreasing disruptive student behaviors. However, an increase in positive student behavior is another potential valued outcome of these programs. At present, it is not only unclear whether research-based programs improve positive student behavior; there is also a lack of clarity as to what constitutes positive student behavior in school. Before a definition of positive behavior can be formed however, rewards need be examined at what part play in how teachers determine which behaviors to reward. This paper, therefore, reviews our current understanding of positive behaviors as they pertain to SWPBIS and how teachers perceive rewards within a SWPBIS framework.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports

PBIS is systems approach to improving behavior in K-12 school that is based in basic behavioral science. Attention is concentrated on decreasing student behaviors that are seen to be socially unacceptable and increasing student behaviors that are socially important (Sugai et al., 2000).

PBIS is implemented within a multi-tiered system of supports (Carr et al., 2002; Luiselli, Putnam, Handler, & Feinberg, 2005; Sugai et al., 2000). All students are provided services at the universal level, also known as tier 1. It is expected that 80% of students will respond effectively

at this tier. However, it is not effective for everyone. If the student does not respond to services at Tier 1 the student receives more intensive services. Students are identified as needing additional supports through the use of data that the school is collecting. Tier 2 is for students who are not responding to the interventions and supports provided at Tier 1. They are receiving additional supports while still receiving the same interventions and supports as the students in Tier 1. The student receives more intensive interventions and supports that are research based to match their needs. Students with significant behavioral needs who do not respond to Tier 2 supports are provided with intensive, individualized interventions at Tier 3. These interventions are based on functional behavioral assessments and are provided across settings, often requiring special education services.

The first step for a school in implementing SWPBIS at Tier 1 is the creation of behavior expectations (Sugai et al., 2000). A clear, operational definition should be provided so all students understand and know exactly what the expectations are. A rationale for why the expectation is important may be needed for the students to understand why they should follow the expectation. For younger children a simple rationale will suffice. The teachers now need to demonstrate what the expectations look like.

After the behavioral expectations are defined the school needs to explicitly teach the expectations (Carter & Pool, 2012). There should be expectations for each of the behaviors in all settings in the school (i.e., classroom, bathroom, hallway, lunchroom). The teacher should demonstrate what the expectations look like in each setting. This provides a model for the students to know exactly what the expectations mean. For example, if being respectful in the bathroom consists of being quiet, washing your hands without making a mess, and throwing away the paper towel when done, then the teacher would wash their hands without getting water

all over the floor and sink and throw away their paper towel, all without saying a word. Teaching the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behavior is also needed. This teaches the child exactly what they need to do and what is considered unacceptable and could get them in trouble. This clarifies for the student what is expected so that there is no confusion. It removes an uncertainty as to how the student should be behaving and replaces it with concrete definitions and examples.

Rewards within SWPBIS Framework. Once the school has taught the expectations they need to monitor and reward the students when the students follow the expectations (Luiselli et al., 2005). Teachers should be actively looking for students who follow the rules. When a student is observed engaging in a positive form of behavior, they should be rewarded for doing so. There should be a system in place for students to quickly receive a reward. An example would be for students to receive a golden ticket (smaller reward) that goes into a raffle for a larger prize. The larger prize is then drawn at a regular specified time. The student is receiving smaller rewards, but they are receiving them more frequently, that go towards a larger reward that is given away less frequently. Smaller more frequent rewards have been found to be more effective than larger less frequent rewards (Flannery, Sugai, & Anderson, 2009). It is unclear, however, how teachers decide what behaviors are sufficiently positive as to deserve a reward of any level. This information will be important in future efforts to improve student behavior and the reward process.

These expectations are continually taught from elementary school through high school. While it may seem redundant and unnecessary to continue to teach and reward these behaviors at the middle and high school level it is still very applicable. While students may know the expectations from previous years, it would be unrealistic to expect them to continue to apply

those expectations if they aren't explicitly taught every year. What the behaviors looked like in elementary school are different than how they would look in a high school setting. Also, all students may not have attended the elementary schools that taught those specific behaviors. They may also not come from homes where these expectations are taught. Thus, to assume all students have received appropriate and uniform opportunities to acquire the school's behavioral expectations is problematic and unfair (Tyre & Feuerborn, 2021).

Positive Behavior

When schools implement SWPBIS they are hoping to see an increase in student positive behaviors. Although it would seem that most people know what others mean when they use the term 'positive behavior', the literature suggests that there is a wide variation between the definitions of positive behavior. There are probably a large number of specific behaviors that would fall into the category of positive behaviors. For example, we can assume that most teachers would like their students to take turns with peers during activities and use respectful language when talking with adults. But are there also differences between what some people consider to be positive behavior and what others consider to be positive behavior?

Each school has its own way to define positive behavior. When schools begin implementing SWPBIS they write up a matrix that outlines what behaviors are expected at each location throughout the school. Thus, each school has differing expectations for their students. However, because these are all behaviors that the schools want their students to engage in more there is an overarching concept to these positive behaviors that can be applied to all settings. To get a better understanding of what positive behavior is, we should examine how scholars have defined positive behavior.

To begin, Epps, Park, Huston, and Ripke, (2005) have conceptually defined positive

social behaviors as something more than the mere lack of problem behaviors. They define it as the social skills and capability that is exhibited with peers and adults, following rules and direction from adults, and being self-sufficient. According to Epps and Huston (2007) social skills include "getting along with peers, being well liked, being generous and thoughtful, and being perceptive about others' feelings and perspectives" (p. 163).

Hearron and Hildebrand (2009) define positive behaviors as behaviors that allow children to progress toward the ultimate goal of developing into stable and secure adults. In other words, positive behavior is behavior that is characteristic of a specific phase of development that lays the foundation for the next phase of development. This definition suggests that positive behavior is more than obedience with adult directions, particularly if the directions from the adult are inappropriate for the child's development. If using this definition to define positive behavior, then positive behaviors are behaviors that are typical for the child's age and their development.

Contrary to Hearron and Hildebrand's definition of positive behavior, Geisel (1944) defines positive behavior as behavior that typically pleases the requests of adults or peers. According to this definition, positive behavior can lead to negative or unacceptable behaviors. Some behaviors that would not be considered socially acceptable would be considered positive because the behavior fulfills the request of the teacher. For example, the teacher may ask a student to stop holding the door for other students and get back in line. While holding the door for others would typically be considered a positive behavior, it would not in this situation because it would go against the teacher's directions. Additionally, some behaviors that are typically considered to be negative behaviors (e.g., talking during silent reading) would be considered positive because the student is helping another student (e.g., helping them sound out a word). Positive behavior according to this definition includes any behavior as long as it follows

the adult's directions.

The varying definitions of positive behavior suggest that there is no single best definition available. Taking all of these various definitions into consideration positive behavior is behavior that is typical for a child's age and development, follows the teacher's directions, and is socially acceptable behaviors towards peers and adults.

Prosocial Behavior

Although positive behavior is a poorly defined construct, prosocial behavior, a related construct, has been described extensively in the research literature. There is a substantial body of research to support the definition of prosocial behavior with various researchers demonstrating general agreement on definitions.

Staub (2015) simply defined prosocial behavior as a behavior that benefits another person. This simple definition is problematic. First, it is difficult to assess whether the behavior does in fact benefit the other person. For example, if a student helps their peer with their schoolwork by giving them the answers, are they really benefitting their peer? Second, it is difficult to determine the intent behind a student's behavior. In other words, how could we know conclusively whether a student intended to benefit another student with her actions?

Eisenberg and Miller (1990) define prosocial behavior as a situation in which a person voluntarily behaves in such a manner that is intended to benefit another. This definition is very similar to Staub's (2015) definition of prosocial behavior; however, Eisenberg and Miller include the word voluntarily. Combining Staub's definition and Eisenberg and Miller's definitions of prosocial behavior it can be typically defined as voluntary, intentional behavior that results in a benefit for another.

There has been extensive research on prosocial behavior in schools. However, when these

studies are focusing on prosocial behavior, they are not concretely defining prosocial behavior and if positive behaviors in schools had a concrete definition it may be a better fit. Their studies are lacking concrete definitions of prosocial behavior and positive behavior may be a more appropriate term to be used instead. However, these studies do show just how important it is to increase appropriate student behaviors in school.

According to Dana et al. (2005) prosocial behaviors can be decreased when the relationship among choices and consequences is unclear. They used scientific control that allows participations to accept the association among their behaviors and others behavioral outcomes as vague. These choices therefore left the participants to choose without being aware of whether their choice adversely impacted another's payoff. They found significantly less kind behavior if the choices were relative to a reference in which the relationship among their behaviors and the consequences that the other person would then receive were uncertain. These findings were consistent in spite of the fact that the receivers were anonymous and cannot react. From this they determined that people are often fair because they do not want to appear unfair to either themselves or to others. Students want to be fair and engage in appropriate and positive behaviors.

The outcomes from the Dana et al. (2005) study suggest that most people are not exactly concerned with fair outcomes (Charness & Dufwenberg, 2006). Models of social preferences that simply explain the end results do not do a thorough job explaining the decrease in prosocial behavior. However, social preference models need to also consider psychological influences such as social expectations. More specifically, it appears that most people will not behave prosocially because of intrinsic motivation but because they are motivated by the expectations of others or by their own expectations. Conceivably, most people are attempting to meet social

expectations to be able to elude negative feelings such as shame, or guilt as a consequence of seeming unfair. Thus, we can expect that students will increase their engagement in these prosocial behaviors when schools promote positive rules and expectations. This explanation aligns with results and theories from social psychology research. Batson and colleagues have contended that true ethical motivation is less frequent than often assumed (Batson et al., 1997, 1999; Batson, 2011). Instead, they hypothesize that people are driven to appear ethical without actually having to engage in those behaviors that would align with the positive expectations.

Prosocial behavior is a closely related construct to positive behavior. Both definitions include stipulations that the behaviors result in desired outcomes by other people and are socially acceptable. However, there are also a few differences between the two constructs. The definition of prosocial behavior includes voluntary actions; the student is following the rules because they want to. When students are in the school setting and following the rules, regardless of whether they want to comply or not, they are following the school's expectations. Determining whether or not a student is complying with school rules and expectations because they want to or because they have to is difficult to determine and difficult to measure. Social preference theory helps to explain that students need to have positive expectations set out for them because they are not motivated to engage in these behaviors themselves but are motivated by the expectations of others. Students can engage in positive behavior simply because they are following the schools' rules. Thus, the construct of positive behavior is more in line with the perspectives inherent in SWPBIS than is the construct of prosocial behavior. Schools need a definition that allows them to easily measure whether students are engaging in positive behavior or not. If schools want to be able to measure the increase of students engaging in positive behavior, a practical approach to what teachers find to be rewardable is needed first.

Early Efforts to Define Positive Behaviors Aligned with SWPBIS

Positive behavior within a SWPBIS framework could be practically defined as any behavior exhibited by students that teachers are willing to reward. Ebsen and Filter (2013) took this approach when they examined which behaviors are considered to be positive behaviors in schools that are implementing SWPBIS. They examined the behaviors that teachers find to be so 'good' that they are willing to reward those behaviors. Ebsen and Filter asked teachers to record the behaviors of students that they reward with a positive referral ticket (e.g., tickets that students receive for being caught doing something good). This led to the development of five putative categories of positive behavior: Supporting Other Students in Following the Rules (S), Helpful (H), Using Manners (U), Cooperating/Sharing (C), and Kind/Caring (K). These five behaviors created the acronym, SHUCK. Ebsen (2014) defines supporting other students in following the rules as "appropriately reminding classmates and peers of the rules or behavior expectation within the school" (p. 27). Helpful is defined as "providing task assistance or service to benefit another" (p. 27). Using manners as "using words or behaviors that are deemed to be socially acceptable that follow or precede other social behavior" (p. 27). Cooperating/sharing as "giving materials to or using materials with another person" (p. 27). And finally, Kind/caring as "displaying a good or benevolent nature of disposition, displaying concern, thought, or positive regard to another" (p. 27).

Ebsen and Filter (2013) pioneered the work of trying to establish a tool that would measure whether positive behavior was increasing after schools began implementing SWPBIS. Their work set the foundation to build upon what positive behaviors in schools really are. They found that rewards play a significant role in defining positive behavior.

Rewards

In addition to being critical to an understanding of positive behavior, student rewards are a critical component of SWPBIS. Schools set up reward systems for students as a method of acknowledging when students are engaging in the expected behaviors (Sugai et al., 2000). According to the Oxford Dictionary (1989), a reward is "a thing given in recognition of one's service, effort, or achievement." A closely related term reinforcement is an event that occurs after the person engages in a behavior that increases or maintains the person engaging in that behavior again. The difference between these two definitions is important. When teachers are giving rewards, the hope is that the student will find the reward valuable to increase their behavior. However, whether a reward functions as a reinforcer cannot be determined until a later point when the student engages in the behavior again. For example, if a teacher gives a student an acknowledgement ticket for helping a peer, then this is a reward. However, the reward is also a reinforcer if it can be demonstrated to have led to an increase in the target student helping peers in the future.

History of Rewards. Using rewards in school goes back to the 1950's when B. F. Skinner began establishing operant condition (B. F. Skinner, 1953). His work on founding operant conditioning lead the way for positive reinforcement to become the method of choice for teachers who were looking for a system to establish behavior management in the 1960's and 1970's. Despite millions of teachers receiving training and reading books on the use of positive reinforcement (Canter & Canter, 2001), behavior modification practices in the classroom started to receive harsh criticism from distinguished psychologists who perceived rewards as being manipulative and having possible detrimental effects on human development and intrinsic motivation (Kohlberg, 1972).

Much of this negative stigma towards the use of rewards in the classroom has come from the work of Alfie Kohn (1996) who is an outspoken critic of the use of rewards with children. He claims that the majority of research studies supports that the use of rewards by teachers is a method of controlling students' behaviors. The results of these research studies have found that the use of rewards deters students rather than promotes students from taking academic risks and causes them to engage in the behavior for the sole reason of obtaining the reward that is being given.

Unfortunately, the criticism of positive reinforcement in the schools is still seen today. The criticism is most harsh when rewards and praise are used often and systematically. This consists of using rewards that are contingent upon specific target behaviors, are given as soon as the behavior occurs, are provided for maintenance and generalization, and for the goal of managing and regulating behaviors. Despite these strong criticisms, behavior modification and reinforcement in particular are still used and taught. Techniques such as assertive discipline (Canter, 2010) along with other programs and styles with a behavior-oriented approach to classroom management and school discipline are rising in popularity (Bear, 2013).

Teacher's Perceptions of Reward Relative to Other Approaches to Behavior Management. Given the documented outspoken critics of rewarding behavior, it is not surprising that teachers are leery of rewarding students for engaging in positive behaviors. When schools are beginning to implement SWPBS, teachers reported more resistance to the core features of SWPBS and more opposition to process of change in general than schools who were already implementing SWPBS (Feuerborn & Tyre, 2016). Teachers that had not yet implemented SWPBS reported greater cynicism to the effectiveness of teaching and rewarding behaviors. They also compared giving rewards to bribery. Teachers that had not yet implemented SWPBS

had an overall more negative attitude towards employing rewards for students engaging in positive behaviors.

Research by Bambara, Nonnemacher, & Kern, (2009) and Bambara, Goh, Kern, & Caskie, (2012) has found that barriers to implementing SWPBS include teacher's resistance to changing behavior management practices. It also included their beliefs regarding how behaviors should be dealt with, specifically they found that teachers believe problem behaviors should be punished, students with problem behaviors are better served in non-general education settings, and behavior interventions should result in rapid reductions in problem behaviors. These findings suggest that some of the strongest barriers to implementing SWPBS include teachers attitudes and beliefs regarding how staff should respond to student behaviors. Teachers believe that student behavior should not be rewarded but instead should be punished and dealt with reactively than proactively.

Teachers often feel that they need to be strict with their students in order to correct the behavior, such as with Zero Tolerance approach. However, Zero Tolerance approaches have found to have negative outcomes for students (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). Such negative effects include being excluded from the learning environment, with each suspension decreasing the students' opportunities to learn, decreasing the student's interest in learning, and increasing their likelihood to become involved with the juvenile detention system. Removing the students from the classroom can create more problems because the student feels less connected to the school.

Teachers feel that there needs to be punitive consequences for negative behavior. Feurerborn and colleagues (2005) found that teachers often want there be a consequence for negative behaviors, instead of focusing on rewarding the expected behaviors. SWPBIS, however, places a

heavier emphasis on preventing students from engaging in negative behaviors by teaching and rewarding students for engaging in the expected behaviors (Horner et al, 2005).

Effective Use of Rewards. When teachers have more positive interactions with their students, the students in turn perform better academically and socially. When teachers provide their students with abundant praise statements throughout the day, students are less likely to engage in off-task or disruptive behaviors (Espin & Yell, 1994). Praise has also been found to increase appropriate behaviors in students who display disruptive behaviors (Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, & Martin, 2007) and increase academic engagement (Hall, Lund, & Jackson, 1968). Decreased disruptive behaviors and increased academic engagement are common results when schools implement SWPBIS (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Bradshaw, Waasdorp, & Leaf, 2012; Muscott, Mann, & LeBrun, 2008). The changes in behavior have also been associated with increased instructional time when students are engaged in their academic work.

Rewards should be used in a specific way to be effective (Bear, 2013). Rewards should be used in a way that informs the child of what behavior they are engaged in that resulted in that reward. Which, is part of the SWPBIS process of acknowledging the positive behavior that the student engaged in. School staff should not just be handing a ticket, it should include stating exactly what the student did to receive that reward. Rewards should be used frequently for behaviors that are not intrinsically motivating and less often for behaviors that students are already intrinsically motivated to engage in. Rewards should be given for students engaging in cognitive and emotional processes and features associated with self-discipline. Rewards should not just focus on the expected behaviors but also behaviors that show when a student engages in social emotional learning.

It has been recommended that teachers should engage in four positive interactions for every one negative interaction (Kalis, Vannest, & Parker, 2007). Even the students which teachers find to be the most disobedient and taxing to work with on average engage in more positive, compliant behavior, than they do negative behavior. Given the frequency of positive behaviors, teachers have ample opportunity to deliver behavior specific praise (e.g., "you did an excellent job walking down the hall quietly"), which is the most effective in decreasing problem behavior (Good & Brophy, 2003). Unfortunately, research has documented that this is not how praise is often used in the classroom (Brophy, 1983; Reinke, Lewis-Palmer, & Merrell, 2008). Teachers are not engaging in high rates of behavior-specific praise in the classroom. Even schools that have been trained on implementing SWPBIS are not engaging in high rates of behavior-specific praise (Stormont, Covington, & Lewis, 2006).

This was also found in the work completed by Reinke, Herman, & Stormont (2013). They found that one out of 33 teachers used the recommended 4:1 ratio of positive to negative statements. There were two teachers that used a ratio of 2:1 positive to negative interactions. When teachers did engage in positive statements, they were much more likely to use general praise than to use behavior-specific praise. Only two teachers used behavior-specific praise more than general praise, meaning 31 teachers used general praise more than behavior-specific praise.

Although behavior specific praise can be an effective reward for students, there are a range of potential relevant rewards that can be used to encourage positive behavior in schools. For example, student could receive access to tangibles such as stickers or treats for positive behavior. Thus, a range of potential rewards, including praise, tangibles, and opportunities to gain or escape from activities could be utilized for all students in a school (Dunlap et al. 2009).

However, it is important to note that teachers tend to prefer to acknowledge students with praise over tangible rewards (Brophy & McCaslin, 1992).

Present Study

There is no uniform definition for positive behavior but, drawing on definitions from various scholars, positive behavior appears to be behavior that follows the teacher's directions, is socially accepted by peers and adults, and is rewarded by teachers (Ebsen & Filter, 2013; Epps et al., 2005; Geisel, 1944; & Hearron and Hildebrand, 2009). The present study aims to extend what is known about positive behaviors by examining which behaviors teachers believe to be so positive that they are willing to reward the student for engaging in that behavior. This information could inform efforts to select, measure, and encourage positive behaviors in schools. This study examined the following research questions:

- Research Question One: Which positive student behaviors are staff willing to reward?
- Research Question Two: What level of reward do staff believe are appropriate for each positive student behavior?
- Research Question Three: Are there any demographic variables (grade level, roles, gender) that differentiate ratings for behaviors?
- Research Question Four: Is the decision to reward behaviors a simple decision or a complex decision? A complex decision is one in which the willingness to reward a behavior corresponds with the level of reward assigned to the behavior. A complex decision is one in which the willingness to reward a behavior does not correspond with the level of reward assigned to the behavior.

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited from the winter 2016 Southern Minnesota SWPBIS regional trainings. Attempts were made to recruit from SWPBIS trainings in the metro and north regions, however, it was unsuccessful. Participants came from training cohorts 11 and 12, who will be in their second and first year of training, respectively. There were 87 people that completed the survey (see table 1 in Appendix A for percentage of school information). There were approximately 22 schools in attendance at the Southern Minnesota training. The schools included all levels (i.e., kindergarten through 12th grade and included Alternative Learning Centers). Each school has their own SWPBIS team that consists of 5-8 people. The team is typically comprised of general education teachers, special education teachers, school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, and principals (see table 2 in Appendix A for staff information). Some teams may also include paraprofessionals and other non-licensed staff.

Survey Measure

Structure. The Positive Behaviors and Rewards Survey, which was developed for this study, was used to assess which student behaviors are considered to be "positive behaviors" within a school setting (see Appendix C for survey). There are three sections to the survey: demographics, reward examples, and positive behaviors. In the Demographic sections the participants are asked about their ethnicity, years in education, and position within the school. This section helps to answer questions to examine if there are differences between various grade levels and teaching positions.

For the Reward Examples section of the survey, participants were asked to write down behaviors that they believed should be rewarded with a low value reward and high value reward. From this section the researchers hope to distinguish which behaviors are considered to be positive to the degree that they deserve a high value reward and which behaviors are considered to be positive but only to the degree of deserving a lower value reward.

In the Positive Behaviors section of the survey the teachers were asked about their willingness to reward specific behaviors and the degree of rewards that they would use for rewarding the behavior. They were provided with a behavior and then asked to report their degree of willingness to reward that behavior on a 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0% – 100% divided into 10% increments. For that same behavior they then reported the level of reward that they believed the behavior deserves on an 11-point scale ranging from 0 (no reward) to 10 (high value reward).

Development. The behaviors included in the Behaviors section of the survey were selected by going to the website for the Technical Assistance Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) and examining the sample behavioral teaching matrices. Behavioral teaching matrices are a list of specific behavioral examples of general behavioral expectations agreed upon and taught in the school and are arranged by locations in the school. For example, a school may adopt the general behavioral expectations of "Be Safe, Be Responsible, and Be Respectful". The behavioral teaching matrix for this school would then include specific examples of those behaviors delineated by setting. So, specific behaviors included on the teaching matrix for "Be Safe" in the hallway could include "Walk on the right side of the hall" and "Keep hands to self in hallway". Behavioral teaching matrices are generally designed as tables with the general behavior expectations and the locations in the school serving

as the headers for the columns and rows (see Appendix B for example). Behavioral teaching matrices from the SWPBIS website were used because they are real behavioral teaching matrices created by actual schools. This means that staff in these schools agreed that these behaviors are the expected specific behaviors in the school (i.e., positive local behaviors). The next step was to select behaviors from the large collection of behavioral teaching matrices from the website for inclusion in the survey.

Behaviors were chosen from the matrices by choosing the top two behaviors in each box of the teaching matrix going down diagonally (i.e., moving over one column and down one row). If there was only one behavior in a category the behavior from the next category was chosen. It was decided to choose the top two behaviors from the categories to keep the strategy of picking behaviors consistent and systematic. It allowed the researcher to know exactly which behaviors to choose while also keeping it consistent. Even if there were redundant behaviors those behaviors were still included in the original sample. There were 20 behavioral matrices that were examined for a total of 220 behaviors.

The initial list of positive behaviors then needed to be cut down to reduce the overall length of the survey and ensure that school staff would complete it in a timely fashion. Since staff completed the survey at their winter SWPBIS cohort training, the survey should not take away significant time from their other activities that they need to be working on. Behaviors were eliminated if they met one of three criteria: they were (a) situation specific, (b) vague/subjective, or (c) redundant. Situation specific behaviors were behaviors that could only be applied in particular circumstances. For example, sit at end of class line was considered to be situation specific because that behavior is only expected in certain situations. Behaviors were considered to be vague or subjective if they were not clearly or explicitly stated or could be interpreted in

different ways by different people. For example, “Be a positive role model” was considered vague because positive could be taken so many different ways. It does not explicitly say what the student needs to be doing. Finally, behaviors were considered to be redundant if they or another behavior with very similar wording had already been listed. Therefore, the behaviors that remained were applicable to multiple school situations, concrete, and non-redundant.

The researcher and a fellow doctoral candidate in school psychology went through the list of behaviors separately to cut behaviors using the criteria listed above. Once they had both gone through the list, they met to discuss their new lists of behaviors. The two agreed on 80% of the behaviors. There were 11 behaviors that the pair did not agree on or were unsure about and those behaviors were then brought to a research team meeting led by a faculty member to discuss. From the list of 11 behaviors the team decided to keep four of those behaviors. The team used the same criteria for cutting behavior. The final list of behaviors was then cut from 220 behaviors down to 49 behaviors.

The behaviors were then worded to keep the wording consistent among the behaviors. Behaviors were worded for efficiency. For example, ‘stay in your seat’ was re-worded to ‘stay in seat.’ Behaviors were also changed from long duration forms of behavior to short, discrete forms of behavior. For example, ‘do each activity to the very best of your ability’ was changed to ‘do an activity to the very best of your ability.’ It was decided to change wording to the short, discrete format because it may be difficult for observers to determine if a student is always performing the behavior. This revision process also kept the behavior wording consistent throughout the survey.

Procedure

The survey was distributed at the winter 2016SWPBIS training to cohorts 11 and 12. The participants were given a brief description of the study and the purpose. All of the participants also received a letter that contained a description, the purpose, consent, and contact information for the primary researcher. Participants were given time to complete the survey as part of their work time during the training. It was anticipated that it would take them 15 minutes to complete the survey and sometime afterward to discuss the ideas from the survey within their leadership teams for their own action planning. Consent forms were not given to the participants, as they were informed that their completion of the survey functioned as their consenting to complete the survey. Once the surveys were completed, they were collected.

Data Analysis

The researcher used SPSS to analyze the survey results. Pairwise deletion was used to deal with missing data. Pairwise deletion only eliminates the specific missing values from the analysis (not the entire case). In other words, all data that are available are included. Pairwise deletion was used since the sample size was so small. This method helped to keep all of the available data so that there is more data for the analysis.

The first two research questions addressed respondents' ratings on willingness to reward and level of reward. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were used to examine if there was a relationship between behaviors that teachers considered to be positive behaviors. We examined the means of different behaviors along with theoretical cut scores for the behaviors. This provided a simple summary of the data. From the descriptive data we were able to see if any patterns emerged from the data to see if there were differences in behaviors that teachers rated as low reward behaviors versus high reward behaviors. Descriptive statistics allowed us to examine which behaviors fall into different levels of reward. We also examined which behaviors fall into

the top level of willingness to reward. Behaviors were split into quartiles to determine which behaviors fall into high, medium, and low level of reward and willingness to reward. The median tells us the center of the data set, while the first and third quartiles tell us about how spread out the middle 50% of the data set is. The minimum and maximum values tell us about the most extreme values in the data set. Altogether, this breaks it into four equal sections.

A third research question is, “Are there any demographic variables that differentiate ratings for behaviors?”. T-tests were used to examine demographic data. T-tests were used to examine the means of various groups. For example, a 2-sample t-test was used to measure the differences in elementary schools versus high schools’ ratings for behaviors. ANOVAs were also ran when we wanted to compare all of the groups. We wanted to examine if there were demographic variables that determine who is more willing to reward than another group based on demographic variables.

The fourth research question is “Is the decision to reward behaviors a simple decision or a complex decision?”. We decided that if it was a simple decision if willingness and level were highly correlated. It is a complex decision if willingness and level were not correlated. If the two are highly correlated, then the person thinks the same way about the behavior in regard to level and willingness to reward. However, if they do not correlate then the person thinks differently about level and willingness, thus making it more difficult to decide if they should reward the behavior.

Chapter 3

Results

Research question one examined the degree to which educators are willing to reward specific behaviors and research question two examined the magnitude at which those behaviors should be rewarded. The data were collected using a ten-point scale. Overall, educators are generally less willing to reward most behaviors (mean of 3.94). They are more likely to give a low-level reward than to give a high-level reward (mean of 2.96). See Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix A for the mean of each behavior arranged from lowest to highest. Regarding research question #2, which examined respondents' perceptions of the level of reward that is appropriate for each behavior, the respondents also provided examples of what they considered to be high-level and low-level rewards. See Table 5 in Appendix A for a list of examples of high value and low value rewards that respondents generated. There appeared to be two types of themes for low value and for high value rewards. High value rewards appeared to have events that took place over a longer period of time (e.g., priority parking, extra recess) and include others (e.g., pizza party, lunch with a special person). Whereas low value rewards included small tangible objects (e.g., candy, pencil, ticket) and involve only the student (e.g., verbal recognition, front of lunch line).

The data were divided into quartiles to determine low, moderate, and high. Had the data been broken into quartiles based on the ten-point scale, all responses would have been considered low to medium and no data would have fallen in the high range. A lot of information would have been lost because the data would not have been reflective of the ten-point range. The data had to analyzed using their own scale, based on their minimum and maximum values.

A box plot was used to break the data into quartiles. Quartiles were needed to determine how to break the scores into high, medium, and low categories for level of reward and willingness to reward. Quartiles let us quickly divide a set of data into four groups, making it easy to see which of the four groups a particular data point fit within. While it's easy to categorize the data into quartiles, the two groups of data, level of reward and willingness to reward, were not the same and thus needed to be run separately.

Quartiles were determined based on the mean scores for willingness and level separately. It was decided to differentiate the two because the ranges were so different. The ranges for each group were different, for willingness the range was 1.28-6.25 while the range for the level was 1.07-4.88. Thus, an average of 3.76 would be in the high range for level but in the moderate range for willingness. Differentiating the two quartiles based on the group allows for the examination of each individual group separately to account for the difference in the ranges.

For each category, there were 12 behaviors in the low and high range and 24 behaviors in the middle range. For willingness to reward the range was 1.28 to 6.25 with a mean of 3.943 and a median of 3.79. The low ranges from 1.28 to 3.16. The middle ranges from 3.17 to 4.69. The high range fell between 4.7-6.25.

For the level of reward, the range was 1.07 to 4.88 with a median of 2.89. The low range for level was 1.07 to 2.36, the moderate range fell between 2.37 to 3.44, and the high range fell between 3.45 to 4.88.

Research question three examined whether demographic variables related to reported ratings for willingness to reward and magnitude of reward. Demographic analyses indicated that only one behavior significantly differed between professional roles. Special education teachers are more likely to reward chewing with your mouth closed than all other staff. For gender, there

are only four behaviors that males and females had significantly different views on rewarding behaviors. Males (*M*=4.36) are more likely than females (*M*=2.87) to reward cleaning up after themselves (P= .018). Males (*M*=4.16) are more likely than females (*M*=2.82) to reward cleaning up equipment when they are done using it. (*p*=.042) Females (*M*=6.28) are more willing than males (*M*=4.33) to reward using positive words with others (i.e., no put-downs). (*p*=.047) Females (*M*=4.48) are more willing than males (*M*=2.50) to reward having belongs and necessary supplies (*p*=.040).

Research question four looked at which behaviors were simple or complex decisions on whether or not they should be rewarded. If willingness and level were highly correlated, then it was considered a simple decision because their thoughts about whether they would be willing to reward the behavior and how large/small of a reward they would give for that behavior. They agree that the behavior should be rewarded and that the student engaging in that behavior deserves a higher reward. However, when the correlation is low, meaning that they rated either willingness to reward high and the level of the reward low, or vice versa, that this is a more complex decision because there is a discrepancy in their thinking. All behaviors were significantly correlated (p= >.05). Behaviors that were considered low had a correlation between 0-0.39, moderately correlated behaviors had correlations between 0.4-0.69, and correlations that were considered highly correlated were 0.70 or above. There were 34 behaviors that were highly correlated, indicating that they are simple decisions. There was only one behavior that had a low correlation, indicating that it is a more complex decision. Chewing with mouth closed had a correlation of .36. There were 12 behaviors that were moderately correlated meaning that they aren't simple decisions, but neither are they complex decisions.

Chapter 4

Discussion

This study examined which behavior educators considered to be sufficiently positive as to merit the delivery of rewards. While one might assume that positive behavior is a well-defined construct the literature says differently. There are many different definitions. Some focus more on a specific phase of life (Hearron and Hildebrand, 2009), another definition focuses on how pleased adults or peers are with the behavior (Geisel (1944), and it has also been defined as the lack of problem behaviors (Epps, Park, Huston, and Ripke, 2005).

Results of the present study indicate that school staff aren't very willing to reward most student behaviors. However, they mostly agree about how they see behaviors and how likely they are to reward or not reward behaviors.

Research Questions 1 and 2

Overall, school staff were less willing to reward behaviors and tend to prefer low-value rewards for the behaviors included in this study. Average scores from the box plot analysis indicated an overall pattern of less willingness to reward the behaviors that were listed in the questionnaire. This was an unexpected finding given that respondents had participated in at least two days of in-service training prior to responding during which they had been learning about implementing SWPBIS, including the use of rewards for positive behaviors. These school staff are members of the SWPBIS implementation team for their schools, so their less willingness to reward positive behaviors is concerning because they are supposed to be the leaders of SWPBIS in their schools.

There were only seven behaviors rated that had a mean of higher than 5 for willingness to reward and no behaviors with a mean higher than 5 for magnitude of reward, which indicates

very few behaviors in the upper half of the willingness and magnitude scales. Given that the purpose of research question 1 was to investigate relative patterns of high and low ratings, scores for magnitude and willingness were broken into quartiles for analysis.

One potential explanation for this finding of low willingness to reward behaviors is the fact that almost all individual behaviors evaluated in this study are behaviors properly classified as "meeting expectations" rather than "above and beyond" using the criteria from Knapper and Stang (2019). When we look at this problem in a different way and asked respondents about their willingness to reward above and beyond behaviors versus behaviors that meet expectations, they reported being more likely to reward behaviors that are considered above and beyond (mean of 8.17) and less likely to reward behaviors that are considered to be meeting expectations (mean of 4.06). These data were collected at the beginning of the questionnaire but were not included in the four main research questions for this study, which is why they were not reported in the results section. However, in retrospect, there seems to be a significant issue here worth exploring in future research.

Another explanation for teachers overall low willingness to reward behavior could be attributed to teachers having an overall negative approach to rewarding behaviors in general. This may stem from a book written by Alfie Kohen (1996). Kohen states that rewarding students' behaviors decreases them from taking academic risks and causes them to only engage in the positive behaviors so that they can earn a reward. This information may have unfortunately stuck with teachers despite there being an abundance of research supporting the effectiveness of rewards, when used appropriately (Cameron, 2001). Research has supported that one of the barriers to implementing SWPBS is teachers' beliefs regarding how they should respond to student behavior. Overall, research has found that many teachers prefer punishing behavior

(Bambara et al., 2009; Bambara et al., 2012; Feurerborn et al., 2005) and believe that rewarding behavior is the same as bribery (Feuerborn & Tyre, 2016).

An additional explanation may be that teachers have received little training in a teacher-centered method such as applied behavior analysis techniques. Instead, teachers are trained on methodologies that are much more likely to be student-centered and constructivist approaches to human development (Brownell, Ross, Colon, &McCallum, 2005). There are two main differences between the teacher-centered approach from the student-centered approach that would impact their use of praise and rewards. The student-centered approach would warn teachers that rewards would diminish the student's intrinsic motivation for engaging in positive behaviors, whereas the teacher-centered approaches would stress that the likelihood of that occurring is very low. The other difference is the knowledge of human behavior being influence by their environment and independent of other factors versus being transactional and determined by a multifaceted collaboration of the environment and one's thoughts and feelings. Taking the stance of behavior being unidirectional, behavior is regarded as being determined largely by antecedents and consequences. Thus, when students engage in negative or unexpected behaviors, it is assumed that there are insufficiencies in their direct environment and that these insufficiencies involve making changes for the student to engage in positive behaviors (Dunlap, et al., 2009).

Research Question 3

Overall there were few behaviors that people significantly disagreed on their willingness or level to reward. There was only one behavior that was significantly different for school staff. Special education teachers are more likely to reward chewing with your mouth closed than all other staff. This suggests that school staff see behavior the same way and were equally likely to

reward behavior. With consistency amongst staff to reward behavior, regardless of which position the staff has, students, should be rewarded the same.

There were more differences in rewarding behaviors between genders. However, there are only four behaviors that males and females had significantly different views on rewarding behaviors. It was an even split with two behaviors with males being more likely and two behaviors where females are more likely. Males are more likely than females to reward cleaning up after themselves. Males are more likely to give a larger reward than females to reward cleaning up equipment when they are done using it. Females are more likely to give a larger reward than males for using positive words with others (i.e., no put-downs) Females are more willing than males to reward having belongings and necessary supplies. While there are a few instances where males and females differ in rewarding behaviors, it only consisted of four of the 47 total behaviors.

There were multiple behaviors that were rated significantly different depending on grade level. Elementary teachers were more willing to give a larger reward than all of the other grade levels (middle, high, and middle/high schools) for walking in a straight line. This is a behavior that is expected and taught at elementary schools because of how they walk through the hallways. However, at middle and high school levels, when kids are in the hallway it's during passing time and being in a single file line would not be appropriate or expected.

There were two behaviors that high school staff were more willing to reward than other schools (whether that be one grade level or multiple grade levels) but 11 behaviors that high school staff were more willing to give a larger reward for engaging in the behavior. Thus, high school staff may not be as willing to reward behavior, but when they do, they are more willing/likely to give a larger reward.

Middle school staff were significantly more willing to reward ten behaviors than other schools, but they did not have any behaviors that they were significantly more willing to give a larger reward to. Middle school staff were more willing than high school staff to reward behaviors but were not so willing to give a larger reward for behaviors. Elementary schools were significantly more willing to reward 20 behaviors and there were 14 behaviors that they were significantly more willing to reward with a larger behavior than other schools. Overall, elementary school staff are more willing to reward behavior and more willing to give a larger reward to students than other schools. Middle/high school staff never significantly more willing to reward behavior or willing to give a larger reward. However, middle/high school staff were often the least likely to reward a behavior. Of the 43 significant differences for willingness to reward a behavior, middle/high school staff were least willing to reward behavior 32 times. This results in 23 behaviors that they were least willing to reward compared to other grade-level staff.

Secondary teacher, compared to elementary teachers, may put more of an emphasis on punishing behaviors (Flannery et al., 2013). In a study conducted by Feuerborn, Wallace, & Tyre, (2016) however, some teachers were concerned about specific behavioral problems and procedures for addressing behavioral violations. Also, teacher perceptions or beliefs that conflict with the underpinnings of SWPBS may be more prevalent in the middle and high schools; 27% of concerned teachers reflected this theme. They found a main area of disagreement between elementary and secondary staff in the use of extrinsic rewards. More research is needed in the use of rewards with adolescents, as they may respond differently to rewards than elementary students (Lane, Wehby, Robertson, & Rogers, 2007). Teachers work hard to foster relationships that encompass trust and integrity with their students, and they may be concerned that if they offer rewards that students are uninterested in and find to be immature, their hard work could be

damaged. However, this may also be a concern because some teachers appeared to lack a thorough understanding of the SWPBS framework. This was indicated by some of the concern statements, in which some schools may have been giving out non-contingent rewards that were of little value to adolescents.

Feuerborn, et al., (2016) also found that secondary teachers were less likely to teach expectations. They believed that by the time they reached the secondary level they should have been taught these expectations in previous years and/or by their parents. If they do not see the importance of teaching behavioral expectations, they are also unlikely to reward students for engaging in such behaviors.

There was no significant difference between teachers and nonteachers for rewarding behaviors. This means that teachers and nonteachers both think of rewarding the behaviors the same way.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 examined if deciding to reward a behavior was a simple (highly correlated) or complex (low correlation) decision. If the teacher's willingness to reward the behavior and the level of reward they would give were highly correlated, it was considered to be a simple decision. On the flip side of that if their willingness to reward and level had a low correlation, then it was considered to be a complex decision. There was only one behavior that had a low correlation, indicating that it was a complex decision. Chewing with mouth closed was the only behavior that had a low correlation. School staff were more likely to give a student a larger reward for chewing with their mouth closed but less willing to reward that behavior. If school staff are going to reward a student for chewing with their mouth closed, they are going to give that student a larger reward.

The majority of the behaviors (72.3%) were highly correlated, meaning that teachers were either willing to reward and willing to give a larger reward or not very willing to reward and would give a smaller reward if a student engaged in that behavior. Being in the assigned area before the bus arrives was the most highly correlated behavior at .853. School staff are not very willing to reward the behavior (mean 2.61) and would reward the behavior with a smaller reward (mean 2.07). There was a moderate correlation for 25.5% of the behaviors, thus, 13 behaviors fell in the moderate range.

Acknowledgment of Limitations

While this research is important for further analyzing the future of positive behavior, specifically within a SWPBIS framework, there are several limitations that need to be addressed. First, the sample size was limited and small. It only included schools in the southern region of Minnesota. The respondents were all participating in their first year of SWPBIS training. There were only 87 participants that responded to the survey. When looking at demographic data specifically, it is hard to make generalizations when there are such few participants. For example, there were only 13 staff that work at a middle school, 12 that work at high school, and 12 that work at a middle/high school. These group sizes are very small and thus making generalizations may not be reflective of the entire population.

Pairwise deletion was used to deal with missing data. Pairwise deletion only eliminates the specific missing values from the analysis (not the entire case). In other words, all data that are available are included. Pairwise deletion was used since the sample size was so small. This method helped to keep all of the available data so that there is more data for the analysis. This resulted in some variables having more or less data depending on the number of participants that completed each question. This resulted in one variable having as few as 57 participants respond.

Behaviors were included in this study based on their inclusion in SWPBIS matrixes that have already been created by schools that were implementing SWPBIS. The top two behaviors in each category were chosen. This means that some behaviors may have been missed because they were further down the list. The researcher and advisor each went through the list of behaviors and cut behaviors that they thought were considered vague. This was subjective and based on their opinions. However, they each went through them separately and then compared lists. Then they discussed why each behavior was either kept or cut. Behaviors were also cut for redundancy and if they were overly specific to a certain situation. Since behaviors were all from matrixes of expected behavior, it is likely that they did not represent a wide range of "positivity." It is possible that more separation would have been found if a different process had been chosen for including behaviors in the questionnaire.

Future Research

The results of the current study offer a variety of options for future research to further examine positive behavior within a SWPBIS framework. Unfortunately, the findings from this study did not provide results that were useful in working towards a uniform definition of positive behavior. Research should continue to focus on defining positive behavior in a uniform way so that a measurement can be developed to assess if positive behaviors are increasing. However, even though this study did not aid in forming a standardized definition of positive behavior within SWPBIS, it did provide insight and future direction for research focusing on teachers rewarding behaviors.

Future research should also examine above and beyond behaviors versus meeting expectations. This should examine which behaviors teachers consider to be going above and beyond versus behaviors that are expected. Feurerborn et al., (2005) found that teachers were

reluctant to teach expected behaviors, students should just know these behaviors. However, while teachers may be reluctant to teach expected behaviors, they may feel differently about behaviors that are above and beyond expected behaviors. They may be more willing to reward behaviors that goes beyond the basic expectations. This could be examined by teachers completing a survey to assess what behaviors they would be willing to reward, instead of offering them a list of behaviors.

Future research should also dig into how willingness to reward would change if praise and tangible rewards were separated. On the list of low value and high value rewards, praise was often listed as a low value reward. Brophy & McCaslin (1992) found that teachers much prefer praise over punishment but also over the use tangible rewards. They are more likely to engage in rewarding students with praise than using tangibles to reward their behavior. The use of praise over tangible rewards should be examined to see if teachers would be more willing to reward behavior.

There should also be future research that examines if there are any themes in which behaviors are rated as high versus low behaviors. This should be completed using a formal statistical analysis method such as a thematic analysis. Future research could also examine observing behaviors that are rewarded to determine if there are patterns. Instead of doing a questionnaire asking teachers about their behaviors researchers could go into the schools and observe when staff are rewarding behaviors.

Practical Implications

While this study did not yield the expected results, there are still practical implications that can be applied for school staff working within a SWPBIS framework. It is great insight to know that staff are generally less willing to reward behaviors than to reward behaviors. Digging

into the research on that more it may be that teachers do not want to reward behaviors that they expect students to engage in. However, as mentioned above in future research, differentiating expected behaviors versus above and beyond behaviors may yield different results. Knowing that teachers are not fond of rewarding behaviors helps in working with teachers. It allows a place for conversations to start to engage teachers on why they prefer to not reward behavior. Now that I am aware of this, I would ask the teachers their opinion on rewards and how we can problem solve together to come to an appropriate and fair way to acknowledge the students hard work while also taking into account their resistance. Being aware that even teachers that are trained on the benefits of SWPBIS are less likely to reward a behavior, helps to lead the discussion and be able to get them onboard with the benefits of rewarding students' behaviors.

Conclusion

PBIS is a universal, school-wide framework that is designed to increase student's positive behaviors by teaching and acknowledging them when they occur while at the same time decreasing negative behaviors. Despite SWPBIS having positive behavior in its name, there is not a formal way to measure if students are engaging in positive behaviors more. Before schools can measure that there needs to be a definition of what constitutes positive behavior. The purpose of this study was to determine what behaviors that teachers find to be worthy of giving a reward and how large of a reward they were willing to give.

When acknowledging the limitations of the study, overall results indicate that staff are less willing to reward most behaviors. However, staff are in agreement on when they would be more or less willing to reward behaviors. If school staff were willing more willing to reward the behavior, they were also more willing to give a larger reward or less willing to reward and give a smaller reward. Although the results of this study did not directly answer the question of what

behaviors in schools are "positive behaviors," the results suggest that there may be degrees of "positivity." Behaviors that simply meet expectations, such as those included in SWPBIS behaviors matrixes that were analyzed in this study, are perhaps not high on the positivity scale. More research on the difference between behaviors that meet expectations and behaviors that are above and beyond expectations may further clarify the question of "what is positive behavior in schools?"

References

American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. American Psychologist, 63(9), 852–862. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1995). Schools as caring communities, poverty, levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and performance: A multilevel analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 32, 627 658.

Bambara, L., Goh, A., Kern, L., & Caskie, G. (2012). Perceived Barriers and Enablers to Implementing Individualized Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in School Settings. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *14*(4), 228–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300712437219

Bambara, L. M., Nonnemacher, S., & Kern, L. (2009). Sustaining school-based individualized positive behavior support: Perceived barriers and enablers. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*, 161-176. doi:10.1177/1098300708330878

Bear, G. G. (2013). Teacher Resistance to Frequent Rewards and Praise: Lack of Skill or a Wise Decision? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *23*(4), 318–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2013.845495.

Bierman, K. L., Smoot, D. L., & Aumiller, K. (1993). Characteristics of aggressive rejected, aggressive (nonrejected), and rejected (nonaggressive) boys. Child Development, 64, 139–151. doi:10.1111/j. 1467-8624. 1993.tb02900.x

Blanchard, K., & Spencer, J. (1993). *The one-minute manager: The world's most popular management method*. Rutherford, New Jersey: Berkley Publishing Group.

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*(3), 133-148.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. *Pediatrics, 130*(5), e1136-e1145.

Brophy, J. E. 1981. On praising effectively. *Elementary School Journal*, 81: 269–278.

Brophy, J. E. and McCaslin, M. 1992. Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *Elementary School Journal*, 93: 3–68.

Brownell, M. T., Ross, D. D., Colón, E. P. and McCallum, C. L. 2005. Critical features of special education teacher preparation: A comparison with general teacher education. *The Journal of Special Education*, 38: 242–252.

Cameron, J. (2001). Negative effects of reward on intrinsic motivation – A limited phenomenon: comment on Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (2001). *Review of Educational Research, 71,* 29 42.

Canter, L. and Canter, M. 2001. *Assertive discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classroom,* 3rd ed, Los Angeles, CA: Canter and Associates.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo,P. (2000). Prosocial foundations of children's academic achievement. Psychological Science, 11, 302–306. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00260

Carr, E. G., Dunlap, G., Horner, R. H., Koegel, R. L., Turnbull, A. P., Sailor, W., et al. (2002). *Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 4,* 4-16, 20

Carter, D. R., & Pool, J. L. (2012). Appropriate social behavior: Teaching expectations to young children. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 40*(5), 315-321. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10643-012-0516-y

Council of Europe. (2010). Council of Europe Charter on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Dana, J., Weber, R. A., & Kuang, J. X. (2007). Exploiting moral wiggle room: experiments demonstrating an illusory preference for fairness. *Economic Theory*, *33*(1), 67-80.

Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., & Lynam, D. (2006). Aggression and antisocial behavior in youth. In: W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (series eds.), & N. Eisenberg (volume ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development (6th ed., pp. 719–788). New York, NY: Wiley.

Dunlap, G., Sailor, W., Horner, R. H. and Sugai, G. 2009. "Overview and history of positive behavior support". In *Handbook of positive behavior support*, Edited by: Sailor, W., Dunlap, G., Sugai, G. and Horner, R. 3–16. New York, NY: Springer.

Ebsen, S. A. (2014). *The Development of a Teacher-Rating Measure of Positive Behavior*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3670357)

Ebsen, S., & Filter, K. J. (2013). An examination of positive social behavior in schools. *Poster Presentation at the Annual Convention for the National Association of School Psychologists*, Seattle, WA.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial behavior. In W. Damon &R.M. Lerner (series ed.), & N. Eisenberg (volume ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development (6th ed., pp. 646–718). New York, NY: Wiley.

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. (1990). The development of prosocial behavior versus nonprosocial behavior in children. In *Handbook of developmental psychopathology* (pp. 181-188). Springer US.

Epps, S. R., Park, S. E., Huston, A. C., & Ripke, M. (2005). A scale of positive social behaviors. In *What Do Children Need to Flourish?* (pp. 163-179). Springer US.

Epps, S. R., & Huston, A. C. (2007). Effects of a poverty intervention policy demonstration on parenting and child behavior: A test of the direction of effects. *Social Science Quarterly, 88*(2), 344-365. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00461.x

Espin, C., & Yell, M. (1994). Critical indicator of effective teaching for preservice teachers: Relationships between teaching behaviors and ratings of effectiveness. *Teacher Education and Special Education,* 17, 154–169. doi:10.1177/ 088840649401700303

Feuerborn, L., & Tyre, A. (2016). How Do Staff Perceive Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports? Implications for Teams in Planning and Implementing Schools. *Preventing School Failure*, *60*(1), 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2014.974489

Feuerborn, L. L., Wallace, C., & Tyre, A. D. (2016). A Qualitative Analysis of Middle and High School Teacher Perceptions of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *18*(4), 219–22.

Flannery, K. B., Frank, J. L., Kato, M. M., Doren, B., & Fenning, B. (2013). Implementing schoolwide positive behavior support in high school settings: Analysis of eight high schools. *The High School Journal*, *96*, 267–282.

Flannery, K. B., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2009). School-wide positive behavior support in high school. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*(3), 177-185. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098300708316257

Geisel, J. B. (1944). Positive Behavior: Definition and Illustrations. *The School Review*, *52*(6), 362–369. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1081537

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (2003). *Looking in classrooms* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hall, R., Lund, D., & Jackson, D. (1968). Effects of teacher attention on study behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1, 1–12. doi:10.1901/jaba.1968.1-1

Hearron, P., & Hildebrand, V. (2009). *Guiding young children* (8th ed., pp. 122-127). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Merrill.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for school wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *42*(8), 1 14.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005). School-wide positive behavior support. *Individualized supports for students with problem behaviors: Designing positive behavior plans*, pp. 359-390.

Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to child and classroom outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 79, 491–525. doi:10.3102/0034654308325693

Kalis, T. M., Vannest, K. J., Parker, R. (2007). Praise counts: Using self-monitoring to increase effective teaching practices. *Preventing School Failure,* 51, 20–27. doi:10.3200/ PSFL.51.3.20-27

Knapper, S., Stang, B., (2019) *Defining Above and Beyond Behaviors*. Minnesota State University Undergraduate Research Symposium.

Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. 1972. Development as the aim of education: The Dewey view. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42(4): 449–496.

Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2000). Aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood: A cycle of maladaptation and some protective actors. Developmental Psychology, 36, 463–472. doi:10.1037/0012 1649.36.4.463

Kokko, K., Tremblay, R. E., Lacourse, E., Nagin, D. S., & Vitaro, F. (2006). Trajectories of prosocial behavior and physical aggression in middle childhood: Links to adolescent school dropout and physical violence. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16, 403–428. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006. 00500.x

Krueger, R. F., Hicks, B. M., & McGue, M. (2001). Altruism and antisocial behavior: Independent tendencies, unique personality correlates, distinct etiologies. Psychological Science, 12, 397–402. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.0037

Luiselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., Handler, M. W., & Feinberg, A. B. (2005). Whole-school positive behaviour support: Effects on student discipline problems and academic performance. *Educational Psychology, 25*(2-3), 183-198.

Muscott, H. S., Mann, E. L., & LeBrun, M. R. (2008). Positive behavioral interventions and supports in new hampshire. effects of large-scale implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support on student discipline and academic achievement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*(3), 190-205.

Pulkkinen, L., & Tremblay, R. E. (1992). Patterns of boys' social adjustment in two cultures and at different ages: A longitudinal perspective. International Journal of Behavioural Development, 15, 527–553. doi:10.1177/016502549201500406

Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Stormont, M. (2013). Classroom-level positive behavior supports in schools implementing SW-PBIS: Identifying areas for enhancement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *15*(1), 39-50.

Reinke, W. M., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Martin, E. (2007). The effect of visual performance feedback on teacher use of behavior specific praise. *Behavior Modification*, 31, 247–263. doi:10.1177/0145445506288967

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. American Psychologist, 55, 5–14.

Simpson, J. A., Weiner, E. S. C., & Oxford University Press. (1989). The Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Skinner, B. F. 1953. *Science and human behavior*, New York, NY: Macmillan.

Staub, E. (2013). *Positive social behavior and morality: Social and personal influences* (Vol. 1). Elsevier.

Stormont, M., Covington, S., & Lewis, T. J. (2006). Using data to inform systems: Assessing teacher implementation of key features of positive behavior support. *Beyond Behavior, 15,* 10–14.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., & al, e. (2000). Applying positive behavior support and functional behavioral assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2*(3), 131.

Tyre, A. D., & Feuerborn, L. L. (2021). Ten Common Misses in PBIS Implementation. *Beyond Behavior*

Tyre, A., Feuerborn, L., Beaudoin, K., Bruce, J. (2019). Middle school teacher concerns for implementing the principles of SWPBIS. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 22(2), 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300719867858

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2008). Prosocial and antisocial behavior in preadolescence: Teachers' and parents' perceptions of the behavior of girls and boys. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32, 243–251. doi:10.1177/0165025408089274

Wentzel, K. R. (1993). Does being good make the grade? Social behavior and academic competence in middle school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85, 357–364. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.85.2.357

Wittink, D. R., & Bayer, L. R. (1994). The measurement imperative. *Marketing Research, 6*(4), 14.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). A developmental perspective on community service in adolescence. Social Development, 5, 85–111. doi: 10.1111/j.1467 9507.1996.tb00073.x

Appendix A

Table 1

School Information

School Type	n	Percentage of Sample
Elementary	46	52.9%
Middle School	13	14.9%
High School	12	13.8%
Middle/High	12	13.8%
Other	4	4.6%
Total	87	100%

Table 2

Staff Information

Staff	n	Percentage of Sample
Administrator	10	11.5%
Gen Ed Teacher	39	44.8%
SPED Teacher	7	8.0%
Licensed Non-teaching	19	21.8%
Non-licensed Support Staff	9	10.3%
Other	3	3.4%
Total	87	100%

Table 3

Mean of school staff on their willingness to reward each behavior

Behavior	*M*
eating own food, not trading	1.28
chewing with mouth closed	1.89
using sidewalks	2.59
being in assigned area before the bus arrives	2.61
sitting in assigned seat	2.64
staying in playground area	2.85
keeping body parts inside the bus	2.92
using the computer for academic purposes	3.02
leaving dangerous or distracting things at home	3.05
keeping place in line	3.08
raising hand	3.09
keeping track of belongings	3.15
returning trays to the appropriate place	3.18
taking all belongings with them	3.2
looking both ways before crossing the street	3.27
exiting the building and entering the playground safely	3.38

being in seat before bell	3.41
being on time	3.43
staying in assigned area	3.45
walking in a single-file line	3.5
walking on the right	3.5
arriving on time	3.56
taking care of restrooms needs before class	3.69
cleaning up their eating area (ex. discard trash after lunch)	3.76
waiting their turn	3.82
keeping hands to themselves	3.94
promptly walking to their class/locker	4
having belongings and necessary supplies	4.12
cleaning up equipment when done	4.16
returning materials and property when they are due	4.17
sharing and taking turns	4.28
cleaning up after self	4.39
raising hand and waiting to be recognized	4.55
sitting quietly and waiting for directions	4.61
leaving are clean	4.61
listening to directions	4.61
using inside voices	4.71
walking quietly	4.75
completing assignments as assigned	4.85
promptly beginning work	4.92
following directions the first time they are given	4.98
helping pick things up on the floor for safety	5.18
greeting adults and students	5.25
saying "please," "thank you," and "excuse me"	5.76
using positive words with others (i.e., no put downs)	5.92
doing an activity to the very best of their ability	5.94
reporting problems, vandalism, etc.	5.99
informing adults if there is a problem	6.25

Table 4

Mean of school staff on the level of reward they would give for each behavior

Behavior	***M***
eating own food, not trading	1.07
using sidewalks	1.62
being in assigned area before the bus arrives	2.07
staying in playground area	2.1
leaving dangerous or distracting things at home	2.1
sitting in assigned seat	2.14
raising hand	2.17
keeping track of belongings	2.17
chewing with mouth closed	2.18
walking on the right	2.21

returning trays to the appropriate place	2.29
looking both ways before crossing the street	2.35
taking all belongings with them	2.37
keeping place in line	2.46
walking in a single-file line	2.53
keeping body parts inside the bus	2.55
being in seat before bell	2.58
exiting the building and entering the playground safely	2.6
using the computer for academic purposes	2.68
being on time	2.71
taking care of restrooms needs before class	2.79
staying in assigned area	2.81
arriving on time	2.86
cleaning up their eating area (ex. discard trash after lunch)	2.86
waiting their turn	2.91
promptly walking to their class/locker	2.96
having belongings and necessary supplies	3.02
sharing and taking turns	3.1
returning materials and property when they are due	3.11
keeping hands to themselves	3.13
cleaning up equipment when done	3.14
cleaning up after self	3.21
Sitting quietly and waiting for directions	3.21
walking quietly	3.33
raising hand and waiting to be recognized	3.35
listening to directions	3.41
using inside voices	3.45
leaving area clean	3.59
promptly beginning work	3.68
greeting adults and students	3.73
saying "please," "thank you," and "excuse me"	3.75
helping pick things up on the floor for safety	3.76
completing assignments as assigned	3.79
following directions the first time they are given	4
using positive words with others (i.e., no put downs)	4.21
doing an activity to the very best of their ability	4.22
reporting problems, vandalism, etc.	4.7
informing adults if there is a problem	4.88

Table 5

Examples of high and low value rewards

High value rewards	**Low value rewards**

Pizza Party	Candy
Off-site lunch	Pencils
Food/drink	Stickers
Lunch with special person	Verbal recognition
Extra recess/free time	Front of lunch line
Use of phone or iPad	Ticket/token
Priority parking	Eraser
Class party	Gum
Gift card	

Appendix B

Fowler Drive Elementary School Behavior Matrix

At Fowler Drive we…

	Classroom	Hallway	Restroom	Cafeteria	Playground	Bus
Follow Instructions	• Listen to directions. • Complete assignments as asked.	• Stay in a single file line. • Walk instead of run.	• Flush toilet after use. • Use the restroom quickly and quietly.	• Enter and exit quietly. • Get what you need while you are in line. • Line up at the wall before the aquarium.	• Exit the building and enter the playground safely. • Stay in designated play area.	• Stay in seats. • Keep aisles clear.
Demonstrate Self-Control	• Be quiet while teacher is talking. • Keep hands, feet, and objects to yourself.	• Keep your mouth closed. • Keep your hands and feet off the walls as you walk down the hall.	• Wait your turn. • Use the facilities correctly.	• Stay in your seat. • Keep food on your tray. • Talk quietly at your table.	• Show good sportsmanship, • Keep hands, feet, and objects to yourself.	• Keep body parts inside bus. • Be patient when entering and leaving bus.
Exercise your brain and body	• Think before you speak • Think before you act.	• Keep proper distance between you and others.	• Wash your hands. • Use the supplies correctly.	• Sit with good posture. • Eat all of your lunch. • Chew your food thoroughly.	• Use your mind and not your fist. Talk to your teacher to solve problems. • Use the equipment correctly and safely.	• Face forward on bus. • Arrive at bus stop on time. • Keep pens and pencils put away.
Show Respect	• Talk nicely to teachers and classmates • Be supportive of others	• Walk quietly without disturbing other classes	• Keep the restroom clean. • Respect the privacy of others.	• Chew with your mouth closed. • Listen to adult instruction.	• Play gently. • Take turns. • Share equipment.	• Use low voice when talking. • Keep bus clean.

Appendix C

Positive Behaviors and Rewards Survey

Demographics

Your role in the school

Administrator
General Education Teaching (including specials such as music and phys. ed.)
Special Education Teacher
Licensed Non-Teaching Staff (e.g., counselor, social worker, psychologist)
Non-licensed Support Staff (e.g., para, maintenance, office assistant)
Other _____

Grade level of your school (circle all that apply)

Elementary School Middle School High School

Grade levels you work with (circle all that apply):

Pre-K K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Gender

Male Female

Name of Your School _____

Rewards Examples

Please provide 3-5 rewards that you consider to be high value rewards

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

Please provide 3-5 rewards that you consider to be low value rewards

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

_____
_

Decisions to Reward

1. If you observed 10 incidents of students **meeting basic behavior expectations** (e.g., on-task, in seat, listening to directions), how many of those incidents would you be likely to reward with any level or reward? (Circle your response)

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. If you observed 10 incidents of students engage in positive behaviors that were **above and beyond** basic behavior expectations (e.g., helping other students, cleaning up messes they didn't make), how many of those incidents would you be likely to reward with any level or reward?

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Positive Behaviors

For each question, please (a) indicate the degree to which you would be willing to reward a student for the following behaviors by circling numbers on a scale of 0-100% and then (b) indicate the level of reward that you think that behavior should earn by circling 0-10 (with 10 representing high reward, 5 representing moderate reward, and 0 representing no reward):

1. **RAISING HAND**

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

2. **CLEANING UP AFTER SELF**

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. **SITTING QUIETLY AND WAITING FOR DIRECTIONS**

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. **BEING IN SEAT BEFORE THE BELL**

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. **KEEPING PLACE IN LINE**

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

6. STAYING IN ASSIGNED AREA

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7. KEEPING HANDS TO THEMSELVES

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

8. REPORTING PROBLEMS, VANDALISM, ETC.

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9. LEAVING AREA CLEAN

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

10. WAITING THEIR TURN

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

11. LOOKING BOTH WAYS BEFORE CROSSING THE STREET

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

12. STAYING IN THE PLAYGROUND AREA

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

13. LISTENING TO DIRECTIONS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

14. CHEWING WITH MOUTH CLOSED

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

15. EXITING THE BUILDING AND ENTERING THE PLAYGROUND SAFELY

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

16. KEEPING BODY PARTS INSIDE THE BUS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

17. PROMPTLY WALKING TO THEIR CLASS/LOCKER

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

18. RETURNING TRAYS TO THE APPROPRIATE PLACE

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

19. INFORMING ADULTS IF THERE IS A PROBLEM

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

20. ARRIVING ON TIME

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

21. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS THE FIRST TIME THEY ARE GIVEN

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

22. USING THE COMPUTER FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

23. EATING OWN FOOD, NOT TRADING

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

24. WALKING IN A SINGLE-FILE LINE

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

25. WALKING ON THE RIGHT

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

26. SHARING AND TAKING TURNS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

27. BEING ON TIME

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

28. WALKING QUIETLY

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

29. RAISING HAND AND WAITING TO BE RECOGNIZED

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

30. BEING IN ASSIGNED AREA BEFORE THE BUS ARRIVES

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

31. SITTING IN ASSIGNED SEAT

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

32. USING SIDEWALKS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

33. CLEANING UP THEIR EATING AREA (EX. DISCARD TRASH AFTER LUNCH)

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

34. USING INSIDE VOICES

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

35. COMPLETING ASSIGNMENTS AS ASSIGNED

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

36. CLEANING UP EQUIPMENT WHEN DONE

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

37. TAKING ALL BELONGINGS WITH THEM

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

38. RETURNING MATERIALS AND PROPERTY WHEN THEY ARE DUE

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

39. HELPING PICK UP THINGS ON THE FLOOR FOR SAFETY

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

40. KEEPING TRACK OF BELONGINGS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

41. TAKING CARE OF RESTROOMS NEEDS BEFORE CLASS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

42. SAYING "PLEASE," "THANK YOU," AND "EXCUSE ME"

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

43. LEAVING DANGEROUS OR DISTRACTING THINGS AT HOME

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

44. USING POSITIVE WORDS WITH OTHERS (I.E., NO PUT DOWNS)

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

45. GREETING ADULTS AND STUDENTS

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

46. PROMPTLY BEGINNING WORK

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

47. DOING AN ACTIVITY TO THE VERY BEST OF THEIR ABILITY

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

48. HAVING BELONGINGS AND NECESSARY SUPPLIES

Willing to Reward	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Level of Reward	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10