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Teachers receive a number of professional development trainings and consultations to develop or enhance their repertoire in various evidenced based practices (EBP) and classroom management strategies. Nevertheless, teachers’ adherence to strategies learned during trainings often decline when external supports are removed (Codding et al., 2015; Oliver et al., 2015) which may lead to challenges in the consistent and accurate implementation of EBP in classroom settings (Shernoff et al., 2020). Performance feedback and self-monitoring have been used to address these challenges and promote teachers’ use and fidelity of EBP in the classroom (Scheeler et al., 2004; Oliver et al., 2015). The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of performance feedback and self-monitoring on teachers’ delivery of behavior specific praise (BSP) in their classrooms using a multiple baseline design across participants. Results suggest performance feedback was successful in increasing the rate of BSP while self-monitoring maintained BSP at a predetermined goal, in the absence of observation or feedback for two teachers. These results align with prior literature, suggesting that performance feedback is effective in changing teacher performance and self-monitoring is potentially a viable strategy to promote maintenance in EBP in the absence of external supports and feedback.
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Introduction

Evidenced based practices (EBP) are those empirically supported and validated with research findings that demonstrate beneficial student outcomes (Forman et al., 2009). As mandated by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), teachers should use EBP in their classrooms to enhance the academic and behavioral growth of their students (IDEA, 2004; IRIS, 2014). However, maintaining their adherence in the implementation of these EBP has been a recurring challenge for consultants and researchers (Gross et al., 2014). As a result of omitting components of EBP, implementing components incorrectly, or completely abandoning the use of them, teachers’ gains in implementing EBP are often followed by a gradual or immediate decline in adherence and fidelity once supports are removed (Coddington et al., 2005; Gross et al., 2014; Oliver et al., 2015). Furthermore, the effectiveness of EBP on student outcomes is dependent on accurate and consistent implementation. Thus, with student success being the ultimate goal of education, it is imperative that teachers maintain the skills needed to use these practices, and that research continues to identify effective strategies to maintain the accurate use of EBP in the classroom (Hawkins & Heflin, 2011; Oliver et al., 2015).

Throughout the literature on teacher practices, many studies have assessed the extent to which various interventions promote the maintenance of teachers’ use of EBP. Researchers have used video self-modeling (Hawkins & Heflin, 2011), performance feedback (Scheeler et al., 2004; Duchaine et al., 2011; DiGennaro et al., 2007), didactic training (Dufrene et al., 2012), and direct consultation (LaBrot et al., 2020), collectively or in isolation, to enhance teachers’ use of various EBP such as behavior specific praise (BSP) (Duchaine et al., 2011), opportunities to respond (Hager, 2012), and token economies (Plavnick et al., 2010). Despite the success in
improving initial levels of the teachers’ target behavior with EBP during the use of these interventions, results across a number of studies depict a pattern of inadequate or deteriorating levels of behavior across the maintenance phase when the intervention is removed (Codding et al., 2005, Gross et al., 2014, Rispoli et al., 2017). This is evident by the immediate or gradual decline in the level of reported teacher fidelity during follow-up phases.

For example, Noell et al. (1997) trained teachers to implement a reinforcement-based intervention to manage student challenging behaviors. After discontinuing consultation, teachers temporarily (e.g., 2-4 days) implemented the trained reinforcement procedures with high fidelity. This was followed by an immediate descending trend and researchers used performance feedback to return teacher fidelity to identified levels. Similarly, Taber (2015) used performance feedback to restore teachers’ rate of BSP after direct consultation failed to maintain this behavior at desired levels following its removal. More specifically, during intervention, researchers provided prompts for teachers to deliver BSP every two minutes, increasing their overall rate of BSP to at or above their goal. However, an immediate decline in the rate of BSP was observed when training was removed.

Moreover, teachers initially maintaining fidelity of trained EBP, often demonstrate a steady decline in the level of fidelity over time. This is depicted in LaBrot et al. (2020), as teachers maintained steady levels of BSP for about one to two weeks following the removal of direct consultation. At the two-week follow up, the rates of BSP were on a descending trend, followed by a constant decrease in the overall level of BSP at each subsequent follow-up session. For example, two months following the termination of direct consultation, teachers once delivering BSP well above (e.g., 2.22 per min) their established criterion of 0.5 per min, only delivered BSP directly at or below their goal line (e.g., 0.88 per min). This gradual, yet
consistent, decline in teacher behavior suggests the same trend could continue during later follow-up sessions (Reinke et al., 2008). This is further supported by Miller et al., (2014) as teachers’ use of behavior management strategies returned to pre-training levels following a 12-month discontinuation of Behavior Skills Training. This common decline in behavior indicates that maintenance does not naturally occur following the rapid removal of interventions and that maintenance strategies should be incorporated during trainings (Eyberg et al., 1998).

**Performance Feedback**

Performance feedback has been used in classroom settings to establish and sustain teacher performances (Scheeler et al., 2004). This evidenced-based strategy requires teachers to receive specific information and guidance relative to their implementation of the target practice through reviewing data, receiving praise for correct performance, obtaining corrective feedback for areas necessitating improvement, and/or discussing any questions regarding implementation (Codding et al., 2005). This, along with other modes of feedback delivery (e.g., written feedback, peer feedback, delayed feedback) have produced positive changes in teacher behavior (Scheeler et al., 2004). Throughout the literature, performance feedback has improved initial performances following trainings (Oliver et al., 2015), returned performances to desired levels after observed declines (Taber, 2015), and sustained performances at a consistent rate across consecutive sessions (Codding et al., 2005). However, other factors such as time commitment and observer reactivity can jeopardize the feasibility of implementing performance feedback over an extended period of time (Oliver, 2011). Research suggests that performance feedback is eventually faded to support feasibility and teacher independence in implementing EBP (Codding et al., 2005; Oliver, 2011). Yet, as previously described, some studies (e.g., Taber, 2015; LaBrot et al., 2020) illustrate the challenges in maintaining high rates of teacher performances when feedback or
consistent supports are removed, and researchers suggest examining strategies to maintain teacher performance following the removal of feedback and other intensive supports (Oliver, 2011).

**Self-Monitoring**

Self-monitoring is a low cost, readily available intervention, defined as a procedure in which a person systematically observes and records the occurrence and nonoccurrence of his or her own behavior (Cooper et al., 2020) and has been identified as an effective evidenced based strategy to promote and maintain behavior change (Cooper et al., 2020; Eyberg et al., 1998; Rispoli et al., 2017). The use of self-monitoring has promoted the maintenance of a variety of behavior change related to student on-task behaviors (Amato-Zech et al., 2006), teacher implementation of token economies (Plavnick et al., 2010), and classroom management strategies (MacSuga & Simonsen, 2011). Self-monitoring is often identified as an efficient behavior change strategy because it allows for independent observation and change in one’s own behavior, without the sole reliance on other personnel (Rispoli et al., 2017). Additionally, observing, recording, and evaluating one’s own behavior serves as a continuous source of feedback, producing self-awareness of performance and allowing the individual to change relevant variables in their environment to obtain desired behavior change (Cooper et al., 2020; Skinner, 1953).

Given the benefits of self-monitoring, the use of it amongst teachers has great potential for self-identification of performance in pinpointing areas of improvement and making changes to further enhance their use of EBP (Wright & Baxter, 2012). For example, in the absence of a self-monitoring tool, teachers are more likely to over or underestimate the fidelity of their use of EBP. Kranak (2015) illustrates this, as a teacher expressed a preference of delivering four BSP
statements per min, reporting it was similar to her typical rate of BSP prior to the study, even though the teacher’s average rate of BSP was only 1.38 per min in baseline. Teachers highly overestimating their performance could result in inadequate or insufficient changes in behavior if it appears to them that their behavior does not need improvement. Thus, Kranak (2015) suggested teachers engage in self-monitoring to obtain potentially more accurate representation(s) of their behavior and change their behavior accordingly.

Self-monitoring has also been used to promote and maintain adherence and fidelity of various EBP in the classroom (e.g., Hager, 2012; Oliver et al., 2015; Plavnick et al., 2010; Rispoli et al., 2017). Oliver (2011) used self-monitoring to assess its impact on the maintenance of teachers’ initial high levels of fidelity in the implementation of the Good Behavior Game (GBG). As performance feedback was removed, a self-monitoring checklist was introduced and fidelity checks indicated that the teachers were able to maintain high levels of fidelity, independent of researcher feedback and support. However, a limited maintenance phase prevented researchers from concluding if fidelity maintained at the desired level after weeks of no feedback or use of the self-monitoring checklist. Nevertheless, it was concluded that self-monitoring served as an effective approach to fade intensive supports during trainings and maintain high fidelity of EBP. To further assess the impacts of self-monitoring on maintaining teacher performances, Oliver (2011) suggested using this intervention with other EBP.

**Behavior Specific Praise**

Behavior specific praise is a common and simple, yet effective EBP used as a classroom management technique to increase appropriate behaviors and decrease undesired behaviors (Floress & Jenkins, 2015). BSP can be defined as explicitly describing to the student or group of students, the behavior that is being approved or for which praise is delivered. In turn, students
are more likely to know what behaviors are desirable, further strengthening the relationship between appropriate behaviors and reinforcement (Floress & Jenkins, 2015). Despite the substantial literature base to support the use of BSP (Zoder-Martell et al., 2019), it is not adequately used in practice as teachers’ natural rate of praise is typically less than one per minute (Floress & Jenkins, 2015; White et al., 1975). There is limited literature to objectively indicate exactly how much BSP should be delivered in the classroom; however, various studies recommend that teachers deliver one to four praise statements for every reprimand delivered in the classroom (Piscatera et al., 2011; Trussel, 2008). Additionally, research suggest that BSP should be delivered at a range of one to eight per minute (Kranak et al., 2017). This is supported within the literature as desired student behaviors increase when teachers deliver at least two BSP statements per minute, with greater changes evident with a higher rate of BSP (Dufrene et al., 2012; Kranak et al., 2017). A number of studies have found various evidenced based strategies to be successful in enhancing teachers’ use of BSP, while also citing the decline in maintenance over time following the removal of the intervention (Dufrene et al., 2012; Hawkins & Heflin, 2011; Taber, 2015). For example, Hawkins and Heflin (2011) used video-self modeling and visual performance feedback to increase teachers’ use of BSP. During observation meetings with the researcher, teachers watched recorded clips of their appropriate use of BSP and reviewed graphs depicting their progress over time, resulting in an increase in their rate of BSP. However, following the removal of this intervention, two of the three teachers’ rate of BSP returned to baseline levels and the researchers suggested that future studies use self-monitoring to promote maintenance in teachers’ behavior change.

Several studies have demonstrated self-monitoring as an effective tool to assist in enhancing and maintaining teacher use of BSP. For example, Kalis et al. (2007) assessed the
relationship between a high school teacher’s use of praise and self-monitoring. The teacher was trained to monitor her behavior while delivering Direct Instruction lessons during her math class. Self-monitoring consisted of recording each instance of BSP on a handheld counter and documenting the total number of BSP statements delivered during 10-min intervals. The teacher’s rate of general and BSP increased during intervention and maintained at the desired level for three additional sessions. However, this short maintenance phase does not provide enough support for the use of self-monitoring to maintain behavior over an extended period of time. Also, it is important to note that these results reflect the impact of self-monitoring on a single, first year, high school teacher, limiting its generalizability to other teachers. Willis et al. (2019) extended the literature of the use of self-monitoring on BSP to four paraprofessionals in elementary classrooms. The paraprofessionals were trained to tally each instance of praise (i.e., general and specific praise) during instructional periods, while observers simultaneously recorded teachers’ delivery of total praise, BSP statements, and reprimands. A functional relationship between self-monitoring and total praise was suggested as there was an immediate increase in overall praise statements following the introduction of self-monitoring, with a slight increase in BSP, specifically. Maintenance observations occurred two weeks following the intervention and the level of total praise was variable yet remaining relatively consistent with levels in intervention. Because paraprofessionals were not trained to exclusively monitor only their delivery of BSP, a clear functional relationship between self-monitoring and BSP could not be determined. However, researchers suggested future research focus on monitoring BSP due to its positive impact observed on overall praise levels and selecting a self-monitoring strategy most appropriate for the teacher’s classroom environment.
Simonsen et al. (2012) assessed the effects and preference of various self-monitoring strategies (i.e., tally, count, and estimation of their rate of BSP) on teachers’ rate of BSP. Tally and count were most effective as teachers’ rate of BSP, adherence, and accuracy of recording, showed the greatest levels relative to the use of each strategy. Teachers favored the handheld counter and reported it produced greater changes in student behavior, served as a prompt to deliver BSP, and was feasible to use while delivering instruction. However, of the five teachers in the study, only one maintained a high and stable rate of BSP during the follow-up phase. All other teachers required performance feedback to return their rate of BSP to desired levels. Thus, researchers suggested that future research examine how much self-monitoring is required to maintain the desired level of BSP.

**Student Behaviors**

Due to the positive relationship between student and teacher behavior change, researchers have suggested that studies targeting the enhancement of teacher performance also measure student outcomes to determine if observed changes in student behaviors coincide with varying levels of teacher fidelity (Dufrene et al., 2014; Oliver, 2011). Rispoli et al. (2017) reported that few studies have measured student outcomes relative to changes in teacher behavior, limiting an objective conclusion on the effects of teacher self-monitoring on student behavior. EBP are designed to produce positive student outcomes and are only as effective as its delivery, meaning that they are more effective at positively changing student behaviors when they are implemented with high fidelity (Oliver et al., 2015). This relationship is demonstrated within the literature as improvements in teachers’ fidelity of implementing EBP covary with the occurrence of decreases in challenging behaviors (DiGennaro et al., 2007; Dufrene et al., 2014), increases in desired student behaviors, (LaBrot et al., 2020) and increases in student academic outcomes (Allinder et al., 2000; Plavnick et al., 2010). Thus, measuring the effects of a self-monitoring intervention
designed to change teacher behaviors on student outcomes is important to ensure that changes in student behaviors are also reaching optimal levels.

The research described above includes varied results on the extent to which self-monitoring maintains desired levels of teacher behavior with no feedback. Thus, studies such as Oliver (2011) suggests more research is needed to determine the impact of self-monitoring on maintaining desired levels of fidelity. Oliver (2011) successfully used performance feedback to increase initial levels of fidelity and self-monitoring to maintain teachers’ high levels of fidelity in implementing the GBG, supporting the use of performance feedback to promote initial levels of teacher performance and self-monitoring as a tool to maintain desired levels of behavior, independent of consistent supports. Due to these positive implications, Oliver (2011) suggested future research extend their findings by applying the use of performance feedback and self-monitoring to other EBP. Therefore, the primary purpose of this study was to extend the research of Oliver (2011) by examining the effects of self-monitoring on teachers’ rate of BSP following the removal of performance feedback in the classroom. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the effects of daily self-monitoring on maintenance of teacher rate of behavior specific praise (BSP) following the removal of performance feedback?
2. What effect does increasing the rate of teacher BSP have on student on-task behavior?
3. What effect does increasing selected teachers’ rate of BSP have on the rate of BSP of other classroom personnel?
4. How will teachers rate the use of performance feedback and self-monitoring on social acceptability measures after the study?
Method

Participants

Participants included three female classroom teachers in a local school district located in Southwest Michigan. For this study, teachers included both lead classroom teachers and program aids in classroom settings, both of whom interacted with students through delivering instruction or conducting instructional activities. All participants reported dealing with challenging student behaviors (i.e., property destruction, eloping, lack of motivation, and physical and verbal aggression), an interest in increasing behavior specific praise statements, and were recruited through email and collaboration with program directors and school principals. Participants were required to meet the following inclusion criteria: (a) have at least one year of general teaching/classroom experience, (b) deliver less than two behavior specific praise (BSP) statements per minute during a 10-min observation, and (c) have no current experience using a self-monitoring tool for instructional purposes. Amber was an early childhood special education (ECSE) paraprofessional with 5 years of teaching experience. Jamie was a high school special education teacher with 30 years of teaching experience, and Kat was a middle school, special education teacher with 28 years of teaching experience. At least one other classroom staff member from Amber’s and Jamie’s classroom (i.e., program aid or classroom teacher) was also observed during selected observations. There were no inclusion criteria for these classroom personnel as they were not the primary participants, and they did not receive any programmed intervention at any point in the study.

Setting

The study took place in public elementary, middle, and high school special education classrooms for Amber, Kat, and Jamie, respectively. Baseline and intervention observations
occurred during a 10 to 30 min teacher selected class activity or instructional period. Teachers selected a class period or activity during which challenging behaviors were most common. Amber selected centers as the target activity, which included a systematic rotation of various crafts, projects, toys, and costumes. Jamie’s selected target instructional time period included reading and language arts, comprised of group and one-on-one read aloud, worksheets, and comprehension questions. Kat’s target instructional time periods included language arts and math, which included one-on-one instruction with worksheets and knowledge checks. Another class period, where there was no direct intervention, was selected by the researcher and observed for generalization probes. These observations occurred during snack, algebra/geography, and vocabulary for Amber, Jamie, and Kat, respectively.

**Materials**

During training, participants reviewed a recorded PowerPoint presentation (Appendix A) that described the purpose, effectiveness, and implementation of BSP, including two video models of classroom teachers accurately delivering BSP to students in a classroom. They also received worksheets of 10 written examples and non-examples of BSP statements. During the self-monitoring phase, participants received a handheld counter to track each instance of BSP and a self-monitoring checklist (see Appendix B), used to aid their implementation of the self-monitoring tool and ensure fidelity. Following the end of each session, they recorded their data (i.e., date, time, frequency, and rate of BSP) on a self-monitoring data collection form (see Appendix C) while the researcher plotted the rate of BSP statements on a graph to monitor the change in BSP rates over time and review with participants during feedback sessions. Fidelity checklists were also used during specified observations to collect data on the teachers’ use of the self-monitoring tool and procedural checklists were used to assess the researcher’s
implementation of procedures. Throughout all phases, researchers used a virtual MotivAider® and/or an interval timer to track the frequency of BSP statements during each specified interval.

**Dependent Measures**

The primary dependent variable was the teachers’ rate of BSP, defined as delivering a response-dependent general praise statement that included a description of the behavior being praised, to a student, or group of students, engaging in appropriate behaviors. The frequency of BSP was tallied on a data collection sheet (see Appendix D) in 10-s intervals and converted into rate per minute by dividing the total number of BSP statements by the total number of minutes of the observation or self-monitoring session. Observations ranged from a total duration of 10 to 30 min, relative to the classroom activity and instruction. Researchers sat in an unobtrusive location in the classroom and recorded the frequency of BSP statements delivered during each interval. The rate of BSP delivered by other classroom personnel was also measured in the same manner, with observations occurring on the same day as generalization probes (e.g., for every third observation in the target activity).

The secondary dependent measure was students’ appropriate on-task behavior, defined as actively (e.g., manipulating task materials) or passively (e.g., looking at task materials) engaging in a designated classroom activity with their eyes and body oriented toward the teacher or activity (LaBrot et al., 2020). Student appropriate behaviors were measured simultaneously with during each teacher observation using momentary time sampling. Prior to beginning each observation, researchers discussed the order in which students would be observed (e.g., student 1, student 2, student 3). At the end of each 10-s interval, researchers systematically observed a single student on a rotating basis, recording whether they were engaging in appropriate on-task
behaviors. At the end of the following interval, the next student was observed, and researchers continued this pattern until the observation session elapsed.

Other variables measured throughout the study included the rate of teacher’s general praise (GP), defined as delivering a statement of approval for a student’s or group of students’ behaviors without specifying what behavior is being approved (Floress et al., 2020), and reprimands (R), defined as delivering a statement that is intended to correct undesired behaviors and indicate disapproval by describing the student’s inappropriate behavior (Caldarella et al., 2020). Both behaviors were measured simultaneously with BSP, by tallying the frequency of delivered statements during 10-s intervals and converting it to rate by dividing each total number of GP and R by the total duration of the observation. Teachers did not receive any programmed training or feedback on these variables at any point in the study. Examples of BSP, GP, and R statements can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

*Examples of Behavior Specific Praise, General Praise, and Reprimand Statements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Specific Praise</th>
<th>General Praise</th>
<th>Reprimands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice work reading the entire paragraph</td>
<td>Great job</td>
<td>Do not talk out without permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You answered that question so quickly, excellent</td>
<td>You’re phenomenal</td>
<td>No, wait until I tell you with instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You did such a great job walking in line</td>
<td>Awesome work</td>
<td>Stop running around the room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Integrity**

During the self-monitoring phase, the researcher used a treatment integrity checklist (see Appendix E) to assess teachers’ adherence to the self-monitoring process during 100% of
sessions for all participants. The checklist included whether the teacher recorded the duration of the activity, had the counter with them during the observed activity, used the counter after delivering a BSP statement, and recorded their total count and duration on the corresponding data collection sheet. Treatment integrity was calculated as the number of steps completed correctly, divided by the total number of steps, multiplied by 100. Treatment integrity for all teachers was 100%, accurately implementing the self-monitoring tool across all observed sessions. Interobserver agreement (IOA) for teachers’ treatment integrity was conducted by the researcher or a research assistant by comparing their completed checklist with teachers’ checklist, and calculated as the number of agreements, divided by the total number of agreements and disagreements, multiplied by 100. IOA data were collected for 100% of the pre-identified sessions (i.e., the first three sessions of the self-monitoring phase), and the mean agreement was 100%.

Procedural integrity of the researcher’s implementation of procedures was also evaluated during 100% of training sessions, and 50% (Amber), 40% (Jamie), and 50% (Kat) of performance feedback sessions. During the self-monitoring phase, procedural integrity was assessed for 30% and 40% of Amber’s and Jamie’s sessions, respectively. Procedural integrity was also assessed for Kat’s single self-monitoring session. A research assistant used a procedural checklist during each phase to assess the researcher’s adherence to the procedures (see Appendix F). Procedural integrity was calculated as the number of steps performed correctly, divided by total steps, multiplied by 100. The researcher scored 100% on all procedural integrity evaluations, across each participant and each phase (see Appendix G).
Interobserver Agreement

IOA was assessed for 44% (range, 33%-57%) of all sessions on all dependent variables across each participant and each phase using interval-by-interval comparisons. The researcher and a research assistant simultaneously and independently observed and tallied the frequency of BSP delivered within 10-s intervals, during the classroom observations. IOA of the use of BSP was calculated by dividing the number of intervals with agreement by the total number of intervals and multiplying by 100. IOA of students’ appropriate behavior was also collected during observations and was calculated by dividing the number of agreed intervals by the total number of intervals, multiplied by 100. When IOA fell below 80% the researcher and research assistant reviewed discrepancies, definitions, and examples of the respective dependent variable, and conducted another observation. The IOA results from all sessions can found in Appendix H.

The mean agreement for Amber’s BSP statements was 85.2% (range, 71.67%-100%), 97.04% for GP statements, (range, 93.3%-100%), 99.4% for R (range, 98.3%-100%), and 99.1% for student appropriate behaviors (range, 92.5%-100%). Jamie’s mean agreement for BSP statements was 93.8% (range, 84.5%-100%), 98.5% for GP statements (range, 95.8%-100%), 99.7% for R (range, 95.8%-100%), and 97.8% for appropriate student behaviors (range, 91.3%-100%). Kat’s mean agreement was 98.5% (range, 93.3%-100%) for BSP statements, 98.6% for GP statements (range, 95%-100%), 100% for R, and 100% for appropriate student behaviors.

During all self-monitoring sessions, the researcher conducted IOA with the teachers’ recorded frequency of BSP statements during the observation to ensure fidelity of the self-monitoring tool (see Appendix I). The teachers recorded the frequency of BSP statements delivered on their handheld counter while the researcher or research assistant simultaneously recorded the frequency of BSP statements on the data collection sheet. Following each session,
the total frequency was compared and BSP frequency IOA was calculated by dividing the smaller recorded frequency by the larger recorded frequency, multiplied by 100. Amber’s BSP frequency agreement averaged 94% across all sessions (range, 80%-98.6%), Jamie’s mean agreement was 95.3% (range, 91.7%-100%), and Kat’s BSP frequency agreement for the single self-monitoring session was 66.7%.

**Social Acceptability**

Prior to completing the training and following the completion of the study, teachers completed a brief BSP questionnaire regarding their use and experience with delivering BSP and its impact on student behaviors (see Appendix J). The 7-item questionnaire consisted of five questions with a 5-point Likert scale and 2 open-ended questions. Additionally, a revised version of the Treatment Acceptability Rating Form (TARF-R) (see Appendix K) was used at the end of the study to assess participants’ acceptability of performance feedback and self-monitoring as tools to improve their performance of BSP. The TARF-R is a 20-item questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale and items were modified so that questions addressed performance feedback and self-monitoring. All questionnaires were delivered electronically through an online survey. Teachers were emailed the link to the respective questionnaire and all post measures were completed anonymously.

**Experimental Design and Procedures**

A multiple baseline across participants design was used to assess the effects of self-monitoring on maintaining teachers’ rate of BSP, independent of researcher feedback (Cooper et al., 2020). The phases included baseline, performance feedback, and self-monitoring. Visual analysis was used to assess the level, trend, and variability of data to make data-based decisions
throughout the study (Cooper et al., 2020). Phase changes occurred when teachers met the specified criteria of each phase and the rate of BSP data were stable across consecutive sessions.

Throughout all phases, for about every third observation, or as feasible, in the teacher selected period/target activity, the researcher conducted a generalization probe in an activity where no training or programmed feedback was delivered. During generalization probes, the researcher sat in an unobtrusive location and tallied data on the teachers’ frequency and rate of BSP to determine if teachers increased their use of BSP in areas outside of their selected period/target. Similar to observations in the target activity, generalization observations occurred during a 10 to 30 min class activity, with 10-s intervals. Teachers did not receive any programmed feedback or training specific to this setting or activity at any point during the study.

Pre-baseline

Prior to collecting baseline, participants received a brief screening survey (see Appendix L) to collect information regarding their current use of self-monitoring tools, teaching experience, student challenging behaviors, and other basic demographics. In addition, the researcher observed each teacher delivering BSP during a classroom period to determine if they met the inclusion criteria for the study. The researcher sat in an unobtrusive area in the classroom and collected data on rate of BSP during a brief 10-min observation.

Baseline

During baseline, the researcher conducted observations to assess teachers’ initial rate of BSP during the selected period/target activity. Additionally, the BSP rate of the other selected classroom personnel and students’ appropriate behavior were observed and recorded during this phase. No instruction or programmed feedback was delivered during this phase and each teacher
remained in baseline until their rate of BSP was stable across a minimum of three consecutive observations.

**BSP Training**

Each teacher individually received training on BSP, after school or outside of scheduled class time with students. Training lasted approximately 45-min and included a brief recorded presentation of the literature, effectiveness, and correct implementation of BSP. This also included two video models of trained teachers delivering BSP naturally in their classroom. Each video model was reviewed twice. During the first viewing of the video model, teachers were instructed to think about which statements delivered in the model were examples of BSP. During the second viewing of video models, the researcher stopped throughout to discuss which statements were examples and non-examples of BSP. They also discussed the frequency and rate of BSP statements delivered in each video. Following this, the researcher provided the teacher with a 10-question worksheet consisting of examples and non-examples of BSP statements (see Appendix M) and instructed them to identify which statements were BSP and which statements were not. Participants were expected to correctly identify the praise statements with 90% or higher accuracy to move on to role-play; this criterion was met on the first opportunity by each teacher. Upon reaching mastery, participants practiced delivering BSP during mock classroom instruction or activities. Each participant received a scenario, instructions for the activity, and behavior expectations of the confederate students (see Appendix N). Participants were asked to facilitate the activity and interact with the confederate students as they typically would with students in their classroom. Confederate students received a list of on-task behaviors to engage in throughout the role-play (see Appendix O), mirroring behaviors that would receive praise in the classroom setting. At the end of every 1 to 2 min interval, confederate students engaged in
specified behaviors to contrive opportunities for each participant to respond to by redirecting and/or delivering praise for on-task behaviors (e.g., requesting to use the bathroom, asking for a break, walking away from the table, or looking away from the task). The researcher recorded the number of BSP statements provided by the teacher during role-play, each ranging from 7 to 11 min in duration. Following role-play, the researcher discussed the frequency and rate of BSP statements delivered and provided praise and feedback relative to the teachers’ appropriate use of BSP statements. Training was completed when teachers delivered BSP at a rate of 1 per minute; all participants met this criterion during the first practice opportunity.

**Performance Feedback**

Prior to the first observation following training, the researcher informed the teacher of their goal, which was individualized based on participant’s performance during training and classroom variables such as class size and type of instruction (e.g., one-on-one instruction). Amber’s goal was to deliver at least 2 BSP statements per minute, while Jamie and Kat’s goal was both 1 BSP statement per minute. Observations during this phase mirrored those of baseline with the addition of performance feedback. Immediately following each observation, the researcher met with the teacher for approximately two to three minutes, to discuss their performance, using a performance feedback script (see Appendix P) to ensure consistency in feedback delivery across all participants. This included reviewing the total time of the observation, the number of BSP statements delivered during the observation, the rate of BSP, verbal praise contingent on meeting the criterion, and discussing any questions from the teacher. A graph of each teacher’s rate of BSP was reviewed with the teacher to provide a visual analysis of their progress. The researcher encouraged the teacher to continue delivering BSP and notified the teacher of the next observation. When criterion was not met, the researcher discussed their
frequency and rate of BSP and reminded them of their goal, with all other components of the feedback session remaining the same. Performance feedback continued until the teacher’s rate of BSP data were stable and at or above their respective criterion level for at least three consecutive sessions. An exception to this criterion was made for Kat due to performance and limited opportunities to collect data at the end of the school year.

**Self-Monitoring**

Self-monitoring was introduced after criterion was met in the performance feedback phase and was defined as systematically recording one’s own behavior. The researcher gave each teacher a handheld counter, a data collection sheet, and a self-monitoring checklist. The checklist was only used during acquisition, as the teacher learned to monitor their own behavior. They were instructed to record the start and stop time of the target activity, use the handheld counter to record each instance of BSP, and record all relative data on the data collection sheet at the end of the session. During beginning sessions of this phase, the teacher and observer concurrently completed the self-monitoring checklist and compared results to determine IOA, to ensure accurate implementation of the self-monitoring tool. The rate and frequency of BSP was also compared to ensure they were accurately monitoring and converting their frequency of BSP to a rate. Following each observation, the researcher and the teacher reviewed these data, determined IOA, and the researcher provided feedback on the use of the self-monitoring tool and rate of BSP, as needed. Feedback was removed once IOA of the use of the self-monitoring tool was 100% for a minimum of three consecutive sessions and teachers delivered BSP at or above their goal, with IOA of 80% or above. The teacher was then instructed to continue using the handheld counter and record their data on the data collection sheet. Completing the self-monitoring checklist was no longer required; but were available for use at the teacher’s discretion. The
researcher and/or a research assistant returned on unannounced days to conduct fidelity checks on the teachers’ use of the self-monitoring tool, using the treatment integrity checklist. They also collected IOA on the teacher’s rate of BSP statements; each teacher was expected to continue delivering BSP at their predetermined criterion level (e.g., 1-2 per minute). Performance feedback was only provided if a teacher’s treatment integrity fell below 80% and the BSP rate fell below their individualized criterion level, or if the teacher’s treatment integrity was above 80% with a BSP rate that fell below their individualized criterion level. Performance feedback was delivered in the same manner as the previous phase, which consisted of reviewing the steps missed and the rate of BSP, as applicable. Performance feedback was not delivered if treatment integrity was above 80% and the teacher delivered BSP at or above their individualized criterion, or if their treatment integrity fell below 80% with a BSP rate that was at or above their individualized criterion level. This continued until the teacher met their individualized BSP rate criterion, with no feedback, for three consecutive sessions.

**Maintenance**

Researchers aimed to assess maintenance of teachers’ delivery of BSP after 2-weeks and 4-weeks following the removal of the self-monitoring tool. However, due to the ongoing challenges of COVID-19, maintenance data were not collected. Specifically, challenges with participant recruitment delayed the start of the study and the global pandemic caused a two-week school closure, both impacting data collection. Along with these challenges, the end of the academic school year posed a time constraint and prevented researchers from continuing data collection and assessing maintenance.
Results

Figure 1 displays the teachers’ rate of behavior specific praise (BSP), general praise (GP), and reprimands (R) for Amber, Jamie, and Kat depicted in the top, middle, and bottom panel, respectively. All dependent variables were measured across baseline, performance feedback, and self-monitoring phases with generalization probes conducted every three sessions, or as feasible, indicated by open circles for each participant. Asterisks represent independent self-monitoring sessions where teachers recorded their rate of BSP in the absence of a researcher.

Teachers

During baseline, Amber’s rate of BSP averaged 0.33 per min (range, 0.1-0.5); GP averaged 0.12 per min (range, 0.0-0.3), and R were not observed. Following training there was an immediate increase in the rate of BSP, remaining at or above the goal of 2 per min, averaging 2.4 per min across all performance feedback sessions (range, 1.9-2.9). Amber’s rate of GP remained consistent with baseline levels averaging 0.1 per min (range, 0.1-0.2), and there were no observed reprimands throughout this phase. For the first three acquisition sessions of self-monitoring, Amber’s rate of BSP maintained with a mean rate of 2.5 per min (range, 2.5-2.6), with GP ($M = 0.1$, range, 0.03-0.1), and R ($M = 0.06$, range, 0-0.07) remaining low and stable across each session. Amber averaged 2.3 BSP statements for all subsequent independent monitoring sessions (range, 2.0-2.5), using the self-monitoring tool with 100% adherence across the entire phase.
Figure 1

*Teachers’ Rate of Behavior Specific Praise, General Praise, and Reprimands*
Jamie, depicted in the middle panel of Figure 1, averaged 0.1 BSP statements (range, 0-0.2), 0.1 GP statements (range, 0-0.2), and 0.03 R (range, 0-0.03) per min, across all baseline sessions. After training, there was a slight increase in the rate of BSP; however, she did not meet the individualized goal of 1 per min. Following the first performance feedback session, Jamie’s rate of BSP increased and remained at or above the goal for four consecutive sessions, averaging 1.2 per min (range, 1.1-1.3). GP and R were delivered at a mean rate of 0.13 (range, 0-0.3) and 0.01 per min, respectively, (range, 0-0.05). Jamie averaged 1.2 BSP statements per min during the first three acquisition sessions of self-monitoring (range, 1.1-1.3); GP maintained with a mean rate of 0.02 per min (range, 0-0.10) and no reprimands were observed. For all subsequent independent self-monitoring sessions, BSP maintained with a mean rate of 1.3 per min (range, 1.2-1.3), using the self-monitoring tool with 100% adherence across the entire phase.

Kat delivered BSP and GP at a mean rate of 0.02 (range, 0-0.1), and 0.14 (range, 0-0.6), respectively, with no R observed across all sessions during baseline. Despite the slight increase in rate of BSP following training, she did not meet the individualized goal of 1.0 per min until after the first performance feedback session occurred, with 1.3 BSP per min. However, her rate of BSP declined during the following two sessions, with 1.0 and 0.6 BSP per min, respectively. GP increased steadily throughout all sessions ($M = 0.5$, range, 0.3-0.7), and R were not observed. During the single self-monitoring probe, Kat’s rate of BSP increased slightly to 0.9 per min, and her adherence with the self-monitoring tool was 100%.

The rate of BSP statements increased in generalization settings from baseline to intervention for all teachers. Amber delivered 1 BSP statement per min during the baseline probe, 1.6 during performance feedback, and 2.3 and 1.2 during probes in the self-monitoring phase. Jamie and Kat did not deliver any BSP statements during the baseline generalization
probe. BSP statements delivered by Jamie and Kat increased to 0.7 and 0.8, respectively, during the performance feedback phase. Researchers were unable to conduct a generalization probe during the self-monitoring phase for either of them.

**Classroom Personnel**

Observed BSP rates for Amber and Jamie’s classroom staff are depicted in Figure 2. Selected classroom personnel in Amber’s classroom included the lead teacher, displayed with closed circles, and program aid, displayed with closed triangles. Neither personnel delivered BSP statements during baseline and there was no observed change in the rate of BSP for the program aid following the intervention. However, the lead teacher’s rate of BSP during the intervention phases increased to 0.2 per min in performance feedback, and 0.5 and 0.3 per min during self-monitoring probes. In Jamie’s classroom, displayed with closed squares, there was no observed change in the rate of BSP for the selected program aid, averaging 0.3 per min and maintaining at the same level for all probes in the baseline and performance feedback phase (range, 0-0.5). There were no probes for Jamie’s program aid during the self-monitoring session.
Figure 2

Classroom Personnel’s Rate of BSP

![Graph showing the rate of BSP for different personnel in different phases: Baseline, Performance Feedback, and Self-Monitoring.](image_url)
Student Behaviors

The percentage of intervals of student on-task behaviors for each classroom are displayed in Figure 3. Amber’s classroom is depicted in panel one, Jamie’s classroom in panel two, and Kat’s classroom in panel three. On-task behaviors were measured during each observation across all phases of baseline, performance feedback, and self-monitoring. Number of students present throughout the study varied from 2 to 6 for Amber, 1 to 3 for Jamie, and 1 for Kristen. Student on-task behaviors maintained at a high level for all teachers across all phases, with no observed changes relative to teachers’ rate of BSP. Amber’s, Jamie’s, and Kat’s student on-task behaviors averaged 98.89%, 93.48%, and 99.44% during baseline, and 100%, 95.63%, and 100% during performance feedback, respectively. During self-monitoring sessions, on-task student behaviors averaged 100% for all teachers.
Figure 3

Percentage of Intervals of Student On-Task Behavior
**Social Acceptability**

Ranges and mean ratings for pre and post measures of the social acceptability BSP survey is displayed in Table 2; scales ranged 1 to 5 with 1 indicating high disagreement and 5 indicating high agreement. Due to the anonymity of the survey, conclusions on individual ratings and responses cannot be determined. Prior to receiving training on BSP, all teachers rated the delivery of BSP as important for their classroom and necessary to change student behaviors. Overall, two teachers reported delivering BSP frequently throughout the day, while one teacher rated this statement neutrally, and reported it as an area for improvement. All teachers shared challenges with delivering BSP which included identifying what behavior(s) to praise, feeling repetitive or talkative, and forgetting to deliver positive statements throughout the day. Strategies in use to help deliver BSP prior to training included catching students being good and using the school point or token economy system.

Post ratings on the BSP survey were similar to pre-measures as the view of BSP being beneficial and necessary to positively change student behaviors remained consistent for all participants. Also, each participant reported delivering BSP frequently throughout the day, while its delivery during instruction remained challenging for one teacher. Still, two participants described challenges with delivering BSP as stating what behavior is being praised and interrupting the flow of instruction. Reported strategies used to deliver BSP following interventions included praising specific behaviors that are outlined in the students’ IEP, praising target behaviors, or providing praise immediately after students follow instruction.
Table 2

Ranges and Mean BSP Survey Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-</th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior specific praise is beneficial for students in my classroom.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior specific praise is not necessary to change my student's behaviors.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I incorporate behavior specific praise frequently throughout the day with my students.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it challenging to deliver behavior specific praise during instruction.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior specific praise does not have any impact on my student's behavior.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean rating scores for all questions on the revised Treatment Acceptability Rating Form (TARF-R) can be found in Table 2. Overall, teachers rated performance feedback and self-monitoring as strategies that can be incorporated appropriately with their daily classroom routines and are effective in increasing their delivery of BSP. However, only two participants reported a high preference for receiving performance feedback or using the self-monitoring tool, with one participant with a neutral rating. Teacher responses varied on the extent to which continued use of performance feedback in the classroom would be beneficial, ranging from not likely to likely. Participants’ ratings also ranged from possible to very likely when asked if performance feedback would have a permanent impact on their delivery of BSP. Similarly, all participants reported that self-monitoring is likely to produce permanent improvements in their use of BSP with the extent to which they would continue monitoring their BSP ranging from
possible to very likely. One participant reported that the use of both performance feedback and self-monitoring are likely to have disadvantages; however, other participants disagreed with this statement. The perceived disadvantages were not described and thus, cannot be determined for this study.
### Table 3

**Ranges and Mean TARP-R Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you that performance feedback was effective in increasing your behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How disruptive was it to your classroom routine to receive feedback on your performance?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like receiving feedback?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would continued performance feedback on your delivery of behavior specific praise be beneficial?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much discomfort did you experience while receiving performance feedback?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did performance feedback help you to deliver behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are there disadvantages in receiving performance feedback?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is performance feedback to have permanent improvements on your delivery of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would other classroom staff be willing to receive feedback on their delivery of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much discomfort did your students experience because of this strategy?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How clear is your understanding of self-monitoring?</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How willing were you to use self-monitoring as described?</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are there disadvantages in following the procedures of self-monitoring?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is this strategy to make permanent improvements in your use of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would you be to continue monitoring your delivery of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would other classroom staff be willing to use this strategy?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you that self-monitoring was effective in increasing your delivery of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How disruptive was it to implement self-monitoring in your classroom?</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much discomfort did your students experience because of this strategy?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like monitoring your delivery of behavior specific praise?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Evidenced based practices (EBP) include classroom management strategies that promote positive student behaviors, and can prevent, or reduce challenging behaviors such as off-task and non-compliance (Markelz et al., 2021). Yet, teachers often find implementing EBP to be an intricate process as strategies learned in training often fail to generalize to their classroom settings (Shernoff et al., 2020). This is illustrated in the literature of behavior specific praise (BSP) as teachers typically deliver less than the recommended rate of 1 to 8 per min prior to direct training, with rates declining back to pretraining levels without continued support (Floress & Jenkins, 2015; Floress et al., 2021a; White et al., 1975). Performance feedback and self-monitoring are two commonly used interventions to increase and promote awareness of teachers’ rate of BSP; however, both are not without their limitations. Research reports challenges in maintaining teachers’ rate of BSP after the direct support of performance feedback is discontinued (LaBrot et al., 2020; Scheeler et al., 2004; Taber et al., 2015) and only 14% of studies targeting teachers’ delivery of BSP report using self-monitoring as the method of intervention, limiting the knowledge of the extent to which it can increase and maintain teachers’ performances (Zoder-Martell et al., 2019). Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine self-monitoring as an approach to maintain teachers’ delivery of BSP following the removal of performance feedback.

Prior to training, all teachers reported delivering BSP sometimes or frequently throughout the day; however, this was not observed during baseline, as all rates were less than one per minute. This is consistent with the literature as teachers typically deliver little BSP without direct training (Floress & Jenkins, 2015; White et al., 1975) and overestimate the extent to which they engage in this behavior in the classroom (Floress et al., 2021b; Kranak et al., 2017). Amber, for
example, reported frequent use of BSP, delivered mostly narrations of behavior during baseline, such as “You put the sand in” and “You are washing your hands”. Jamie, who also reported frequent use of BSP, delivered mostly general praise such as “good” and “great”. Similarly, Kat reported some use of BSP statements; however, statements observed during baseline included mainly affirmations such as “yes” or “correct”. Following training, all teachers altered their praise to include more accurate BSP statements such as “Nice job matching the colors”, “I like the way you looked up that word for me”, and “Great job using your vocabulary words”. Based on these observations, the initial low rates of BSP and discrepancy between teachers reported and actual use of BSP could be due to previous trainings or various understandings of its critical components, considering any positive or praise statement to constitute BSP. Thus, future research should examine what statements teachers consider to be BSP prior to training for a better understanding of how teachers naturally deliver praise in the classroom.

Performance feedback was successful in increasing the rate of BSP for all three teachers, maintaining the rate at the goal for Amber and Jamie. Kat’s rate of BSP increased initially but did not maintain. This aligns with the previous literature as performance feedback has repeatedly shown to produce positive changes in teacher behavior (LaBrot et al., 2020; Oliver, 2011; Taber, 2015; Zoder-Martell et al., 2019). Research also shows that teachers may respond differently to training and intervention procedures, requiring varied levels of support to deliver BSP with fidelity and at the identified rate (Zoder-Martell et al., 2019). Furthermore, when assessing teachers’ use and belief of praise, Shernoff et al., (2020) found that teachers view the delivery of praise as an intentional process that requires preparing and reminders to know how, when, and where to deliver praise during instruction. One potential limitation of this study is that performance feedback sessions did not target these specific features of teacher performance,
focusing solely on whether the teacher met the identified goal. Also, due to the limited time within the school year, researchers were unable to assess or conclude if a more intrusive approach would have returned Kat’s rate of BSP to desired levels. Each teacher also received explicit goals prior to receiving any feedback; however, these goals alone did not increase Jamie and Kat’s rate of BSP. Although it can be used as an intervention to change behavior (Fellner & Selzer-Azaroff, 1984), goal setting was not the primary independent variable in this treatment package and results suggest performance feedback was required to increase rates of BSP. Thus, considering the different observed responses to the intervention across participants in this study and the current literature, future research should examine increasing teacher rate of BSP using a tiered approach to individualize and better meet the needs of teachers in their classroom.

Self-monitoring successfully maintained the rate of BSP delivered by Amber and Jamie throughout the entire phase. Specifically, Amber maintained her rate of BSP without programmed feedback from the researcher and in the absence of researchers for four sessions during this phase. Additionally, the rate of BSP during the independent self-monitoring sessions mimicked rates during which researchers were present, suggesting that Amber accurately monitored and recorded her behavior and that her delivery of BSP was unlikely due to observer reactivity. Similarly, Jamie maintained her rate of BSP for one additional session without the presence of the researcher; thus, it is possible she would have continued to deliver BSP at similar rates, regardless of feedback or observations if additional sessions were conducted. This is consistent with previous research of Oliver (2011), Kalis et al. (2007), Simonsen et al. (2012), and Willis et al. (2019), demonstrating that self-monitoring can produce self-awareness and teachers can serve as their own source of feedback as they observe and record their delivery of BSP, reducing the need for external supports. No concrete conclusions regarding the impact of
self-monitoring can be made for Kat due to her only experiencing one session in self-monitoring and the descending trend during the performance feedback phase.

It is important to note that each teacher was in a different learning environment that varied in student age, grade level, and instructional activities, limiting consistency across classrooms. Research shows that certain instructional activities generate less or more opportunities to deliver BSP (Floress et al., 2021a; Hawkins & Heflin 2011); hence the individualized BSP goal for each teacher. Amber’s target observations occurred during centers, a free operant, interactive, period allowing for continued opportunities to deliver praise to students. In contrast, Jamie’s and Kat’s target observations occurred during independent work time or one-on-one instruction, which may be generally less conducive for ongoing interactions with students than active, ongoing instruction (Floress et al., 2021a). Future research may consider conducting observations during similar instructional periods for all teachers that include frequent teacher and student interactions.

Although some teachers delivered general praise (GP) during baseline, it was not at a higher level than BSP at any point throughout the study, differing from previous findings that teachers typically deliver more GP than BSP (Floress et al., 2021b). Kat was the only participant who increased GP delivery (in the performance feedback phase), which could have contributed to the decline in her rate of BSP. Research also suggests that reprimands are typically higher than praise statements and increase with higher grade levels (Caldarella et al., 2020; Floress et al., 2021b). This relationship was not observed as teachers’ rate of reprimands remained near zero throughout the entirety of the current study. Prior research suggests that student behaviors are directly influenced by teachers’ use of praise and reprimands, with more on-task behaviors observed in classrooms with higher praise to reprimand ratios (Caldarella et al., 2020). Although
rates of reprimands remained low in the current study as teachers increased their delivery of praise, conclusions on how this enhanced ratio impacted student behavior cannot be determined. Since student on-task behaviors were near or at 100% during baseline, a ceiling existed early in the study with limited room for change or improvement as teachers increased their delivery of BSP. These data are limited however, as teachers were remotely teaching several students due to the ongoing pandemic. These students were not included in the current investigation, which resulted in a decreased the sample pool of students, potentially limiting variations of behavior seen in typical classrooms. Nevertheless, because a high praise to reprimand ratio is associated with positive on-task behaviors, it is likely that the increase in behavior specific praise statements in a classroom setting with little reprimands would positively impact student behaviors (Caldarella et al., 2020; Floress et al., 2021b). Additionally, it is possible that other student behaviors such as participation, engagement, peer interactions, and positive affect (e.g., smiling) could have been positively impacted by BSP; however, because the definition used to measure student behaviors focused solely on being on-task, these conclusions cannot be determined. Although it is not represented in these data, teachers anecdotally reported that after increasing their rate of BSP, students were following instructions, participating more in group assignments, and staying on task. These direct observations from teachers support the existing literature of BSP positively impacting student behaviors (Dufrene et al., 2014; LaBrot et al., 2020). Thus, because current literature is scarce in measures of student outcomes relative to changes in teacher behavior (Rispoli et al., 2017), future research should continue to examine how student behavior changes relative to positive changes in teacher performances to better understand how practices such as BSP influence student behaviors and interactions.
The current study also aimed to determine how changes in the participants’ use of BSP would impact the delivery of BSP from other classroom personnel; however, no change in their behavior was observed as a result of a change in the BSP amongst the three participating teachers. This suggests that neither modeling from a lead teacher or program aid is enough to increase BSP, supporting the research that classroom staff tend to deliver little praise and require explicit training to deliver BSP at a desired rate (Zoder-Martell et al., 2019). More research is needed to examine how to increase BSP, effectively and efficiently, for all classroom personnel. More specifically, research shows program aids and paraprofessionals in special education settings are often responsible for delivering instruction to students (Willis et al., 2019), illustrating the importance of ensuring they are also equipped to implement practices such as BSP. Therefore, future research should examine a train the trainer model to encourage teachers to directly train other classroom staff to deliver BSP to students during instruction or student-teacher interactions.

Participants generally reported that BSP is an important strategy and essential to promote and maintain positive student behaviors, as reflected by the responses received on the BSP Questionnaire before and after the intervention. Still, two participants reported challenges with incorporating BSP into their instruction. These challenges included difficulty in tacting what the student did correctly and determining when to provide praise during certain instructional activities (e.g., reading). One teacher also reported the ease in delivering a general praise statement, such as “good job”, compared to including the specific behavior. These are common teacher concerns as interrupting instruction, context dependence, and a preference for general praise statements have all been identified as barriers to teachers delivering BSP in their classrooms (Shernoff et al., 2020). This further illustrates the importance of future research to
train teachers more specifically how and when to deliver and embed BSP into instructional activities.

Responses received on the revised Treatment Acceptability Rating Form (TARF-R) indicated all teachers found performance feedback and self-monitoring to be appropriate strategies to help increase their delivery of BSP without disrupting their classroom or students. One teacher reported that both strategies contributed to the ease of incorporating BSP both during and after the study. Specifically, the hand-held counter served as a consistent reminder to deliver BSP and provided an accurate representation of how often she delivered praise. In contrast, another teacher neutrally ranked their enjoyment in receiving performance feedback and using the self-monitoring tool and that both strategies posed some disadvantages. These perceived disadvantages were not described and because participants anonymously completed the surveys, we are unable to determine how this may have impacted this participant’s performance. However, from anecdotal conversations with participants throughout the study, two teachers disclosed that using the handheld counter caused them to think more about what BSP statement they would deliver next, altering their attention from delivering instruction or distracting them from the students’ actual behavior. This may suggest that the handheld counter was successful in producing awareness of their delivery of BSP; however, it may require several sessions to eliminate or reduce reactivity. Future research should continue to examine what self-monitoring strategies teachers prefer to produce the most effective outcomes.

Additional limitations and challenges of this study include those related to the ongoing global COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic caused many unprecedented changes for schools and teachers, producing additional or new task and responsibilities, limiting the extent to which teachers were able to commit to participation. As a result, participant recruitment was delayed
several months, limiting the amount of time researchers were able to conduct observations and gather data. Also, a two-week school closure restricted observations for Jamie and Kat during baseline, further delaying data collection. In addition to COVID-19, the end of the school year prevented researchers from assessing ongoing maintenance of BSP rates. Future research should examine the extent to which teachers maintain BSP in the absence of external performance feedback and if self-monitoring is used or necessary to maintain performance.

In conclusion, although little can be determined from one participant’s data, the results of this study support performance feedback as a strategy to increase teachers’ rate of BSP and self-monitoring as an approach to maintain their rate when performance feedback is removed, supporting the findings of Oliver (2011). A pattern of literature illustrates the recurring challenge of maintaining teachers’ adherence in implementing various EBP after trainings or removal of external supports and feedback (Codding et al., 2005; Gross et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2014; Noell et al., 1997). Because the implementation of these practices directly impacts student outcomes (Rispoli et al., 2017), it is imperative that teachers are equipped with strategies to help maintain desired performances. These results are promising for teachers to be trained to monitor their own behavior to promote the maintenance and fidelity of practices, such as behavior specific praise to ultimately produce positive learning experiences and student outcomes.
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Appendix A

Training PowerPoint Slides
Behavior Specific Praise (BSP)

Explicitly describing to the student, the behavior that is being approved or why praise is delivered.

Why use BSP?
1. Proactive, evidence based strategy
2. Teaches students desired behaviors
3. Increases appropriate behaviors
4. Decreases undesired behaviors

Critical Features of BSP
- Focus on what the student did well
- Provide praise immediately following behavior
- Use positive language: “Good job!” “Nice work!”
- Specify what behavior is being praised

Examples & Non-Examples

- “Great job pushing your chair in all the way!”
- “You’re doing an amazing job sitting so quietly and reading your books!”

1-4 praise statements for every reinforcement
At least 2 per min. Ranging from 1-8 per min
“I love how you turned in your work on time!”

“Phenomenal, You read the entire paragraph!”

“Excellent job sharing with your friend!”

“Nice job holding the door for your friends!”

“Walk quietly in the hallway.”

Models
Appendix B

Teacher Self-Monitoring Checklist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow these steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Always had the counter ready. (e.g., in hand, attached to clothing or name tag, or arm’s reach away)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recorded total duration of monitoring (e.g., at least 10 min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clicked counter for each BSP statement delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recorded data on the data collection sheet (e.g., date, duration, frequency, and rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of steps completed: ____/4____ = __________%
Appendix C

Self-Monitoring Data Collection Form
Name: _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>BSP Goal</th>
<th>Total Time Monitored (Min)</th>
<th>Frequency of BSP (Total # of BSP)</th>
<th>Rate of BSP (Total # BSP/Total Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Researcher Data Collection Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity:</th>
<th>Time Start:</th>
<th>Total Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval (10 sec)</td>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Observer Self-Monitoring Checklist
### Self-Monitoring Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Description</th>
<th>Observed?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Always has the counter ready. (e.g., in hand, attached to clothing or name tag, or arm’s reach from the teacher)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Records total duration of monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clicks counter for each BSP statement delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Records data on the data collection sheet (e.g., date, duration, frequency, and rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of steps completed: __________ / 4 = ______ %
Appendix F

Procedural Integrity Forms
**TEACHER TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plays recorded presentation on BSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Plays recorded video models of teachers delivering BSP with embedded descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides teacher with worksheet of examples and non-examples of BSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If criterion is met (e.g., at least 90%), moves to Step 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. If criterion is not met:  
  Reviews errors and provides rationale for correct and incorrect responses.  
  Asks teacher to provide 3 examples and non-examples of BSP  
  Provides teacher with new worksheet of examples and non-examples of BSP  
  If criterion is met, moves to Step 7, if not, repeats Step 5 |     |    |     |
| 6. Allows teacher to role play delivering BSP and provides feedback |     |    |     |

Number of steps completed: _____/6 = _________%
## PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review the frequency and rate of BSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If criterion is met, provide reinforcement, and move to Step 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If criterion is not met, remind teachers of their goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show the teacher the graph of their rate of BSP and provide an explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage the teacher to continue delivering BSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notify them of the next observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of steps completed: ____/5 = __________%
# SELF-MONITORING SESSIONS

**Date:**

**Observer:**

**Teacher:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compare the self-monitoring checklist to the teacher’s self-monitoring form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compare frequency &amp; rate of BSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If no disagreements, provide praise, move to step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If disagreements are identified, discuss and provide feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourage the teacher to continue self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Notify them of next observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of steps completed: ____/5 = __________%
Appendix G

Procedural Integrity Scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Correct Steps</th>
<th>Total Steps</th>
<th>% of Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Interobserver Agreement Scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>IOA BSP</th>
<th>IOA GP</th>
<th>IOA R</th>
<th>IOA Student Bx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Behavior Specific Praise Frequency IOA Scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Teacher Frequency</th>
<th>Researcher Frequency</th>
<th>IOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Teacher Frequency</td>
<td>Researcher Frequency</td>
<td>IOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
<td>Teacher Frequency</td>
<td>Researcher Frequency</td>
<td>IOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Behavior Specific Praise Questionnaire
Please rate your agreement to the statements below with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.

Behavior specific praise is beneficial for students in my classroom.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavior specific praise is not necessary to change my student's behaviors.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I incorporate behavior specific praise frequently throughout the day with my students.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I find it challenging to deliver behavior specific praise during instruction.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavior specific praise does not have any impact on my student's behavior.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If delivering behavior specific praise is challenging, please describe any of the challenges you experience when incorporating it into instruction. (e.g., no opportunities to deliver, identifying appropriate behaviors)

If behavior specific praise is delivered frequently in your classroom, please describe any strategies you use to incorporate praise for appropriate behaviors.
Appendix K

Treatment Acceptability Rating Form- Revised (TARF-R)
Please rate the following questions based on your experience receiving feedback on your performance.

How confident are you that performance feedback was effective in increasing your behavior specific praise?

______  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Unlikely  Likely

How disruptive was it to your classroom routine to receive feedback on your performance?

Not at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

How much did you like receiving feedback?

Not at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

To what extent would continued performance feedback on your delivery of behavior specific praise be beneficial?

Not at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

How much discomfort did you experience while receiving performance feedback?

None  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

To what extent did performance feedback help you to deliver behavior specific praise?

Not at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

To what extent are there disadvantages in receiving performance feedback?

None at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very

How likely is performance feedback to have permanent improvements on your delivery of behavior specific praise?

Not at all  ______  ______  ______  ______  
Neutral  Very
How likely would other classroom staff be willing to receive feedback on their delivery of behavior specific praise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How much discomfort did your students experience because of this strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please rate the following questions based on your experience using the self-monitoring tool.**

How clear is your understanding of self-monitoring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How willing were you to use self-monitoring as described?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent are disadvantages in following the procedures of self-monitoring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Many are likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How likely is this strategy to make permanent improvements in your use of behavior specific praise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How likely would you be to continue monitoring your delivery of behavior specific praise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How likely would other classroom staff be willing to use this strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
How confident are you that self-monitoring was effective in increasing your delivery of behavior specific praise?

Not at all ______ Neutral ______ Very confident

How disruptive was it to implement self-monitoring in your classroom?

Not at all ______ Neutral ______ Very disruptive

How much discomfort did your students experience because of this strategy?

None ______ Neutral ______ A lot

At all

How much did you like monitoring your delivery of BSP?

Not at all ______ Neutral ______ Very much
Appendix L

Screening Survey
Please provide brief responses to the following questions

Name ________

1. Please indicate your gender below
   - Female
   - Male
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other _________

2. Please specify your ethnicity
   - White
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Asian
   - Native American
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - Other

3. What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?
   - High School Diploma
   - Associate’s Degree
   - Master’s Degree
   - PH.D or higher

4. How many total years of teaching experience do you have?

5. What grade level do you teach?

6. How many years have you been teaching with your current grade level or population?

7. What instructional practices have to received formal training or consultation in?

8. What challenging behaviors do you experience most often in your classroom? Please briefly describe what these behaviors look like.

9. During what activity or class period are these behaviors most likely to occur?

10. Self-monitoring includes strategies in which you record the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a specific behavior. Are you currently using any self-monitoring strategies for instructional practices? If so, what kind?
Appendix M

Behavior Specific Praise Worksheet
Name: __________________________

Please read each of the following examples and identify whether the statement is an example or non-example of behavior specific praise.

1. Give yourself a sticker.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
2. Awesome job raising your hand to speak, Ryan.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
3. Amazing work writing your name all by yourself.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
4. Thank you for not screaming
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
5. Line up behind your friend on the blue star.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
6. You tied your shoes by yourself.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
7. I like the way you have your hands on the desk and are ready to learn.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
8. Nice job walking in the hallway quietly.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
9. Great work cleaning up the toys.
   a. Example
   b. Non-example
10. You should be working on your worksheet.
    a. Example
    b. Non-example
Appendix N

Teacher Training Scenarios
Amber’s Scenario

During center rotations, we are completing arts & craft. Instruct the students to cut out the pictures, glue them to the construction paper, and color the picture. The skill of the month is cutting, and the words of the month are big, small, red, and blue. Interact with the confederate students, as you typically would with your students during centers. Practice delivering behavior specific praise when the students are engaging in appropriate behaviors which can be defined as answering questions correctly, using the scissors correctly, cutting the paper, sitting in the chair, using inside voices, and any other behaviors that involve them appropriately manipulating the materials or being on task.

Karen’s Scenario

During math, we are completing a worksheet of math facts. Instruct the students that you will work together to complete the math worksheet. Read each question aloud and instruct them to solve the problems, using their manipulatives and calculator, as needed. They should raise their hand if they have any questions and work quietly. Interact with the confederate students, as you typically would with students in your classroom. Practice delivering behavior specific praise when the students are engaging in appropriate behaviors which can be defined as answering questions correctly, raising their hands, using manipulatives, sitting in the chair, using inside voices, and any other behaviors that involve them appropriately manipulating the materials or being on task.

Jamie’s Scenario

During math, we are completing a worksheet of math facts. Instruct the students that you will be completing the math worksheet, using their manipulatives and calculator, as needed. They should raise their hand if they have any questions and work quietly. Interact with the confederate students, as you typically would with students during your math period, working with students one on one on the math facts. Practice delivering behavior specific praise when the students are engaging in appropriate behaviors which can be defined as answering questions correctly, raising their hands, using manipulatives, sitting in the chair, using inside voices, and any other behaviors that involve them appropriately manipulating the materials or being on task.
Appendix O

Confederate Students’ Scripted Behaviors
Amber’s Training

Confederate students should engage in the following appropriate behaviors throughout this role play.

- Engage in the instructed activity (cutting, gluing, coloring)
- Manipulate materials (holding scissors, folding paper, sorting through crayons)
- Share with peers
- Tact colors
- Tact size (e.g., big or small)
- Tact other features of the picture
- Sit in chair
- Use inside voice
- Show teacher their work
- Respond to any questions (e.g., what color is that) correctly

Every 2 minutes confederate students should engage in additional behaviors that create additional opportunities for the teacher to deliver praise.

- **Interval 1**: *(Confederate 1)* Gets out of seat, walks to another area of the classroom for a few seconds (e.g., 30 seconds), and then return to your seat and resume engaging in the activity. If the teacher redirects you while you are out of your seat, follow their instructions.

- **Interval 2**: *Confederate 2* ‘accidentally’ drops an item (scissors, crayon, paper). *Confederate 1* helps by saying “I’ll get it”, picking up the item, and returning it to *Confederate 2*. *Confederate 2* says thank you.

- **Interval 3**: *(Confederate 2)* holds up a pair of scissors to show the teacher saying “Scissors” and tacting the color of the scissors. (e.g., “I have green scissors” or “green scissors”)

- **Interval 4**: *(Confederate 1)* Pick out a red or blue crayon, show the teacher and tact the color (e.g., “red”) before using it to color.

- **Interval 5**: *(Confederate 2)* Take strips of cut paper and throw them in the trash, without any prompts
Jamie’s Training

Confederate students should engage in the following appropriate behaviors throughout the contrived role-play:

- Use manipulatives for each problem
- Use calculator
- Raise hand to answer questions
- Share manipulatives with peers
- Sit in chair appropriately
- Use inside voice
- Show teacher their work
- Respond to any questions (e.g., how many are there?) correctly

Every 2 minutes confederate students should engage in additional behaviors that create additional opportunities for the teacher to deliver praise.

- **Interval 1: (Confederate 1)** Gets out of seat, walks to another area of the classroom for a few seconds (e.g., 30 seconds), and then return to your seat and resume engaging in the activity. If the teacher redirects you while you are out of your seat, follow their instructions.
- **Interval 2: (Confederate 2)** Raise hand to request a break from the work, if the teacher says yes, say thank you, if teacher says no, say “Okay, maybe later”
- **Interval 3: (Confederate 1)** ‘Accidentally’ drops a pencil, block, or phone. Confederate 2 helps by saying “I’ll get it for you”, picking up the item, and returning it to Confederate 1.
- **Interval 4: (Confederate 2)** Raise hand to request to use the bathroom, if teacher says yes, walk out the door, wait 30 seconds, then return to the classroom. If teacher says no, say “Okay, maybe later”
- **Interval 5: (Confederate 1)** Raise hand to request help with the stated math problem (e.g., *Is this the correct number of blocks?*), after receiving help, say thank you.
Karen’s Training

Confederate students should engage in the following appropriate behaviors throughout the contrived role-play:

- Use manipulatives for each problem
- Use calculator
- Raise hand to answer questions
- Share manipulatives with peers
- Sit in chair appropriately
- Use inside voice
- Show teacher their work
- Respond to any questions (e.g., how many are there?) correctly

Every 2 minutes confederate students should engage in additional behaviors that create additional opportunities for the teacher to deliver praise.

- **Interval 1: (Confederate 1)** Gets out of seat, walks to another area of the classroom for a few seconds (e.g., 30 seconds), and then return to your seat and resume engaging in the activity. If the teacher redirects you while you are out of your seat, follow their instructions.
- **Interval 2: (Confederate 2)** Raise hand to request a break from the work, if the teacher says yes, say thank you, if teacher says no, say “Okay, maybe later”
- **Interval 3: (Confederate 1)** Puts pencil down, stops working, and looks around the room for a few seconds (e.g., 30 secs.). If redirected by teacher, say “okay” and resume working.
- **Interval 4: (Confederate 2)** Raise hand to request to use the bathroom, if teacher says yes, walk out the door, wait 30 seconds, then return to the classroom. If teacher says no, say “Okay, maybe later”
- **Interval 5: (Confederate 1)** Raise hand to request help with the stated math problem (e.g., *Is this the correct number of blocks*?), after receiving help, say thank you.
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Script for Performance Feedback
If Criterion is Met

Hi (Teacher’s name). What a great day! You delivered (# of BSP statements) today, which converts to ________ per minute. That is phenomenal; you met your goal! You did a fantastic job identifying appropriate student behaviors and providing behavior specific praise immediately after.

Here is a graph of your behavior specific praise rates. (Describe the progress and what the data points mean). You are making such great progress. Continue to deliver BSP to your students; you are truly rocking it!

Do you have any other questions?

I will be back on __________ to conduct another observation. Enjoy the rest of your day!

If Criterion is Not met

Hi (Teacher’s name). What a great day! You delivered (# of BSP statements) today, which converts to ________ per minute. Your goal is ____ per minute; you are almost there! You did a great job interacting with the students and providing praise when you observed appropriate behaviors.

Here is a graph of your behavior specific praise rates. (Describe the progress and what the data points mean). Continue to deliver BSP to your students; you are making such great progress!

Do you have any questions?

I will be back on __________ to conduct another observation. Enjoy the rest of your day!

Remember to:

1. Start positive!
2. Review the **frequency and rate of BSP** and provide praise if they met criterion
3. Review the **frequency and rate of BSP** and provide corrective feedback if criterion is not met
4. Show the teacher the graph of their rate of BSP and explain what it means
5. Encourage the teacher to continue delivering BSP
6. Notify them of the next observation
7. End positive!
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Informed Consent and HSIRB Approval Letter
Informed Consent

Western Michigan University
Department of Psychology

Principal Investigator: Jessica E. Van Stratton (Frieder), Ph.D., BCBA-D, LBA
Student Investigator: Ky’Aria Moses B.S.
Title of Study: Enhancing Teacher Maintenance of Behavior-Specific Praise with Self-Monitoring

STUDY SUMMARY: This consent form is part of an informed consent process for a research study and it will provide information that will help you decide whether you want to take part in this study. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. The purpose of the research is to examine the effects of performance feedback and self-monitoring on behavior specific praise in the classroom and will serve as Ky’Aria Moses’ thesis for the requirements of the Master’s in Behavior Analysis. If you take part in the research, you will be asked to participate in a brief training on behavior specific praise, deliver behavior specific praise during a classroom activity, and use a self-monitoring tool consisting of a checklist and handheld counter. Your time in the study will take about 16 weeks for about 30-60 minutes per session and will align with your regularly scheduled class activities. There are no identified risks. Potential benefits of taking part may be acquiring skills in delivering behavior specific praise and an improvement in students’ behavior, as a result of increased praise rates. Your alternative to taking part in the research study is not to take part in it, thus not consenting for us to have your data for analysis.

You are invited to participate in this research project titled "Enhancing Teacher Maintenance of Behavior-Specific Praise with Self-Monitoring" and the following information in this consent form will provide more detail about the research study. Please ask any questions if you need more clarification and to assist you in deciding if you wish to participate in the research study. You are not giving up any of your legal rights by agreeing to take part in this research or by signing this consent form. After all of your questions have been answered and the consent document reviewed, if you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to sign this consent form.

What are we trying to find out in this study?

Teachers are required to use evidenced-based practices to promote an effective classroom environment and promote positive student outcomes. Research shows teachers rate of behavior specific praise are often low and decline over time. This research study is attempting to determine if the use of performance feedback and self-monitoring can help teachers increase and maintain delivery of behavior specific praise over time.
Who can participate in this study?

To participate in this study, you must have at least one year of general teaching experience and deliver less than two behavior specific praise statements per minute during a 10-minute observation. If you are currently using any form of a self-monitoring tool, you will be excluded from this study. You will receive a brief survey at the beginning of the study to assess inclusion criteria and be observed during a 10 min observation to assess their rate of behavior specific praise.

Where will this study take place?

This study will take place in classroom settings or via a secure virtual web platform, as needed and applicable.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?

At the beginning of the study, you will be asked to partake in a brief training on the use and benefits of behavior specific praise, which is expected to last about 30-45 minutes. Observations will occur during regular scheduled classroom activities and you will be asked to meet for brief feedback meetings following observations that are expected to last no longer than 5 minutes. During identified sessions, you will be asked to use a self-monitoring checklist during or following regularly scheduled activities and should take no more than 3 minutes. A social validity questionnaire will be provided prior to and at the end of the study and will require participants no longer than 5 minutes to complete. The duration of this study is expected to take 16 weeks.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?

By participating in this study, you will be asked to consent to frequent observations of delivering behavior specific praise in the classroom and use a self-monitoring tool to monitor your behavior specific praise statements. Data from these observations will be analyzed for the purposes of this research.

What information is being measured during the study?

This section will describe the measurements that we are going to take during your participation in the study. We will measure your rate of behavior specific praise, student behaviors in the classroom, and social validity of self-monitoring as a tool to maintain rates of praise.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?

Due to the consistent observations, you may experience discomfort when being observed by researchers in the classroom; however, researchers hope to address this by establishing rapport with all teachers and remaining in an unobtrusive location during all observation periods.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?

By participating in this study, you may develop skills to deliver and monitor your delivery of behavior specific praise, thus improving your maintenance of an evidenced based strategy,
potentially leading to more positive and appropriate student behaviors. You may request a copy of results once the study is concluded.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?

A potential cost of participating in this study is time, as some sessions may require time outside of regularly scheduled class time. The researchers hope to address this by conducting the sessions within regularly scheduled classroom periods and limiting required time outside of the scheduled classroom periods.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?

For weekly participation in this study, each participant will be entered into a monthly drawing for a $30 gift card of their choice.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?

All data will be identified by ensuring participants are coded with a unique identifier (e.g., Teacher 1, Teacher 2). All data will be collected and kept on a password protected laptop, which is locked in a university office on WMU’s campus or in a home office. Only individuals involved in this research study will have access to the data. After 3 years, all data will be properly disposed.

What will happen to my information or biospecimens collected for this research after the study is over?

After information that could identify you has been removed, de-identified information collected for this research may be used or distributed to investigators for other research without obtaining additional consent from you.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?

You can choose to stop participating in the study at anytime, for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences personally if you choose to withdraw from this study.

The investigator can also decide to stop your participation in the study without your consent.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Jessica E. Van Stratton (Frieder) at 269-387-4500 or jessica.vanstratton@wmich.edu You may also contact the Chair, Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.
This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (WMU IRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study.

Please Print Your Name

___________________________________  _______________________
Participant’s signature  Date
Date: December 23, 2020

To: Jessica Frieder, Principal Investigator
   Ky’Aria Moses, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: IRB Project Number 20-12-12

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Enhancing Teacher's Maintenance of Behavior Specific Praise with Self-Monitoring” has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes to this project (e.g., add an investigator, increase number of subjects beyond the number stated in your application, etc.). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation.

In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the IRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.
A status report is required on or prior to (no more than 30 days) December 22, 2021 and each year thereafter until closing of the study. The IRB will send a request.

When this study closes, submit the required Final Report found at https://wmich.edu/research/forms.

Note: All research data must be kept in a secure location on the WMU campus for at least three (3) years after the study closes.