

Good Behavior Game: Single-Case Design Appendix

WHAT WORKS
CLEARINGHOUSE™

May 2023

WWC 2023-004
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A Publication of the National Center for Education Evaluation at IES

This appendix provides additional characteristics of the studies of *Good Behavior Game* that meet WWC single-case design standards, including 10 studies that contribute to the findings in the [Good Behavior Game intervention report](#), and 15 studies that do not contribute to the findings because the WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size for any of the outcomes. Table 4 of the [Good Behavior Game intervention report](#) provides the design-comparable effect sizes for the 10 studies that contribute to the findings.

As described in the version 4.1 [Procedures and Standards Handbooks](#), a design-comparable effect size can be computed for a single-case design study that has three or more cases. This includes, for example, multiple baseline designs and reversal-withdrawal designs across three or more classrooms, students, or teachers. For some single-case studies, such as those with just one reversal-withdrawal design for one classroom or teacher, the WWC cannot compute a design-comparable effect size. Additionally, the WWC can calculate a design-comparable effect size for only certain cluster-level outcomes. These include outcomes that are aggregated across individuals for all students in the cluster. The WWC cannot calculate a design-comparable effect size based on (1) small groups of students within the cluster instead of individual students or (2) scans of the cluster without a fixed method for individually observing each student in the cluster. The version 4.1 Procedures Handbook does not outline procedures for calculating design-comparable effect sizes for these types of cluster outcomes. If the WWC cannot calculate a design-comparable effect size for at least one outcome in a single-case design study, the study's findings do not contribute to the main findings in the intervention report.

This appendix briefly describes the findings from all 25 single-case design studies, beginning with the 10 studies that contribute to the findings in the [Good Behavior Game intervention report](#).

Appendix Table 1. Characteristics of the 10 studies of *Good Behavior Game* that meet WWC single-case design standards and contribute to the intervention report

Study citation	Dadakhodjaeva, K., Radley, K. C., Tingstrom, D. H., Dufrene, B. A., & Dart, E. H. (2019). Effects of daily and reduced frequency implementation of the Good Behavior Game in kindergarten classrooms. Behavior Modification, 44(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445519826528
What was the study design?	The study used a multiple baseline design across classrooms to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because it provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in three kindergarten classrooms in one school in the southeastern United States.
Who participated in the study?	The study included 59 students with high levels of disruptive behavior who school administrators recommended for the study. Most students in the sample were Black (98%) and 2% were described as biracial. Three percent of students had an individualized education program, and 44% were male. Among all students in the school, 95% received free or reduced-price lunch.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers introduced <i>Good Behavior Game</i> , reviewed rules for behavior, and divided each classroom into two teams. Teachers recorded each time a student misbehaved with a checkmark on a white-board visible to all students. Students received a reward for the day if their team did not exceed the checkmark threshold for their classroom. The threshold was set for each classroom during a baseline period and ranged from eight to 10 checkmarks. Students who earned a reward could choose an item from a treasure box, such as candy, erasers, stickers, or pencils. Students typically played <i>Good Behavior Game</i> once each day for 10 minutes.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers managed their classrooms in their typical manner, which included using Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

What were the study findings?	<p>The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for classroom-level disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior across the three classrooms. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i>.</p> <p>The WWC also calculated a design-comparable effect size for supplemental findings for three focal students (one from each class) who teachers identified because they demonstrated the highest levels of disruptive behavior in the class. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, focal students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i>.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

Study citation	Donaldson, J. M., Fisher, A. B., & Kahng, S. (2017). Effects of the Good Behavior Game on individual student behavior. <i>Behavior Analysis: Research and Practice</i>, 17(3), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1037/bar0000016
-----------------------	---

What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
-----------------------------------	--

What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for 10 students provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case design for one student Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because it has only three data points in one phase. The single-case design for one additional student Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it has just one baseline phase with only two data points; the WWC’s design-comparable effect size calculation for this study does not include this student.
---------------------------------------	---

Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one large, urban, public school in Maryland. Students were from two kindergarten classrooms and one grade 1 classroom.
-----------------------------------	--

Who participated in the study?	Participants included 11 focal students from three classrooms who teachers identified based on their disruptive behavior. About 64% of the study participants were female. The study did not report other demographic information.
---------------------------------------	--

How was Good Behavior Game implemented?	<i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions took place during whole-group instruction focused on math, reading, and other literacy skills, while students sat on a large carpet. The researcher implemented <i>Good Behavior Game</i> during the first several sessions and the teacher delivered the whole-group instruction. After observing the first several sessions, the teacher then implemented the game while delivering the whole-group instruction. Before each session began, the teacher or researcher would divide the class into teams and review the rules of the game and criterion for winning. During the session, the teacher would record a tally on the board at the front of the classroom each time a team member engaged in disruptive behavior and would verbally state the rule the student broke. The teacher counted the tallies at the end of the game and rewarded the winning team(s). All teams could win if they did not exceed the maximum number of tallies. If all teams exceeded the maximum, then the team with the fewest tallies would win. Winning teams earned two points in the existing classroom token system and received a special cheer. Students could exchange points for access to special toys; lunch with the teacher; high fives or hugs; or prizes such as stickers, pencils, or gold medals. One to three sessions were conducted each day, 2 to 3 days per week. Sessions varied in length, depending on the duration of whole-group instruction, but averaged about 12 minutes each.
--	--

How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers instructed class as they normally would and enforced existing classroom rules, such as requiring students to sit on their designated spot on the carpet, raise their hands before talking or getting up, and to pay attention. Teachers did not go over classroom rules at the beginning of sessions, but they did remind students of the rules if violations occurred during the session.
--	---

What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for student disruptive behavior across the 11 students. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .
--------------------------------------	---

Study citation	Donaldson, J. M., Matter, A. L., & Wiskow, K. M. (2018). Feasibility of and teacher preference for student-led implementation of the Good Behavior Game in early elementary classrooms. <i>Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis</i>, 51(1), 118–129. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1166843
-----------------------	---

What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
-----------------------------------	--

What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least three data points in each of the phases included in the review.
---------------------------------------	---

Where did the study occur?	The study took place in four classrooms in one elementary school in rural western Texas.
-----------------------------------	--

Who participated in the study?	Participants included 53 students in kindergarten and grade 1 at one school. About 58% of the students were male. The study did not report other demographic information.
---------------------------------------	---

How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Researchers, teachers, and other students in the class led <i>Good Behavior Game</i> , which varied by session. During each session, the leader reviewed the rules, presented the reward for the day, and divided the class into two teams. The rules required students to remain seated, raise their hands to speak, and keep their hands and feet to themselves. Each time a rule violation occurred, the leader would place a tally mark on a board at the front of the class and state the rule that was violated. After the session ended, the leader asked teams to count their tallies, and the winning team received a reward. Both teams won if they had fewer than five tallies. Otherwise, the team with the fewest tallies won. Sessions lasted 15 to 25 minutes and were conducted once per day for up to 5 days a week during morning whole-group literacy instruction.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers instructed their classrooms in the typical manner without using a formal behavior system. Sometimes the teacher stated classroom rules that required students to sit on the carpet with their legs crossed, keep their hands in their laps, and raise their hands to speak or leave their seats. Teachers either ignored, reprimanded, or acknowledged disruptive behavior.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for student disruptive behavior across the four classrooms. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .

Study citation	Fallon, L. M., Marcotte, A. M., & Ferron, J. M. (2020). Measuring academic output during the Good Behavior Game: A single case design study. <i>Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions</i>, 22(4), 246–258. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1265213
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: classroom-level academically engaged behavior and disruptive behavior. The study also used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the writing productivity and writing conventions domains: focal students' total words written and number of writing sequences with acceptable word and punctuation use, respectively.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least three data points per phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two classrooms in a Title I elementary school in an urban setting in the northeastern United States.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 45 students, including six focal students with the lowest writing test scores, in two classrooms taught by two teachers in grades 1 and 2. Three of the six focal students were male and four were Black, one was White, and one was Hispanic or Latino. None of the six focal students received special education services. Across the two classrooms, 60% of students were male and 9% received special education services. Sixty percent were Black, 13% were White, 2% were Asian, and 24% did not report race. Sixteen percent were Hispanic or Latino. All students in the school were eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program due to the district's status as a high-needs district, and 60% of the students in the school were classified as economically disadvantaged and received some form of family aid.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers created teams consisting of five or six students each, based on seating arrangements. At the beginning of each session, teachers reviewed the expected behaviors and rules of the game, which included staying seated and quietly focusing on writing tasks. All sessions lasted 15 minutes and took place during writing practice while students responded to a writing prompt. As the students wrote, the teachers walked around the room, praised students, and awarded points if students stayed seated and focused on writing. At the end of the session, the team with the most points received a prize selected by the teacher, such as stickers or candy.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teachers instructed their classrooms in the typical manner without using a formal behavior system.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for total words written and number of writing sequences with acceptable word and punctuation use across six focal students. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students showed improvements in both writing outcomes compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> . The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size for classroom-level academically engaged behavior or disruptive behavior because there were fewer than three classrooms for each outcome. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with improvements in academic engagement and reductions in disruptive behavior in both classrooms.

Study citation	Ford, W. B. (2017). Evaluation of a positive version of the Good Behavior Game utilizing ClassDojo Technology in secondary classrooms. (Publication No. 1046) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. https://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2020&context=dissertations
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because it provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in four classrooms at one middle school in a medium-sized city in a southeastern state.

Who participated in the study?	Participants included 66 students in one school across four classrooms and two teachers in grades 7 and 8. Most students in all four classrooms were Black (95%) and 5% did not report race. Five percent of students were Hispanic or Latino and 53% were female. Six percent of students received special education services for a specific learning disability. School administrators referred all four classrooms to the study for having high levels of off-task and disruptive behavior.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	When the intervention sessions began, the teacher divided students into two teams and explained the game and its rules, which included sitting in one's seat, working on assignments, and staying quiet. Every two minutes, the teacher would scan each team to see if students were engaged. If all the students in a team were engaged, the teacher would praise them and award a point in ClassDojo, an internet application that enables teachers to provide real-time feedback to students. At the end of each session, the team with the most points won a prize; the other team could earn a prize as well, if they exceeded a predetermined criterion. In two of the classrooms, the teachers' projectors broke, prompting the researchers to implement later sessions of the intervention without ClassDojo; they instead marked team points on the white board. Teachers used <i>Good Behavior Game</i> once each day during normal class activities over 10 to 15 days in each classroom.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers instructed class as they normally would and enforced existing classroom rules, such as requiring students to sit on their designated spot on the carpet, raise their hands before talking or getting up, and pay attention. Teachers did not go over classroom rules at the beginning of sessions, but they did remind students of the rules if violations occurred during the session.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for student disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior across the four classrooms. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .

Study citation	Ford, W. B., Radley, K. C., Tingstrom, D. H., & Dufrene, B. A. (2020). Efficacy of a no-team version of the Good Behavior Game in high school classrooms. <i>Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions</i>, 22(3), 181–190. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300719890059
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for two classes provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case designs for one class Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because they have only four data points in one phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in three classrooms in two high schools in two small cities in the southeastern United States. The subject areas in the three classrooms were English language arts and world history.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 74 students in grades 9–11. Most students in the sample were Black (81%), 18% were White, and 1% did not report race. One percent were Hispanic or Latino. Across both schools, 92% of students qualified for free or reduced-price lunch. School administrators or the School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support consultant referred all three classrooms to the study for having high levels of disruptive behavior, elevated levels of discipline referrals, and low levels of academic achievement. None of the students received special education services.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	All students in each classroom were on one <i>Good Behavior Game</i> team and worked together to receive a reward for the day if the class met the established threshold. The teacher explained the rules and informed the students that when a rule violation occurred, they would make a mark on the board. If the class met the threshold, they could vote on the reward they would receive, such as snacks, candy, and “no homework” passes. Each classroom played <i>Good Behavior Game</i> once each day during normal class activities for 11 days. Each session lasted at least 20 minutes.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers instructed their classrooms in their typical manner and managed behavior using business-as-usual practices.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for student disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior across the three classrooms. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .

Study citation	Lynne, S., Radley, K. C., Dart, E. H., Tingstrom, D. H., Barry, C. T., & Lum, J. D. (2017). Use of a technology-enhanced version of the Good Behavior Game in an elementary school setting. <i>Psychology in the Schools</i>, 54(9), 1049–1063. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1156664
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior. The study also used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the teacher practice domain: general praise and behavior-specific praise.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because it provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase.

Where did the study occur?	This study took place in three classrooms in one rural public school serving grades K–8 in the southwestern United States. Students were from one grade 1 classroom and two grade 4 classrooms.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 65 students in three classrooms that school administrators referred for study inclusion due to high levels of inappropriate behavior. Across the three classrooms, 51% of students were male, 95% were White, 3% were Black, and 2% did not report race. Two percent were Hispanic or Latino and 20% received special education services. Across the entire school, 62% of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers explained and posted the classroom rules, which included remaining in seats, focusing eyes on the teacher or assignment, and using only task-relevant materials. Teachers told students their team would receive a point if all members displayed good behavior. Teachers used an interactive whiteboard and the ClassDojo program to display team names and points earned. ClassDojo is an internet application that enables teachers to provide real-time feedback to students. At the end of each session, the teacher announced which team(s) had met the predetermined criterion and distributed the reward for that day, such as candy. Ten to 12 intervention sessions lasted 20 minutes and took place during normal class activities.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers used usual classroom activities and routines.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for classroom-level disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior across the three classrooms and for general praise and behavior-specific praise across the three teachers. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> . There was no change in teacher praise.

Study citation	Murphy, J. M., Hawkins, R. O., & Nabors, L. (2020). Combining social skills instruction and the Good Behavior Game to support students with emotional and behavioral disorders . <i>Contemporary School Psychology, 24</i> (2), 228–238. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1251543
What was the study design?	The study used a multiple baseline design across classrooms to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least three data points in each of the phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in three classrooms in one state-chartered alternative school in the midwestern United States. The school served students identified as needing intensive behavior and mental health supports.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 22 students in kindergarten through grade 6 in three classrooms. Each classroom had one teacher and one teacher assistant. Across the three classrooms, all students had an individualized education program, and most (77%) were male. Sixty-eight percent of students were Black, 9% were White, and 23% did not report race.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers used 10-minute scripted lessons over a 1-week period to teach students social skills, including following directions the first time they were given, raising one’s hand to ask and answer questions, and ignoring distractions. Descriptions of the social skills were printed on posters and placed on the walls of the classroom. When they completed the social skill lessons, teachers randomly grouped students into teams, reviewed <i>Good Behavior Game</i> rules, and explained how students could earn points and rewards. Each session lasted 45 minutes; every 5 minutes teachers would provide behavior-specific praise to students using the targeted skills and award points on a chart displayed at the front of the classroom. When the game ended, teams that scored more points than a pre-set criterion received a reward. The criterion increased throughout the study.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers addressed disruptive behaviors using their typical classroom management strategies, which included reminding students of expected behavior and offering appropriate behavior alternatives.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for both disruptive behavior and academically engaged behavior across the three classrooms. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, students had lower levels of disruptive behavior and higher academic engagement compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .

Study citation	Rodriguez, B. J. (2010). An evaluation of the Good Behavior Game in early reading intervention groups (Publication No. 3420326) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED518158
What was the study design?	The study used a multiple baseline design across small reading groups to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: problem behavior; and two outcomes in the alphabetic domain: phoneme segmentation fluency and nonsense word fluency. The study also used a multiple baseline design across instructional assistants to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the teacher practice domain: instructor praise and corrections for social behavior.

What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for four outcomes (problem behavior, phoneme segmentation fluency, instructor praise, and instructor corrections for social behavior) provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case design for one outcome (nonsense word fluency) Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because it has at least three data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two kindergarten classrooms in one school in the Pacific Northwest of the United States.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 22 kindergarten students from two classrooms who were divided into five reading groups and instructed by five instructional assistants. The study authors reported nearly all students were White and about half were male, but did not report the exact proportions. No students were English learners.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Instructional assistants implemented <i>Good Behavior Game</i> in small reading groups of four or five students while using the Scott Foresman Early Reading intervention. The assistant explained the rules of the game, provided examples of desired behaviors, and practiced role-plays of the desired behaviors with the students. The rules included keeping eyes on the teacher and following directions. In each session, the assistants provided verbal praise and smiley faces when a student displayed appropriate behavior or when most students exhibited good behavior. At the end of each session, the assistant told students the number of smiley faces they needed to receive a reward, such as a sticker or extra time to spend drawing. If the students did not earn the reward, the instructional assistant would remind students of the rules. If the students met the criterion each day of the week, they earned an additional reward on Friday, such as a pencil, eraser, or toy.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Instructional assistants provided reading instruction in small groups using the Scott Foresman Early Reading intervention and were told to respond to student behavior as they typically would. Students received stamps for good behavior, which they could trade for a pencil, eraser, or toy.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for instructor praise and corrections for social behavior across five instructional assistants. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, instructors provided higher levels of praise and lower levels of corrections compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> . The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size for problem behavior, phoneme segmentation fluency, or nonsense word fluency because the single-case designs include a cluster-level outcome based on small groups of students, clustered within classrooms. The author reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with reductions in student problem behavior. There did not appear to be a significant change in literacy skills after implementing <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .

Study citation	Tanol, G., Johnson, L., McComas, J., & Cote, E. (2010). Responding to rule violations or rule following: A comparison of two versions of the Good Behavior Game with kindergarten students. <i>Journal of School Psychology, 48</i>(5), 337–355. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ895127
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior and teacher practice domains: classroom rule violations and teacher praise, respectively.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for one student and for both teachers provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case designs for three students Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because they have at least three data points in each phase. The single-case designs for two other students Do Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because they have fewer than three data points in at least one phase; the WWC’s design-comparable effect size calculation for this study does not include these two students.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two kindergarten classrooms in one public school serving students in pre-kindergarten through grade 9, in a large metropolitan city.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included four focal students and two teachers. All four students were male, Native American, and referred to the study by their teachers because of high rates of disruptive behavior. One student was diagnosed with an emotional behavioral disorder and received special education services to address behavior problems. The three other students were at risk for being classified with emotional behavioral disorders. About 93% of students in the school were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers used two variations of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> , such that they always used verbal praise to reinforce good behavior, but acknowledged rule violations in only some of the sessions. The researchers randomly assigned which version of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> to use in each phase. The teachers divided their students into teams of five or six students, with the four focal students in the study distributed across the teams. At the beginning of each session, the teacher reviewed the classroom rules, which included staying seated and paying attention to the teacher, and stated the criteria for teams to win a reward at the end of the game. The teacher also displayed a poster that stated the rules. During sessions that included acknowledgement of rule violations, all teams began with four stars on their team poster, and teachers removed stars as rule violations occurred; they also stated the problem behavior to the team and praised the other teams. At the end of the session, students on teams with one or more stars remaining on their team poster received a small reward. During the other sessions, all teams started with a blank team poster, and students earned a star and praise for following the rules. Teams violating the rules did not receive attention and did not earn a star. At the end of each session, the teams with at least three or more stars received a small reward. Teams also received a prize (such as a pencil, eraser, or winner medal) each week when they met the daily criterion for two or more days. All sessions took place during instruction periods when students were seated on a carpet and working with their teachers to identify letters, practice counting, or discuss the daily schedule.

How was the baseline condition implemented?	Before the study, teachers worked with the researcher to identify classroom rules that were important to their behavior management needs. Teachers reviewed the rules with students and instructed their classrooms in their typical manner.
What were the study findings?	The WWC calculated a design-comparable effect size for classroom rule violations across four focal students. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, focal students had lower levels of rule violations compared to sessions without <i>Good Behavior Game</i> . The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size for teacher praise because there were fewer than three teachers. The study authors did not provide a characterization of intervention effectiveness; however, data provided in the study suggest levels of teacher praise were slightly higher during <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions than baseline sessions.

Appendix Table 2. Characteristics of the 15 studies of *Good Behavior Game* that meet WWC single-case design standards and do not contribute to the intervention report

Study citation	Donaldson, J. M., Wiskow, K. M., & Soto, P. L. (2015). Immediate and distal effects of the Good Behavior Game . <i>Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis</i> , 48(3), 698–689. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1073404
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case design for one classroom provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase. The single-case designs for four other classrooms Do Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because they do not provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one kindergarten classroom in one rural elementary school in western Texas.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 16 students and one teacher within one kindergarten classroom. About 63% of the students in the class were male. The study did not report other demographic information.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The researcher implemented <i>Good Behavior Game</i> once per day for 1 to 5 days a week, while the teacher led a literacy lesson, math lesson, or an activity center. The duration of sessions averaged 13 to 24 minutes. The researcher started each session by dividing the students into two teams and asking them to repeat the rules: sit on the carpet or at their seats, get permission to speak, and keep hands and feet to themselves. Each time a student displayed a disruptive behavior, the researcher provided a corrective statement and gave the team a tally mark. Teams with five or fewer tally marks each day earned a prize, such as stickers, temporary tattoos, or lip balm, immediately following the game.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher led a literacy lesson, math lesson, or an activity center. Students were expected to sit on the carpet or at their seats, get permission to speak, and keep hands and feet to themselves. The teacher would sometimes remind students of classroom rules before or during activities, and responded to disruptive behavior as they usually would, by either ignoring the behavior, delivering a corrective statement, or providing some other statement. The attention provided for disruption was brief and did not delay instruction.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported that <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in disruptive behavior.
Study citation	Donaldson, J. M., Lozy, E. D., & Galjour, M. (2021). Effects of systematically removing components of the Good Behavior Game in preschool classrooms . <i>Journal of Behavioral Education</i> , 30(1), 22–36. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1287530
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because it provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least three data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two general education preschool classrooms in one public preschool center in southeastern Louisiana.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 39 students. All students were Black (100%) and 54% of the students were female. The study authors did not provide other demographic information.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The researcher led the initial <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions while the teacher led typical classroom instruction, such as story time or phonics instruction. Before each session, the researcher divided the class into two teams based on seating location, stated the rules, explained the criterion for winning, and described the rewards. The rules required students to stay in their spot, wait their turn to speak, and keep their hands to themselves. When they broke a rule, the researcher announced the rule they had broken and added a sticker to a white foam board at the front of the class next to the team's name. At the end of each session, teams with six or fewer rule violations earned a reward, such as stamps, scented lip balm, or stickers. After the first several sessions, teachers began to implement the game while teaching the class lesson. Teachers conducted sessions once or twice per day, for 3 to 4 days per week during morning whole-group activities. Sessions typically lasted an average of 11 minutes.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers responded to disruptive behavior as they normally would, by either ignoring, reprimanding, or commenting on the behavior. If a student demonstrated repeated disruptive behavior, the teacher could require the student to sit next to the paraprofessional in the class.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size for classroom-level disruptive behavior because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in disruptive behavior in both classrooms.

Study citation	Flower, A., McKenna, J., Muething, C. S., Pedrotty Bryant, D., & Bryant, B. R. (2014). Effects of the Good Behavior Game on classwide off-task behavior in a high school basic algebra resource classroom. <i>Behavior Modification</i>, 38(1), 45–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445513507574
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: on-task behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least three data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	This study took place in two algebra classes in one public high school in a suburban school district in central Texas. Both classes took place in a resource room for students with high-incidence disabilities.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 17 students in two grade 9 classrooms taught by one teacher in one school. All participants had high-incidence disabilities and needed additional support in math. Most students were identified with a specific learning disability, some with intellectual disabilities, and others with other health impairments, mostly attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Most students were male and Hispanic or Latino. All were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. No students were English learners.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The teacher divided each class into teams of three or four students and then reviewed <i>Good Behavior Game</i> procedures, class expectations, and rules, which included paying attention and completing teacher-assigned tasks. The teacher then gave fouls to teams when a student violated class expectations. The team with the fewest fouls each day won the game, as long as the number of fouls was below a certain criterion that was unknown to students until the end of the period. Both teams could win if they had the same number of fouls and were both below the criterion. The winning team or teams won a reward, such as a piece of candy or school supplies. Winning teams also earned a token they could use later for a larger reward for the whole class. There was a total of 10 sessions in each class, each lasting about 50 minutes, that took place during algebra instruction.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher provided typical algebra instruction, which included asking students questions and providing one-on-one assistance. The teacher managed the classrooms in the typical manner, which included infrequent behavioral feedback.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with reductions in class-level off-task behavior.

Study citation	Groves, E. A. & Austin, J. L. (2017). An evaluation of interdependent and independent group contingencies during the Good Behavior Game. <i>Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis</i>, 50(3), 552–566. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1147515
What was the study design?	The study used a series of alternating treatment designs for four students to measure the effectiveness of two versions of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on three outcomes in the student behavior domain: verbal disruption, inappropriate sitting, and off-task behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the alternating treatment designs for seven contrasts provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three points in time and have at least five data points per condition, with at most two consecutive data points per condition. The alternating treatment designs for three contrasts Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because they have at least four data points per condition. The alternating treatment designs for six contrasts Do Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because they have only three data points in at least one condition.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one classroom in a specialist school in South Wales, United Kingdom. The school served children with severe emotional and behavior disorders with histories of aggression, property destruction, and excessive classroom disruption.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included four focal students from one classroom within one school. The teacher nominated the four students to include in the study based on their high levels of problem behaviors. All four students were male, had severe emotional and behavioral disorders, and were 9 or 10 years old. The authors did not provide further characteristics of the students.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The study implemented two versions of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> : group and individual. For the group <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, teachers divided students into two teams based on their seating arrangement, with two focal students on each team for the purposes of collecting study data. Students received points and prizes based on the behavior of all students in their group. For the individual <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, individual students were on their own team and awarded points and prizes based on their own behavior. Before <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, the teacher explained the game and reminded students of three rules: requesting attention appropriately, staying in one's seat, and staying on task. The teacher displayed the rules on a poster at the front of the classroom. The teacher also drew a mystery number from a bowl that determined the number of good behaviors each team (or individual) had to display to win a reward. The teacher recorded a point on the board at the front of the class every 2 minutes if all children on the team had followed the rules during the 2-minute interval. At the end of each session, the teacher added the points and revealed the mystery number. The teams (or individual students) who received points equal or more than the mystery number would receive a reward, such as a piece of fruit or time to play games, use an iPad, or play outdoors. Teachers conducted the sessions three or four times a week during normal class activities in which they expected students to work independently, such as literacy-based work. Lessons were usually 1 hour in duration, and students played <i>Good Behavior Game</i> during the independent work portion of the lesson, which usually lasted 20 to 30 minutes.

How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher used business-as-usual classroom management procedures, such as reminding students to raise their hands before speaking. All children in the class also participated in a school-wide points system. If children earned a certain number of points by the end of the week, they could participate in preferred activities on Friday afternoons.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because this study used alternating treatment designs; the WWC does not have procedures for calculating design-comparable effect sizes for alternating treatment designs. The authors reported that <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in inappropriate sitting, off-task behavior, and verbal disruption across students and conditions.

Study citation	Groves, E. A., & Austin, J. L. (2019). Does the Good Behavior Game evoke negative peer pressure? Analyses in primary and secondary classrooms. <i>Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis</i>, 52(1), 3–16. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1203158
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on six outcomes in the student behavior domain: off-task behavior, swearing, negative peer interactions, positive peer interactions, physical disruptive behavior, and verbal disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least four data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	This study took place in two classrooms in two schools in South Wales, United Kingdom. Both schools served students excluded from mainstream education due to severe behavioral problems or disabilities.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 13 students in two classrooms. Students in one classroom were 9 or 10 years old and students in the other classroom were 15 or 16 years old. All students received special education services in self-contained schools due to severe behavioral problems or disabilities. About 69% of students were male.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The teacher placed all students on one team in one of the classrooms, and the other classroom had three teams. The teachers introduced <i>Good Behavior Game</i> and explained students could earn points if they followed classroom expectations and rules, which varied by class and included staying on task, staying in one's seat, being quiet, raising one's hand to talk, refraining from swearing, and using mobile phones only with permission. Teachers displayed the rules on a classroom poster at the front of the room. In each session, teachers reminded students of expectations and then awarded points to teams for following the rules. At the end of each session, teams that met a point criterion for the session received a reward, such as a snack or extra time to use the computer or play with toys. Each session took place during Welsh Baccalaureate lessons or literacy lessons once a day, three or four times a week, for 45 to 60 minutes.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teachers instructed their classrooms and responded to problem behaviors as they typically would. One of the classrooms had an existing classroom management system in which students could earn points towards extra free time.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with increases in positive peer interactions and reductions in off-task behavior, swearing, negative peer interactions, physical disruptive behavior, and verbal disruptive behavior in both classrooms.

Study citation	Johnson, M. D. (2015). An evaluation of the Good Behavior Game in a high school special education setting. (Publication No. 3714080) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of South Dakota]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1709274065
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: focal student on-task behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case design for one student provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase. The single-case design for one other student Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it has fewer than three data points in at least one phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one public high school in a midwestern city in a classroom offering services for students with emotional and behavioral problems.
Who participated in the study?	The study included one focal student in one classroom. The student had an emotional and behavioral disorder and exhibited attention problems, behavioral concerns, and difficulties in academics. The student was male, White, 16 years old, and came from a middle to upper-class socioeconomic background.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Students in the study classroom received <i>Good Behavior Game</i> over a 6-week period, with each session taking place during a 30-minute lesson when the teacher asked students to write in their journals, discuss the topic with others, listen to their teacher introduce a lesson, and then participate in an assignment. The classroom teacher divided the classroom into two teams based on which students worked best together. The teacher then explained <i>Good Behavior Game</i> and the expected behaviors of students. The teacher observed each team during 3-minute intervals and recorded whether they were on task on a whiteboard in front of the classroom. The entire group had to appear on task to receive a plus (+) sign on the whiteboard; the teacher recorded a minus (–) sign if any member of the group appeared off task. Following each 30-minute session, the team received a reward if they met the expectation for on-task behavior. Rewards included iPod use, computer time, or free time.

How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher used normal classroom procedures and activities, including a token economy system for good behavior that started being implemented at the beginning of the school year and remained active throughout all phases of the study. A paraprofessional administered the token economy system.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three students. The author reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with an increase in the focal student's on-task behavior.

Study citation	Joslyn, P. R., Vollmer, T. R., & Hernández, V. (2014). Implementation of the Good Behavior Game in classrooms for children with delinquent behavior. <i>Acta de Investigación Psicológica</i> , 4(3), 1673–1682. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2007471914709731
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: out-of-seat behavior and talking out of turn.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs for one classroom provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least four data points in each phase. The multiple baseline design across classrooms Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it uses a nonconcurrent design that does not allow for comparison between classrooms.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one public alternative elementary school in Florida offering services for children who engage in severe problem behaviors.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included students in one classroom. Six to 10 students were in the class throughout the study, though the class size fluctuated throughout sessions due to student absences and new students entering and exiting the study school. All students had severe behavioral problems and were in grades 2 or 3. The study did not provide additional student characteristics separately for this classroom, but across all three classrooms that participated in the study, 80% of students were male, 72% were Black, 24% were White, and 4% were described as biracial.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The teacher divided the class into two groups listed on a board at the front of the room, along with <i>Good Behavior Game</i> rules. Before the game started, the researcher reminded the students of the rules, which included remaining seated, not talking without permission, and refraining from touching others. When a student broke a rule, the researcher reminded the class of the rule and added a tally mark next to the team's name. At the end of the session, the team with fewer tally marks would win the game; both teams could win if they both met a criterion that was at least an 80% reduction in the average frequency of disruptive behavior observed during baseline sessions. Winning teams earned a choice of prizes such as snacks, stickers, pencils, or free time. Sessions took place three to five times a week, for 30 to 60 minutes, during silent work time or group instruction led by the teacher.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher used standard class rules that required students to remain seated, stay quiet unless addressed, and not make physical contact with other students. Teachers sporadically enforced class rules with verbal statements.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in out-of-seat behavior and talking out of turn.

Study citation	Joslyn, P. R., Vollmer, T. R., & Kronfli, F. R. (2019). Interdependent group contingencies reduce disruption in alternative high school classrooms. <i>Journal of Behavioral Education</i> , 28(4), 423–434. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1234607
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case design for one classroom provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase. The study also used a multiple baseline design across three classrooms, but this design Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it is a nonconcurrent design that does not allow for comparison between classrooms.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one Title I alternative public high school in Florida offering services for children with histories of delinquency and emotional and behavioral disorders.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included students in one high school classroom. Five to 10 students were in the class throughout the study, though the class size fluctuated throughout sessions due to student absences, new students entering and exiting the study school, and student suspensions. All students had emotional and behavioral disorders. Among the school population, 82% received free or reduced-price lunch, 84% were male, 77% were Black, 14% were White, 1% was Asian, and 8% did not report race. Five percent of the students in the school were Hispanic or Latino.

How was Good Behavior Game implemented?	The teacher assigned the entire class to one team because the class was small and students were frequently absent. In each <i>Good Behavior Game</i> session, the researcher stated the rules, which included no talking or leaving one's seat without permission. Each time a student broke a rule, the researcher recorded tally marks on a board at the front of the classroom and reminded the student of the rules. At the end of each session, students received a reward, such as chips or fruit snacks, if the class had fewer tallies than the criterion set by the researcher before the session. During <i>Good Behavior Game</i> sessions, the teacher provided instruction in world history during the first half of the period, and students independently worked on assignments for the rest of the period. Teachers conducted sessions up to five times a week for about 30 minutes. If more than half of the class was absent during a class period, <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was not implemented.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher conducted the class as they normally would, using existing behavior management strategies, including manual restraint in extreme cases, and a point system used to determine student preparedness for returning to their home school. Teachers awarded students points at the end of the class period for engaging in certain behaviors such as respecting others and being on time. The evaluation included sessions only if more than half the class was present during a class period.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported that <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in disruptive behavior.

Study citation	Joslyn, P. R., & Vollmer, T. R. (2020). Efficacy of teacher-implemented Good Behavior Game despite low treatment integrity. <i>Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 53(1)</i> , 465–474. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1240426
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on student talking out of turn, which falls under the student behavior domain.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case design for one classroom provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least three data points in each phase. The multiple baseline design across classrooms Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it uses a nonconcurrent design that does not allow for comparison between classrooms.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in one public alternative school in Florida that offered services for children who engage in severe problem behavior.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included students in one middle school classroom. Six to eight students were in the class throughout the study, though the class size fluctuated throughout sessions due to student absences and placement changes. Across the entire school, all students had severe behavioral problems, and 82% of students received free or reduced-price lunch. The study provided no additional student characteristics.
How was Good Behavior Game implemented?	The teacher divided the class into two teams and listed them on a board at the front of the room along with <i>Good Behavior Game</i> rules. Before the game started, the teacher reviewed the rules, which required students to raise their hands and receive permission before talking or leaving their seats. When students broke a rule, the teacher reminded the class of the rule and added a tally mark next to the team's name. At the end of the session, the team with fewer tally marks won the game; both teams could win if they both met a criterion that was at least an 80% reduction in the average frequency of disruptive behavior observed during baseline sessions. Winning teams earned a choice of snacks such as chips, fruit, crackers, or fruit snacks. Sessions took place one to five times a week for about 30 minutes during usual classroom instruction.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher used standard class rules, which required students to raise their hands to speak or leave their seats. The teacher sporadically reprimanded students when they did not follow rules.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in talking out of turn.

Study citation	Kleinman, K. E., & Saigh, P. A. (2011). The effects of the Good Behavior Game on the conduct of regular education New York City high school students. <i>Behavior Modification, 35(1)</i> , 95–105. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ909233
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on three outcomes in the student behavior domain: verbal disruptions, aggression or physical disruptions, and seat leaving.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least four data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in a grade 9 history class in one public high school in Harlem, New York City.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 26 students in one classroom in grade 9. Most students (73%) were Hispanic or Latino. Almost one-fourth (23%) were Black and the rest did not report their race. More than half (58%) were male, and 88% were enrolled in the free or reduced-price lunch program.

How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The teacher divided the class into two teams and rearranged their seats on opposite sides of the classroom. The teacher informed students they would have an opportunity to participate in a competition for prizes, and then described classroom expectations and rules related to talking, aggression, and moving around the classroom. The teacher displayed these expectations on the front wall of the class. During each session, the teacher read the list of expectations aloud and explained he would verbally identify any students who misbehaved. When students broke a rule, the teacher called out the misbehavior and added a check on the board under the relevant team. At the end of each session, the team with the fewest checkmarks won a piece of candy. At the end of the week, the team with the fewest marks received a pizza or cupcake party. Sessions took place over 2 weeks during history lessons that lasted 30 to 60 minutes.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher divided the classroom into the two teams used for <i>Good Behavior Game</i> and then instructed the classroom in the typical manner. The teacher displayed classroom expectations related to talking, aggression, and moving around the classroom on the front wall of the class and read them aloud at the beginning of each session. Rule violations were handled as usual, with verbal reprimands or expulsion from the classroom.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with reductions in verbal disruptions, aggression and physical disruptions, and seat leaving.

Study citation	McGoey, K. E., Schneider, D. L., Rezzetano, K. M., Prodan, T., & Tankersley, M. (2010). Classwide intervention to manage disruptive behavior in the kindergarten classroom. <i>Journal of Applied School Psychology, 26</i>(3), 247–261. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ892351
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: problem behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for two classrooms provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case design for one other classroom Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it does not have at least three data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two kindergarten classrooms located in one public school in northeastern Ohio.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 36 students in two kindergarten classes taught by two teachers. The single-case design for each class focused on four focal students chosen based on the teacher's recommendation and one random peer from the class who varied by session. Teachers selected the eight focal children based on concerns about their disruptive behavior and high levels of hyperactivity, aggression, or attention problems. The study did not provide additional demographic information.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Before implementing <i>Good Behavior Game</i> , teachers and researchers met to collaboratively design the intervention and determine goals for the classroom. They defined the severity, intensity, and duration of target behaviors and developed rules based on classroom goals, such as being respectful of others, listening, and watching the teacher. Each teacher then divided their students into teams. If one of the students on the team broke a rule, their team lost a sticker on the <i>Good Behavior Game</i> poster. When students behaved appropriately, they received praise from the teacher. After five students on a team received praise, the teacher returned one of the stickers to the poster. At the end of the day, the team with the most stickers received a reward, such as candy, gum, stickers, free time, extra recess, or pizza. They played <i>Good Behavior Game</i> during normal class activities for 2 to 6 weeks in each classroom.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Teachers used existing behavior management strategies and routines. Researchers discouraged teachers from using <i>Good Behavior Game</i> techniques.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in problem behavior.

Study citation	Mitchell, R. R., Tingstrom, D. H., Dufrene, B. A., Ford, W. B., & Sterling, H. E. (2015). The effects of the Good Behavior Game with general-education high school students. <i>School Psychology Review, 44</i>(2), 191–207. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141382
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs for two classrooms provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least three data points in each phase. The single-case design for one other classroom Does Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because it does not have at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time.
Where did the study occur?	The study took place in two general education classrooms in one high school in the southeastern United States.

Who participated in the study?	Participants included 44 students from two classrooms in grades 9–12. Most students in the sample were Black (91%), 7% were biracial or had no race provided, and 2% were White. Two percent were Hispanic or Latino. About 52% of students were male, and across the entire school, 89% of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The teachers introduced <i>Good Behavior Game</i> as a team competition and used a script to outline expectations and the rules of the game. During each session, teachers added a checkmark to the team's name on a board at the front of the class each time a student engaged in disruptive behavior, such as leaving their seat without permission or being off task. To win the competition, teams had to have fewer checkmarks than the criterion set before the game. Winning teams received extra credit points, homework passes, free time, food, or school supplies. The 20-minute sessions took place during algebra and Spanish classes two to three times a week for an unspecified number of weeks.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teachers instructed their classrooms in the typical manner.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with reductions in disruptive behavior in both classrooms.

Study citation	Sewell, A. (2020). An adaption of the Good Behaviour Game to promote social skill development at the whole-class level. <i>Educational Psychology in Practice</i>, 36(1), 93–109. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1244852
What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on three outcomes in the student behavior domain: positive social interactions, working as a team, and supporting peers.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because the single-case designs provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least four data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	This study took place in one classroom in a mainstream primary school in an urban area of the United Kingdom.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 27 students in one grade 4 classroom. The study presented classroom-level findings and separate findings for one focal student in the classroom. The classroom had one teacher and one teaching assistant. Most students were White (66%) and about 33% were Asian. Fifty-eight percent were female, and 19% received special education services. The focal student was male, had low levels of positive social engagement, and was classified as having special educational needs. The study did not clarify if these students had individualized education programs or received special education services.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	The classroom teacher and teacher assistant implemented <i>Good Behavior Game</i> an average of 31 minutes each day for 10 days during group work that focused on literacy and math skills. The whole class was on one team. Before the first session, the teacher and researcher described <i>Good Behavior Game</i> rules and target social behaviors, including positive behavior toward one another, working as a team, and supporting one's peers. The teacher displayed these target behaviors on the walls of the classroom. Students then role-played the target behaviors while the teacher and researcher provided feedback and answered questions. At the beginning of each session, the teacher reminded the students of the rules and target behaviors. The teacher awarded points on a board at the front of the class and verbally praised students each time they observed a target behavior. At the end of each session, the students won a reward if the class scored more points than a criterion set for each session based on the students' previous behavior. The reward was five marbles for the class marble jar, which related to classroom-level rewards, such as a trip to the zoo or theme park.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	Sessions took place during group work that focused on literacy and math skills. The teacher instructed the classroom in the typical manner with no additional reinforcement for positive social interactions, aside from typical positive verbal statements. Students could earn class marbles for staying on task, but not for demonstrating the target social behaviors from <i>Good Behavior Game</i> .
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms and three focal students. The author reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with an increase in classroom-level positive social interactions and working as a team, but found no consistent changes in the focal student's positive social interactions or working as a team with others. The author also found no consistent changes in classroom-level or focal student support for peers.

Study citation	Sy, J. R., Gratz, O., & Donaldson, J. M. (2016). The Good Behavior Game with students in alternative educational environments: Interactions between reinforcement criteria and scoring accuracy. <i>Journal of Behavioral Education</i>, 25(4), 455–477. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1120262
What was the study design?	The study used a reversal-withdrawal design to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on one outcome in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case design for one classroom provides at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and has at least five data points in each phase. The study also used multiple baseline designs across two classrooms, but these designs Do Not Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards because they do not provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time.

Where did the study occur?	This study took place in an alternative educational placement school in one classroom that served students in kindergarten to grade 2.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included nine students in kindergarten to grade 2 within one special education classroom taught by two teachers. At the start of the study, students in the class were diagnosed with emotional disturbance (45%), other health impairments (33%), a learning disability (11%), and intellectual disabilities (11%). Class composition changed over the course of the evaluation and, by the end of the evaluation, students in the classroom were diagnosed with emotional disturbance (88%) and other health impairments (12%). Most students (88%) were male. The study reported no other demographic information.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	<i>Good Behavior Game</i> took place during reading or math instruction. The teacher divided students into two teams and displayed the team names and members on a board in front of the classroom. Before each intervention session, the teacher reminded the students of the rules and that the team would receive a point each time a team member displayed a negative or disruptive behavior. Both teams could win if each team scored below the maximum point criterion determined by the teacher or researcher before the session. The students on the winning teams could select rewards from a treasure chest that contained candy and small toys. Students could also choose to have extra time at recess or spend time playing games or watching videos. Sessions alternated daily between teacher- and experimenter-implemented sessions. The implementer recorded points on the board at the front of the classroom. Implementers sometimes also told the team they would receive a point and explained why. At the end of each session, teachers announced the winners and distributed rewards. To receive a reward, a student had to be present during at least half of the game.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teacher instructed the classroom as usual, during reading or math instruction. The teacher delivered inconsistent responses to student problem behavior, including vocal redirecting, ignoring, reprimanding, or bringing the student into the hall to talk.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in disruptive behavior.

Study citation Wright, R. A., & McCurdy, B. L. (2012). [Class-wide positive behavior support and group contingencies: Examining a positive variation of the Good Behavior Game](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ968485). *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14(3), 173–180. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ968485>

What was the study design?	The study used reversal-withdrawal designs to measure the effectiveness of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> on two outcomes in the student behavior domain: disruptive behavior and on-task behavior.
What was the WWC study rating?	The study Meets WWC Single-Case Design Standards Without Reservations because the single-case designs for one classroom provide at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time and have at least five data points in each phase. The single-case designs for one other classroom Meet WWC Single-Case Design Standards With Reservations because they have at least three data points in each phase.
Where did the study occur?	This study took place in two general education classrooms within one elementary school in the northeastern United States.
Who participated in the study?	Participants included 37 students in kindergarten and grade 4 in two classrooms taught by two teachers. About half (51%) of the students were male, and 36% of the students in the school were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The study did not provide other demographic information.
How was <i>Good Behavior Game</i> implemented?	Teachers implemented <i>Good Behavior Game</i> daily during a 40-minute language arts period. Each teacher divided their class into four teams, explained the rules of the game, and then signaled the beginning of the game. They used two variations of <i>Good Behavior Game</i> , depending on the session. In some sessions, teachers assigned points to teams when a student demonstrated disruptive behavior, defined as being out of seat, talking without permission, playing with objects, or not following directions. In other sessions, teachers gave teams a point when all team members were on task. The teacher tallied points at the end of the period and recorded them on a chart posted in the classroom. Teams that met a point criterion that was unknown to students received a reward such as candy, pencils, and erasers. Each week, teams also had the opportunity to earn a reward if their points met a weekly criterion.
How was the baseline condition implemented?	The teachers provided typical language arts instruction.
What were the study findings?	The WWC could not calculate a design-comparable effect size because there were fewer than three classrooms. The authors reported <i>Good Behavior Game</i> was associated with a reduction in disruptive behavior and an increase in on-task behavior.