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Abstract

Parental participation in parent training programs is necessary for success in behavioral parent training. Prior literature has demonstrated probabilistic reinforcement as an effective intervention for improving a wide variety of behaviors. In the present study, a probabilistic reinforcement program (i.e., lottery) was implemented in order to evaluate its efficacy as part of a behavioral parent training program. The behaviors targeted for increase included attendance, participation, homework completion, and performing role-plays or completing in-class assignments for two 10 week Tools for Positive Behavior Change courses. Participants earned lottery tickets for each of the dependent measures, and drawings took place at the end of each class. An alternating treatments design was employed to determine any differences in performance on the dependent measures between baseline and lottery sessions. Results showed that participants attended and participated more with parent training under the conditions of a lottery compared to baseline class sessions although the effect was minimal; furthermore, this effect was observed more clearly for one of the two classes. Further research is needed to explore the effect of a lottery intervention on parent participation in parent training programs.
Introduction

Behavioral parent training (BPT) is a method for teaching parents skills in order to improve child behavior as well as parent-child interactions. BPT is parent training that imparts knowledge and skills founded in behavioral principles and procedures to parents. Most behavioral parent training programs include the following common or core elements as described by Shaffer, Kotchick, Dorsey, and Forehand (2001): focusing on the parent; emphasizing prosocial behavior; teaching parents to define, identify, and record behavior; instructing parents in behavioral principles; teaching new parenting skills through didactic instruction, modeling, role-playing, and practicing at home; maximizing generalization from the clinic to the home; and, in some cases, introducing parental, family, and community risks which may impede acquisition or maintenance of parenting skills and adaptive child behavior. BPT consisting of didactic instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and feedback is commonly referred to in the literature as behavioral skills training which has demonstrated efficacy in many studies across different skills and participants (Miltenberger, 2008). Further evidence in support of utilizing behavioral skills training to teach parenting skills comes from Hudson (1982) and Rickert (1988) in which their component analyses of BPT demonstrated that teaching behavioral principles alone (i.e., didactic instruction) was not sufficient for skill acquisition but that skills training, such as modeling and rehearsal, was essential to parental behavior change.
BPT Content

Skills taught to parents include general behavioral principles and procedures such as providing or withholding reinforcement (Eyberg & Matarazzo, 1980; Forehand & King, 1977; O’Dell et al., 1982) as well as specific procedures relevant to the targeted behavior chosen by the parent or researcher (Brightman, Baker, Clark, & Ambrose, 1982; Hampson, Schulte, & Ricks, 1983; Hawkins, Peterson, Schweid, & Bijou, 1966). Some researchers have combined the two techniques: Pevsner (1983) provided training on general behavioral principles in addition to specific skills related to the target behavior of interest. In their comprehensive review of the BPT paradigm, Graziano and Diament (1992) reported that parents have been taught skills for a variety of different challenging behaviors including noncompliance (i.e., temper tantrums, aggressive behavior, and refusal to comply), hyperactivity, food-related problem behaviors such as food refusal, and specific problem behaviors such as enuresis. Other unique skills acquired in parent training include conducting discrete trials and negotiating conflict situations (Kifer, Lewis, Green, & Phillips, 1974; Lafasakis & Sturmey, 2007). Furthermore, parents have been taught to modify behaviors of typically-developing children as well as those diagnosed with autism and/or other developmental disabilities demonstrating BPT’s utility among diverse groups of people and problem behaviors (Graziano & Diament, 1992; Kifer, et al., 1974; O’Dell, 1974).

BPT Outcomes

Research in BPT indicates positive outcomes and successes with children of participating parents. In fact, BPT has been shown to be more effective than other types
of parent training programs or treatment (Bourke & Nielsen, 1995; Graziano & Diament, 1992; Lundahl, Nimer, & Parsons, 2006; Serketich & Dumas, 1996). Lundahl and colleagues (2006) found that parent training that included behavioral principles showed more positive changes in parental behavior than those programs that did not. Even more striking, Serketich & Dumas (1996) stated that “the average child with one or more parents in BPT was better adjusted after training than 81% of children who received another form of treatment or no treatment at all” (pg. 178). Specifically, all of the children and parents that participated in BPT were better adjusted on all outcome measures including behavioral observation and parental and teacher reports for children and marital satisfaction, depression, stress and similar measures for parents than those families receiving no treatment or another form of treatment (Serketich & Dumas, 1996).

**BPT in Child Welfare**

Among some of the different populations of parents participating in BPT are those in the child welfare system. Both biological and foster parents have participated and successfully completed BPT (Berard & Smith, 2008; Hampson et al., 1983; Rose, 1974; Smagner & Sullivan, 2005; Van Camp et al., 2008a; Van Camp et al., 2008b). Similarly, parents identified as child abusers have participated in BPT with positive outcomes (Lundahl et al., 2006). When examining training programs for parents in the child welfare system, Berry (1988) found that biological parents received the most effective training (i.e., behavioral skills training) compared to foster and adoptive parents. Foster and adoptive parents were commonly trained via didactic instruction (i.e., lectures and discussion). For those foster parents trained in BPT, a number of positive results were associated with training including an ability to manage difficult child behavior and
increased retention rates in the child welfare system. In a review of parent training for child abusers, Lundahl et al. (2006) determined that incorporating a behavioral theoretical orientation into parent training programs improved outcomes substantially as significant gains were achieved after training in emotional adjustment, child-rearing skills, documented abuse, and attitudes toward abuse.

**Behavior Analysis Services Program**

The Behavior Analysis Services Program (i.e., BASP) is one exemplar of a program that provided training within the child welfare system (Stoutimore, Williams, Neff, & Foster, 2008). The BASP was introduced in 1996 to provide an array of services to children and families including the development and utilization of the *Tools for Positive Behavior Change* curriculum for classroom and home-based caregiver training, individual assessments and interventions for a child or family (e.g., birth, relative, foster care, therapeutic foster care), technical assistance such as consultations and on-site support for out-of-home programs (e.g., shelters, group homes, residential treatment facilities), and special assignments including locating and stabilizing missing or runaway children (Stoutimore et al., 2008).

Two different curricula were utilized for teaching caregivers positive parenting skills including the *Tools for Positive Behavior Change* and the *Essential Tools for Positive Behavior Change (Tools classes)*. These classes were 30 hours and 15 hours, respectively, taking place for three hours each week. Both *Tools* classes utilized a competency-based behavioral skills training for teaching caregivers behavioral procedures to modify children’s behavior. Typical classroom sessions included didactic instruction, modeling, role-playing, and feedback as well as homework assignments and
readings from “The Power of Positive Parenting” (Latham, 1994). The Tools curriculum has demonstrated improved performance in targeted skills (Berard & Smith, 2008; Van Camp et al., 2008a; Van Camp et al., 2008b). Moreover, skills acquired have also maintained after training between trained parents and their children in the home (Van Camp, 2008b). The Tools curriculum has shown similar promising results with direct care staff at group facilities for youth in foster care (Crosland et al., 2008a; Crosland et al., 2008b).

Reinforcement and Parental Cooperation in Parent Training

Shaffer, Kotchick, Dorsey, and Forehand (2001) stated that success in parent training is dependent upon parental willingness to attend class and comply with treatment including completing homework assignments, reading assigned materials, conducting behavioral observations at home, and practicing skills learned. Unfortunately, attrition and parental participation has been reported as a problem in the Tools for Positive Behavior Change classes as well as other parent training programs (Forehand, 1983; Van Camp et al., 2008a). In a review of 22 studies, Forehand (1983) expressed that 28% of parents who participated in training dropped out before the completion of the program. In another large study including 247 parent training participants, 34% dropped out leaving 123 participants who completed the program (Van Camp et al., 2008a). Numbers might be larger if those that are referred to training but never make contact are considered. Wolfe (1980) found that two-thirds of parents referred for court-ordered or voluntary parent training declined treatment. As shown here, it is clear that there is a need for addressing parental attendance and participation in parent training programs.
Due to the concern for attrition and lack of participation in parent training, researchers have included deposits or incentives for parents such as a lottery or salary contingent on predetermined behaviors (Muir & Milan, 1982; Pevsner, 1982; Rose, 1974; Smagner & Sullivan, 2005). Fleischman (1979) investigated the efficacy of a parental salary with families of lower socioeconomic status and/or single-parent households by randomly assigning a salary to parents contingent on completing treatment assignments including observation, implementing a program with their children, and using time-out. Of the four families that did not receive a salary in this study, none completed the program whereas all four of those who received salaries completed the program (Fleischman, 1979). In a preliminary correlational analysis of the use of incentives as part of the BASP Tools positive parenting program, Van Camp (2004) noted similar effects: When a requirement to complete training was present or incentives were offered such as reimbursement for babysitting and/or a monetary stipend, some increases in attendance levels and some decreases in attrition levels were observed. However, this reinforcement program could not be evaluated experimentally due to the researchers’ inability to systematically manipulate reinforcement and observe the effect on attendance and attrition. In order to understand the impact incentives such as a lottery may have on parental behavior in training, a causal analysis of the effect of parental incentives (i.e., reinforcement) on parental participation is essential.

Probabilistic reinforcement (i.e., lottery) has been shown to be very effective in improving behavior in several studies. Effects on behavior have been investigated in domains such as increasing recycling (Witmer & Geller, 1976), seatbelt use (Rudd & Geller, 1985), attendance at a treatment center (Gravina, Wilder, White, & Fabian, 2005),
participation at an elderly residential facility (Gallagher & Keenan, 2000), as well as in organizations for work attendance or performance (Shoemaker & Reid, 1980; Brown & Redmon, 1989; Cook & Dixon, 2005). Lotteries have also been used in areas such as reducing disruptive behavior on school buses (Greene, Bailey, & Barber, 1981) and improving children’s behavior (Martens, Ardoin, Hilt, Lannie, Panahon, & Wolfe, 2002; Muir & Milan, 1982).

Particularly, Muir and Milan (1982) investigated the impact a parental probabilistic reinforcement program would have on children’s progress with language skills. A lottery was implemented for three families during which parents could acquire lottery tickets in order to win prizes such as restaurant menu items, appliances, toys and dishes for their children’s accomplishments in language skills. The children’s accomplishments were expected to correspond with the parents’ efforts in working with their children. An ABAB reversal design showed that when a lottery was present, children’s progress in language skills significantly increased compared to the baseline condition in which a lottery was not in place. In fact, progress made by the children returned to baseline levels when the lottery was withdrawn. Seemingly, the reinforcement provided to parents in the form of a lottery led to an increase in parental cooperation in language training with their children. Muir and Milan (1982) concluded that a lottery can be an efficacious way to enhance parental programming indicating that a lottery may be an effective intervention to enhance parental cooperation in group parent training.

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature on parental reinforcement and its influence on parental attendance and participation in BPT. Specifically, the relationship between a probabilistic reinforcement program (i.e., a lottery) and parental
participation (including attendance and measures of class participation) was examined
with caregivers in the foster care system.
Method

Participants

The participants were six caregivers over the age of 18 in the child welfare system consisting of primarily biological, foster, and adoptive parents. Of the six participants, there were two biological parents, two foster parents, one adoptive parent, and one relative caregiver. There were two males and four females of which none had completed the training before. Two Tools for Positive Behavior Change classes were taught by a certified behavior analyst and offered by a local foster care/adoption agency. A total of 14 students in both classes volunteered, were required, or were recommended to the Tools for Positive Behavior Change course per their treatment plan with the Department of Children and Families. All of the students in both classes participated in the experimental conditions including the lottery; however, only the six participants of the fourteen students who were present for three baseline class sessions and three lottery class sessions were included in the present analysis.

Setting and Materials

The setting consisted of two classrooms provided by the local child welfare agency for teaching the Tools curriculum to a group of caregivers. The classroom contained chairs, a table or tables, and a projector used for presenting the classroom-based curriculum.

Participants were given a copy of the book “The Power of Positive Parenting” (Latham, 1994) on the first day of class which was used for reading at home and completing homework assignments. In addition, they were provided with a Tools for
Positive Behavior Change participant’s guide for each class session. This guide provided notes on the lecture material shown in class pertaining to the Tool targeted for acquisition that week.

Tools Training

The Tools for Positive Behavior Change curriculum is covered thoroughly in past research (see Stoutimore et al., 2008 and Van Camp, 2004); thus, only a brief overview is provided here. Each “tool” or targeted skill for acquisition is a behavioral procedure that is task analyzed into multiple steps. The task analysis enables the trainer or co-trainer to score the participant based on how many steps are performed accurately. This percentage is the score that is recorded for the pre- and post assessments that take place on the first and last session of the class. For example, the “Use Reinforcement” Tool consists of the following steps: 1. Tell the child what behavior you liked, 2. Provide a consequence for the behavior that matches the value of the behavior, 3. Provide the positive consequence within three seconds of recognizing the appropriate behavior, 4. Use sincere and appropriate facial expression, tone of voice, and body language, 5. Avoid reacting to junk behavior, and 6. Avoid coercion and punishment. If a participant accurately performs all six of the steps listed above, he or she will score 100%.

The Tools are as follows: Stay Close (i.e., use non-contingent reinforcement), Use Reinforcement, (i.e., reinforce desirable or appropriate behaviors), Pivot (i.e., extinguish undesirable or inappropriate behavior maintained by attention), Redirect–Use Reinforcement (i.e., use differential reinforcement by providing reinforcement for desirable behavior and extinguishing undesirable behavior maintained by attention), Set Expectations (i.e., provide effective contingency management), Use Contracts, (i.e.,
provide written or contractual contingency management), and Time-Out (i.e., use extinction for undesirable or inappropriate behavior). Although Time Out was included in the original curriculum, a Cool Down procedure was taught in place of this tool in the current research study at the discretion of the Tools trainer. Cool Down was taught as a self-management tool or coping skill for parents to model and teach to their children.

The Tools are taught using a behavioral skills training (BST) procedure which consists of didactic instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and feedback (Miltenberger, 2008). In class, this occurred in the form of lecturing, modeling the Tool, providing the opportunity for rehearsal by role-playing, and supplying feedback to the caregivers. Specifically, in-class role-plays were conducted by the trainer or co-trainer with the participants in which the trainer or co-trainer played the role of the child and the participant played the role of the parent. Thus, the participant practiced the Tool with the trainer to ensure competency. In addition to role-playing with the trainers, participants sometimes had the opportunity to role-play with each other.

Session one provided a course overview, a pretest skills assessment for each participant, and an introduction to the research study. The research study took place during sessions two through ten. Session two taught caregivers how to avoid coercion and punitive behavior management strategies. Sessions three through eight consisted of the Tools for Positive Behavior Change including Stay Close (session three), Use Reinforcement and Pivot (session four), Redirect-Use Reinforcement (session five), Set Expectations (session six), Use a Contract (session seven), and Cool Down (session eight). Session nine taught caregivers how to conduct an antecedent-behavior-consequence assessment (ABC assessment). Session ten was used for the post-training
skills assessment wherein the Stay Close tool was used for scoring the role-play dependent measure as described in more detail below.

**Probabilistic Reinforcement Intervention**

Each class session met once per week for a period of 10 weeks for 3 hours each time. Data was collected in nine of these classes (sessions two through ten as denoted above and classes one through nine as denoted by the graphs). In the beginning of class, a discussion regarding practicing at home and assigned homework from the week prior was conducted. Afterward, the Tool(s) learned from the previous week was reviewed in the form of discussion between the trainer and participants. Following the review, the Tool for the current week was taught through a combination of lecture, modeling, and role-playing as described above. Classes ended with participants filling out a feedback form.

Announcements were made regarding the lottery either in the beginning or middle of class and at the end of class. For example, participants were told, “Today is a lottery day” or “Today, there is no lottery” in the beginning and/or middle of class. Although the objective was to make these announcements in the beginning of class, announcements were made in the middle of class rather than in the beginning of class on days when the trainer immediately began class without allowing time for the lottery announcement which may have been disruptive to the flow of class. Announcements were also made in the middle of class in addition to the beginning of class on days when attendees arrived late so that they were informed of the condition for that class session. At the end of class, participants were told what to expect the following week such as, “Next week is a lottery day” or “Next week, there will be no lottery”. In addition, participants were provided
with a document outlining the lottery schedule and how they could earn lottery tickets on
the second day of class after consent forms were signed and returned.

During baseline or “class-as-usual” sessions, classes were conducted per usual. Although the trainer provided ongoing verbal positive feedback for attendance and participation as she would typically do, tangible reinforcers were not delivered. Thus, no systematic reinforcement system was in place for these sessions.

During intervention sessions, reinforcement in the form of a lottery was utilized. Lottery tickets were handed out at the end of each class by the primary researcher for each target behavior. A total of five lottery tickets could be acquired by each individual each class session which corresponded to the following targeted behaviors: attendance (worth two lottery tickets), homework completion (worth one lottery ticket), participation (worth one lottery ticket), and role-playing or an in-class assignment (worth one lottery ticket). Generally, class sessions required a role-play to earn the fifth lottery ticket; however, in-class assignments were used on class sessions two, seven, eight, and nine rather than in-class role-plays because task analyzed role-plays were not conducted during these classes.

One lottery ticket was chosen at random by drawing a winning lottery ticket at the end of each class session. Those participants who left early were not eligible to win a prize. The winner was provided with three possible prizes to choose from including gift certificates for gas, groceries, and/or restaurants worth 25 dollars. Winners were free to take the gift certificate immediately upon drawing their ticket at the end of each class session in which the lottery was in place.
In addition to the contingencies for individuals, a group contingency was established such that if all members of the class attended, participated, completed homework, and completed in-class assignments or role-plays to criterion (i.e., 80% or above), two lottery winners were drawn as opposed to one. This was planned to occur for every class in which all members earned five lottery tickets; however, two winners were drawn only once which took place on the first lottery session for Cohort One.

**Target Behaviors and Data Collection**

The dependent variable was a composite behavioral score reflecting parental attendance and participation. This composite score corresponded to the total number of lottery tickets earned on lottery sessions or the total number of tickets earned on baseline sessions (baseline tickets were assigned as points since tickets were not handed out to participants during baseline). During baseline sessions, participants were not informed of when they earned points; the composite behavioral score was calculated for purposes of data analysis in order to compare performance in baseline to performance during the lottery intervention. Tickets on lottery days and points on baseline days were earned for the following behaviors: attendance, homework completion, participation, and role-playing or an in-class assignment.

*Attendance* was defined as arriving to class within 10 minutes of class beginning and staying within 10 minutes of class ending. For attendance, one lottery ticket was provided for arriving within 10 minutes of class starting while another point was earned for staying within 10 minutes of class ending. Attendance was scored using a 10-minute interval recording method wherein participants were marked as present or not (a yes/no measure) for the first and last 10 minutes of class (see Appendix A). During lottery
sessions, participants were provided with two lottery tickets at the end of class for being present in both the first and last 10-minute intervals of class.

*Homework completion* was defined as turning in the assigned homework in the participant guide from the week prior with no questions left unanswered. Thus, homework was not considered complete if one or more blanks were present (see Appendix C). Homework was scored as completed or not (a yes/no measure). In session seven, participants were instructed to create a contract for homework completion rather than complete a worksheet in the participant guide. Contracts were considered completed homework assignments if they included at least two of the following dimensions: a target behavior, the consequence earned/not earned, a review time, and/or a start and end date. Sessions two and nine also differed from the other class sessions such that the consent form and social validity survey counted as homework for these sessions, respectively. During lottery sessions, participants were provided with one lottery ticket at the end of class for turning in a completed homework assignment.

*Participation* was defined as contributing to group discussion in the form of a verbal statement or question or engaging in a demonstrative role-play for the class. Participation was scored as occurred or not occurred (a yes/no measure), and participants were provided with one lottery ticket at the end of class for their contribution to class (see Appendix A).

*Role-playing* was defined as playing the role of the parent in a scenario presented by the trainer while the trainer or co-trainer played the role of the child. Role-playing was scored as a yes/no measure wherein participants earned a lottery ticket if they performed 80% or more of the task-analyzed steps accurately (see Appendix D).
In-class assignment was defined as completing the in-class assignment worksheet during the time allotted in class leaving no questions left unanswered. Thus, the assignment was not scored as complete if one or more blanks were present (see Appendix B). In-class assignments were worksheets provided to participants in their participant guide. However, during session seven and session eight, instructions were provided for participants to complete their in-class assignments as opposed to their completing a worksheet. For session seven, participants were asked to create a contract including short- and long-term expectations and short- and long-term consequences. The assignment was considered complete if all parts of the contract were included. For session eight, participants were asked to choose a location for Cool Down, what behaviors would prompt the use of Cool Down, and the age of the child the caregiver planned to implement Cool Down with. The assignment was considered complete if the caregiver included at least one of these items. In-class assignments were scored as completed or not (a yes/no measure), and participants were given one lottery ticket at the end of class for completing in-class assignments.

Interobserver agreement. Interobserver agreement (IOA) was calculated by comparing the scores collected by two trained researchers on attendance, homework completion, role-playing, and participation. Lottery tickets were earned on lottery sessions according to the primary researcher’s data on these target behaviors. IOA was collected for 66% of class sessions (six of the nine class sessions). For attendance and participation, a secondary observer was present in-class to collect data on these behaviors. Similarly, a primary and secondary researcher scored independently while the role-plays were conducted. For homework completion and in-class assignments, the
permanent products were reviewed by a secondary researcher outside of class. An IOA score was determined by comparing the primary and secondary researcher’s scores on each of the dependent measures across the nine classes which was calculated by dividing agreements by agreements plus disagreements and multiplying by 100. The average IOA score across all participants was 95.35%. Table 1 outlines all of the IOA scores including all participants and dependent measures. The IOA scores for all six participants range from 89.59% and 100%, on average.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interobserver Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class Assignments or Role-Plays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall IOA Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental Design**

An alternating treatments design (ATD) was used to evaluate the impact of a probabilistic reinforcement program on parental cooperation (i.e., dependent measures) for two classes of caregivers learning the *Tools for Positive Behavior Change* (Hayes, Barlow, & Nelson-Gray, 1999). A probabilistic reinforcement program (i.e., lottery) was
employed every other session for Cohort One starting with a lottery session. For Cohort Two, the order was counterbalanced such that it began with a baseline session.

**Social Validity**

Participants responded to a survey regarding the lottery on session nine that counted as their homework completion. If the participant was absent on session nine, the survey was completed on session ten (Appendix E).
Results

Figure 1 shows the average composite behavioral score of Cohort One participants for all dependent measures for each class session. Average behavioral scores in lottery sessions ranged from 4.1 to 5 while scores in baseline sessions ranged from 3 to 4.33. Figure 3 shows the average behavioral score per experimental condition across participants: 3.58 in baseline class sessions and 4.10 in lottery class sessions.

Figure 2 shows the average composite behavioral score of Cohort Two participants for all of the dependent variables for each class session. Average behavioral scores for each dependent variable ranged from 3.67 to 4.67 in lottery sessions and 2.5 to 5 in baseline sessions. Figure 4 shows the average performance per experimental condition across participants: 4.00 during baseline and 4.21 during intervention.

Table 2 describes the average performance per participant per condition. Scores observed during baseline ranged from 2.00 to 4.75. Scores observed during intervention ranged from 3.00 to 5.00. As seen in the table, average composite behavioral scores during the lottery were higher than those acquired during baseline sessions. With the exception of participant four, all six of the participants, on average, performed better during the lottery class sessions as compared to baseline class sessions.
Figure 1. Average Performance of Cohort One Participants. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Cohort One participants for attendance, participation, homework completion, and role-plays. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.

Figure 2. Average Performance of Cohort Two Participants. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Cohort Two participants for attendance, participation, homework completion, and role-plays. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.
Figure 3. Average Performance of Cohort One Participants per Condition. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Cohort One participants across all dependent measures and class sessions.

Figure 4. Average Performance of Cohort Two Participants per Condition. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Cohort Two participants across all dependent measures and class sessions.
Table 3 outlines average performance for Cohort One and Cohort Two per dependent measure. Average attendance scores for both Tools classes ranged from 1.40 to 1.84 during baseline classes. During lottery classes, attendance scores ranged from 1.58 to 1.67. Participation scores fall between .74 and 1.00, on average, during baseline and .87 and .92, on average, during intervention. Average homework completion scores ranged from .03 to .08 during baseline sessions and .53 and .75 during lottery sessions. On average, in-class assignment and role-play behavioral scores range between .42 and .60 during baseline and .58 and .73 in intervention.

Table 4 indicates the composite behavioral score earned by each participant for each dependent variable per class session. Participation was not included in the table as all participants with the exception of participant six participated in every class session except when absent thus earning their one point or lottery ticket for participation. Specifically, participant six did not participate during two class sessions when present.

Individual data indicate similar results compared to group results as displayed in Figures 5-10. Cohort One participants included participants one, two, and three. Participant one appeared to perform better during lottery sessions compared to baseline sessions. Similarly, participants two and three seemed to acquire higher behavioral scores during lottery sessions although this effect is clearer for the first four class classes. Cohort Two participants included participants four, five, and six. Participants four and five performed similarly across conditions indicating no difference between baseline and lottery sessions. Conversely, participant six acquired higher composite behavioral scores during lottery sessions with the exception of the sixth class.
Based on the answers provided on the social validity questionnaire, all participants chose “agree” or “strongly agree” when asked whether they liked the lottery. Four of six participants chose “agree” or “strongly” agree when asked if they would have preferred to have a lottery every class session. Five of six participants circled “agree” or “strongly agree” when asked if they believed the lottery motivated them to attend and cooperate in class. Overall, participants had favorable attitudes regarding the lottery.

### Table 2

*Average performance per Participant per Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort One</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Lottery</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant One</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Two</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Three</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Two</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Lottery</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Four</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Five</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Six</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Average performance for Class One and Class Two per Dependent Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Completion</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class Assignments or Role-Plays</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Average baseline and lottery performance across participants and classes demonstrated that participants attended and cooperated more in parent training under the conditions of a lottery compared to baseline class sessions (see Figures 3 and 4) although the effect is minimal. The positive effect of a lottery can be observed most clearly from Cohort One’s performance. There are several potential reasons for the difference in performances between Cohort One and Cohort Two. Cohort One was a mixed class full of adoptive, foster, and biological male and female parents, some of which were required or recommended to take the class while some of them were there voluntarily. The participants in Cohort One interacted relatively infrequently compared to Cohort Two, and these participants discussed the lottery with each other and praised the winner when their ticket was drawn.
Table 4
*Individual Performance per Dependent Measure per Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Class One</th>
<th>Class Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Eight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Nine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highlighted data are lottery sessions. AB indicates an absence from class.*
Figure 5. Participant One Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant One for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.

Figure 6. Participant Two Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant Two for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.
Figure 7. Participant Three Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant Three for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.

Figure 8. Participant Four Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant Four for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.
Figure 9. Participant Five Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant Five for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.

Figure 10. Participant Six Performance. The average composite behavioral score acquired by Participant Six for all dependent measures. The squares represent the behavioral score/lottery tickets acquired during the lottery condition. The diamonds represent the behavioral score acquired during baseline or class-as-usual sessions.
Cohort Two consisted of all females the majority of which were taking the class voluntarily (i.e., actively seeking new parenting skills as stated in their social validity surveys). Cohort Two was held in a smaller room than Cohort One contributing to a more inviting and intimate atmosphere. The participants in Cohort Two tended to arrive early and engage in discussion amongst themselves and with the trainer although little discussion occurred regarding the lottery itself. In Cohort Two, it is possible that the influence of social positive reinforcement in the form of social interaction and camaraderie played a larger role in motivating the parents to engage in the targeted behaviors across conditions such that a minimal difference between baseline and lottery class sessions was observed. This may have differed from Cohort One wherein the lottery intervention may have had more of an influence on the targeted behaviors than the social positive reinforcement from peers.

With the exception of classes five and nine, composite behavioral scores under the conditions of a lottery were much higher than under the baseline conditions for Cohort One. The particular environmental variables present during these particular classes should assist the reader in understanding this variability. Class nine was the final class, and it is believed that an abolishing operation was present for participants such that most of the students would earn their certificate of completion for training regardless of attending the last day wherein only the post-assessments took place.

Class five took place two weeks after class four due to an extended holiday break (Thanksgiving holiday). Only three of seven students attended class, one of which was a participant in this study; the remaining participants in the current study were absent from class. In addition, all three students performed poorly during this class session.
Participant two was the sole participant present on this particular class session, and he showed up late to class (earning only one lottery ticket for attendance), and he did not earn a ticket for homework completion nor his in-class assignment. Class five’s outlier is believed to have taken place due to extraneous variables taking place outside of class that were not under the control of the primary researcher. These extraneous variables may have included forgetting about attending class, forgetting to complete homework, and/or losing motivation to come to class after a long break.

It is important to note that lottery scores would be higher than the scores listed (see Table 3) if class five data were not included in the analysis. Table 3 shows the average performance for Cohort One per dependent measure. Upon removal of data for class five, average lottery scores for attendance, participation, homework completion, and in-class assignments/role-plays would be 2, 1, .67, and .92, respectively. Comparing these scores to their baseline counterparts of 1.84, 1, .08, and .42, it is clear that a potential effect is observed for attendance, homework completion, and in-class assignments/role-plays if class five data are not considered in the analysis.

It appears that the lottery had the most influence on two of the four dependent variables: homework completion and in-class assignments/role-plays (see Table 3). Future research is needed to conclusively determine whether homework completion and in-class assignments/role-plays can be influenced with a lottery intervention. However, it may be useful for researchers to implement a lottery intervention for homework completion and in-class assignments/role-playing alone as these behaviors appear to be most influenced by a lottery in the current study.
Although the present study does not provide a convincing demonstration of the efficacy of a lottery intervention in parent training, it is evident that all of the participants enjoyed the lottery based on their answers to the social validity questionnaire. Most of the participants indicated they liked the lottery and believed it motivated them to engage in the target responses. In addition, most of the participants would have preferred to have a drawing every class session. However, two of the six participants chose “disagree” when asked if they would have preferred to have a lottery every class session. It is not clear why these participants did not prefer to have a lottery session each class based on the data collected. Only one participant disagreed that the lottery motivated him to participate in class. Perhaps he was motivated by other individual variables as he considered himself a “highly motivated” parent. Furthermore, participant two verbally expressed his disappointment regarding his not winning a lottery prize over the duration of the study. Overall, based on the results of the social validity questionnaire, a lottery intervention appears to be a worthwhile intervention that participants like and find motivating.

Several limitations exist in the present study that should be accounted for in future research. First, the operational definitions of the target behaviors may have influenced whether an effect was observed for the lottery or not. For example, participants earned one point in baseline sessions or one lottery ticket in lottery sessions for participation as defined as contributing to group discussion in the form of a verbal statement or question or engaging in a demonstrative role-play for the class. As a result, participants only had to contribute once to earn their point or lottery tickets. However, a lottery intervention may have more of an influence on participation if participation was defined differently, possibly requiring several instances of participation in order to earn a lottery ticket. It is
possible that the lottery intervention had more influence on homework completion and in-class assignments/role-plays compared to the other dependent measures since these behaviors required more response effort.

A second limitation concerns the lottery rules and expectations. In the present investigation, students could earn a lottery ticket for each of the behaviors independently; subsequently, students could win the lottery prize for having only attended, for example, without engaging in any other target response. Thus, an abolishing operation could potentially influence student behavior such that motivation to engage in all or some of the behaviors would decrease since students could win the lottery prize by earning only one ticket (or two tickets for attendance) for one behavior. Considering the influences on choice as outlined by Miltenberger (2008), it is apparent that students will most likely choose the route of less response effort in order to earn the same reinforcer. Although all lottery winners in this study earned three or more lottery tickets, if researchers or trainers are interested in seeing a higher percentage of all of the target behaviors during lottery sessions (as opposed to homework completion and in-class assignments alone), it may be beneficial to require participants to engage in all or some of the behaviors in order to earn a lottery ticket. Future research might require participants to earn all five lottery tickets corresponding to the dependent measures targeted in the current study or engage in more than one target response to be eligible for the drawing so that a stronger contingency exists between engaging in all or some of the targeted behaviors and earning an opportunity to win the lottery.

A third limitation in the present investigation is the possibility of multiple-treatment interference. Among behavior analytic researchers, it is well-known that
multiple-treatment interference including sequential confounding, carryover effects, and the alternation effect may threaten internal validity when employing an alternating treatments design (Hayes, Barlow, & Nelson-Gray, 1999). In order to control for this, it is best to ensure that participants are fully aware of the lottery schedule. In the current study, the lottery system was explained thoroughly on the first day of class and reminders were given during each class. However, it is recommended that future studies consider testing participants on their knowledge of the lottery expectations and the lottery schedule. Participants could be tested once after they are informed of the lottery schedule and expectations or in the beginning of each class session so that a measure of treatment integrity is available for analysis.

Another limitation includes the small sample size and the diversity among both classes. The present study included two biological parents, two foster parents, one adoptive parent, and one relative caregiver. Individual differences in performance between baseline and lottery conditions may have to do with an individual’s level of motivation to attend and participate in class. Although this sample size was too small to determine differences in performance between types of parents or caregivers, it may be empirically worthwhile to investigate whether a lottery influences only certain types of parents.

In conclusion, the present study demonstrated that a lottery may have a positive effect on parental behaviors such as attendance, participation, homework completion, and in-class assignments/role-plays. Due to the variability present in the data, the present study suggests that the current investigation be replicated for further exploration of a lottery’s influence on parental behavior in parent training.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Attendance and Participation Data Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50-9:00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: In-Class Assignments

2.5.2 Results of Coercion

Results of Coercion

Children will:
- Try to avoid coercive behavior.
- Try to get even.
- Try to escape.
- Learn coercive behavior.
- Become afraid that they will fail.
- Receive attention for inappropriate behavior.

2.6 Identifying Reactive vs. Proactive Caregiving

2.6.1 Activity: Situations

Situation A:
Your 18-year-old child is late for curfew and you ground her/him. (S)he is pleading to get out of it, just for this one night, so (s)he can go to the opening of a new movie theater. (S)he promises to do anything you want, to never come home late again, etc.

CAREGIVER: “You make these promises but never keep them. You know you will come home late the next time you go out.” (The caregiver goes back and forth with the child about whether or not (s)he will come home on time, keep her/his promise, should get another chance, etc.)

What coercive behavior is being used?
Participant’s Workbook
2 Introduction to Tools for Positive Behavior Change

Situation B:
Your 10-year-old child comes in one hour late from playing outside.

CAREGIVER: “I can’t believe you’re late. Do you know what time you’re supposed to be here? What were you thinking? Did you think I wouldn’t notice?”

What coercive behavior is being used?

Situation C:
You are in the car with your 3-year-old child and (s)he keeps unfastening the seat belt around the car seat.

CAREGIVER: “Ryan, you have to stay in your car seat because if you don’t we could get in an accident and you could get very hurt. Car seats keep that from happening. We always wear seat belts so we will be safe. We want you to be safe, too. It is the law that you must wear a seat belt or I cannot drive the car. Do you understand?”

What coercive behavior is being used?

Situation D:
Mark is 17 and uses profane language while talking to his caregiver.

CAREGIVER: “If you talk to me like that one more time, I’m going to take away the car, ground you, and you won’t be using the phone for a month.”

What coercive behavior is being used?
Assess Behavior Using the ABCs Tool Checklist

Participant Name: ____________________________

Behavior Analyst: ____________________________ Date: _______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before (Antecedent)</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>After (Consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before (Antecedent)</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>After (Consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Homework Assignments

Homework: Session 2
Proactive Caregiving Situation

Participant’s Name: ________________________________________________

Child’s Name: ____________________________________________________

Choose one day and count the total number of positive interactions you had that day with this child.

What things did you do that were positive?

What was the result?

---

Reactive Caregiving Situation

Child’s Name: ____________________________________________________

Pick one day and count the total number of coercives you used in that day. What coercive(s) did you use most often?

In what situations were you most often coercive?

What was the result?
3.9.1 Homework

Stay Close

1. **Reading:** Review pages 69-81 from last week's reading assignment in *The Power of Positive Parenting* book.

2. **Home Behavior Record:** During the next week, take time to Stay Close with children. Complete the Home Behavior Record each day and bring it to the next class.

3. **Worksheet:** Choose one of the times you Stayed Close to one child and describe it below.
   
   Your Name: ______________________________________
   
   Child's Name: ____________________________________
   
   What did you talk about?
   
   How did you physically Stay Close?
   
   How did you touch appropriately?
   
   What empathetic statement(s) did you make?
   
   What open-ended question(s) did you ask?
   
   What junk behavior did you Pivot away from?
5.7.2 Homework

Use Reinforcement and Factors that Influence Choice

1. Reading: Pages 52-59 (Praising Good Behavior) and 59-60 (Redirect-Use Reinforcement) in The Power of Positive Parenting.

2. Home Behavior Record Tool: Complete each day during the week and return the sheet at the next meeting.

3. Worksheet: During the next week, take time to use the tool you learned today: Redirect-Use Reinforcement. Then, describe your experience on the worksheet below.

Your Name: ________________________________

Child’s Name: ______________________________

A time I Redirected and Used Reinforcement was when:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

A time I “tipped the scales” in favor of more appropriate behavior was when:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Role Play Worksheet
Redirect-Use Reinforcement Tool

Participant’s Name: ________________________________

Child’s Name: __________________________________

1. Describe one behavior of one child in your home that is inappropriate or potentially harmful:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How would you make sure the child stops the inappropriate behavior?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What appropriate, positive alternative behavior do you want instead?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. How will you use reinforcement (within 3 seconds) for this appropriate behavior?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
6.7.2 Homework

Set Expectations

1. **Reading**: Pages 37-47 in the *Power of Positive Parenting*.

2. **Home Behavior Record**: Complete the Home Behavior Record each day during the week and return the sheet at the next meeting.

3. **Worksheet**: Set expectations with a child and describe your experiences:

   - **Your Name:** __________________________________________________________
   - **Child’s Name:** _______________________________________________________

   Behavior you expected:

   When and where did you set the expectation?

   How did you start the conversation?

   What were the expectations and consequences for meeting and not meeting?
Did you make an empathy statement? What did you say?

Did you explain the benefits to the child? How?

Did you negotiate? If so, how?

Did you ask the child to restate the expectation? The consequences?

How did you praise the child for telling you the expectation?

Did the child show any junk behavior?

Did you stay cool?

Any problems? How did you think it went?
Assess Behavior Using the ABCs Tool Checklist

Participant Name:

Behavior Analyst: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before (Antecedent)</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>After (Consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes
No
N/A
Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before (Antecedent)</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>After (Consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes
No
N/A
Comments
Appendix D: Task-Analyzed Tools

Set Expectations Tool Checklist

| Behavior Analyst: ___________________________ | Date: ____________ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: Set the Expectations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set the stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Time (away from the behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place (uninterrupted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set positive tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State the expectation clearly and specifically (when, where, what, how)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Briefly reflect the child’s feelings (empathy), if necessary for example, “You sound upset.” 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Briefly explain the benefits of this expectation, only if the child asks 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II: Set the Consequences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State clearly the consequences for meeting and not meeting the expectation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate as necessary 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the child to restate the behavior and the consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge and praise the child’s restatement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid reacting to junk behavior of the child, if necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay cool throughout the process (no coercives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher’s Notes:
1. Ask participant to describe when, where, and how setting expectations is occurring (i.e., time, place, tone).
2. An empathy statement is only necessary if the child is upset with the expectation.
3. If the child does not ask, have the caregiver explain to you the benefits. Some yes if the reason for doing the behavior is anything but something like, “because I said so” or “so I won’t have to do it”.
4. Score No: if the child gave the caregiver an opportunity to negotiate, score item 10 as “No” if the caregiver does any of the following: a) said “No” to the child’s request; b) did not negotiate; c) said maybe; or d) put the child off until later. Score Yes: if the caregiver negotiates when asked and gives a different consequence than on the original plan OR if the caregiver negotiates without a definite consequence e.g., says something like “we’ll go out a special treat” if it rains and you have made your bed. Score N/A: if the child did not give the caregiver an opportunity to negotiate or if the child did not ask. “Why do I have to do it?” score item 11 as “N/A.”

Overall Comments: Were any coercive used: sarcasm, teasing, criticism, threats, arguing, questioning, logic, despair, pleading, hyperactivity, force, taking away privileges/incentives, etc. upmanship, adult treatment, telling them to others? Be specific.

52
# Use Reinforcement Tool Checklist

Participant Name: ___________________________________________________________

Behavior Analyst: __________________________________________

Date: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell the child what behavior you liked (if this is appropriate).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide a consequence for the behavior that matches the value of the behavior.</td>
<td>(Circle those provided): Social Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate touch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break from task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide the positive consequence within 3 seconds of recognizing the appropriate behavior (if possible).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use sincere and appropriate facial expression, tone of voice and body language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avoid reacting to junk behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoid coercion &amp; punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainer’s Notes:**

1. The Stay Close components must be used within 3 seconds of the caregiver responding to the appropriate behavior. If used after 3 seconds or not at all, score these items “no”.

   Score “No” if there is any instance of inappropriate expression, tone of voice, or body language after the first 3 seconds. If the observation is a competency check-off, caregiver should tell you how they would make sure the consequence is reinforcing without prompting.

**Overall Comments:** (Circle any coercive used: sarcasm/teasing; criticism; threats; arguing; questioning; logic; despair, pleading, hopelessness; force; taking away privileges/items/allowance; one up-man-ship; silent treatment; telling on them to others. Be specific.)
# Pivot Tool Checklist

Participant Name: ________________________________________________________________

Behavior Analyst: __________________________________________________________________ 

Date: __________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Say nothing about the junk behavior. (For example: Don’t say, “Stop that now!” or “Quit doing that!”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do nothing to react to the junk behavior (for example: don’t roll your eyes, stomp out of the room, cross your arms, stare.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actively attend to another child, person, or activity. (For example: Read a book or praise another child for behaving appropriately.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Once the child who displayed junk behavior behaves appropriately, provide reinforcement for the appropriate behavior (social interaction, praise, touch, item, and privilege, break from task) within 10 seconds of recognizing the appropriate behavior of this child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stay cool. No Coercive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainer’s Notes:**

1,2 Score “No” if there is any response to the junk behavior, including laughing or any change of expression. However, if the caregiver realizes they have responded to the junk behavior and stops the response, note this in the Comments column and reinforce the acknowledgment and correction.

**Overall Comments:** (Circle any coercive used: sarcasm/teasing; criticism; threats; arguing; questioning; logic; despair, pleading, hopelessness; force; taking away privileges/items/allowance; one-up-man-ship; silent treatment; telling on them to others. Be specific.)
**Redirect-Use Reinforcement Tool Checklist**

**Participant Name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Name</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Get within arm’s reach of the child (before saying anything).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Make sure the child stops the inappropriate behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Use gentle physical guidance if necessary.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Calmly say something like, “Hey (child’s name), I want you to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(state the positive alternative behavior).&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. If the child does not begin to do the suggested activity within 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seconds, model, or gently guide her/him to do the activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Use Reinforcement when the child does the appropriate behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(praise, touch).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Reinforce the behavior <strong>within 3 seconds</strong> after the appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior begins. (Stopping serious behavior may be the appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Say nothing and do nothing about junk behavior throughout the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Stay cool and use no coercives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Comments:** (Circle any coercives used: sarcasm, teasing, criticism, threats, arguing, questioning, logic, 
dropouts, pleading, loopholes, force, taking away privileges, fines, adherence, and ownership, alien treatments, telling on others. Be specific.)
## Set Expectations Tool Checklist

Participant Name: 

### Behavior Analyst: __________________ Date: ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I. Set the Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Time (away from the behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place (uninterrupted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set positive tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State the expectation clearly and specifically (when, where, what, how).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Briefly reflect the child’s feelings (empathy), if necessary (for example, “You sound upset...”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Briefly explain the benefits of this expectation, only if the child asks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II: Set the Consequences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State clearly the consequences for meeting and not meeting the expectation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Negotiate as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ask the child to restate the behavior and the consequences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Acknowledge and praise the child’s restatement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Avoid reacting to junk behavior of the child, if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stay cool throughout the process (no coercive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainer’s Notes:**
1. Ask participant to describe when, where, and how setting expectations is occurring (i.e., time, place, tone).
2. An empathy statement is only necessary if the child is upset with the expectation.
3. If the child does not ask, have the caregiver explain to you the benefits. Score yes if the reason for doing the behavior is anything but something like, “because I said so” or “so I won’t have to do it”.
4. **Score No:** If the child gave the caregiver an opportunity to negotiate, score item 10 as “no” if the caregiver does any of the following: a) said “No” to the child’s request; b) did not negotiate; c) said maybe; or d) put the child off until later. **Score Yes:** If the caregiver negotiates when asked and gives a different consequence than on the original plan OR if the caregiver negotiates without a definite consequence (e.g., says something like “we’ll get you a ‘special treat’ if it rains and you have made your bed”). **Score N/A:** If the child did not give the caregiver an opportunity to negotiate or if the child did not ask, “Why do I have to do it?” score item 11 as “N/A.”

**Overall Comments:** (Were any coercive used: sarcasm/teasing; criticism; threats; arguing; questioning; logic; despair, pleading, hopelessness; force; taking away privileges/items/allowance; one up-man-ship/silent treatment; telling on them to others? Be specific.)
Appendix E: Social Validity Questionnaire

1. Did you like the lottery?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Disagree

2. Would you prefer to have had a lottery for every class session?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Disagree

3. Do you believe the lottery motivated you to attend class, participate, complete homework, perform role-plays, and/or complete in-class assignments?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Disagree

4. Is there anything about the lottery you did not like?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Disagree

5. Would you consider yourself a highly motivated parent or caregiver including being highly involved in class and activities, practicing the Tools every week at home, and having a strong desire to improve upon current parenting skills?
6. Please circle the descriptor that suits you best:

Adoptive parent(s)   Foster parent(s)   Biological Parent(s)

7. Please circle the descriptor that suits you best:

Voluntarily completing the Tools class   Required to complete the Tools class

8. How were you referred to this class? Please circle as many as appropriate:

Required by case plan   Recommended by case plan   Hoping to adopt/foster
In order to adopt/foster   Actively seeking new parenting skills   For my job

9. Please place a checkmark or an X next to the descriptor(s) that suits you best. You may choose more than one:

_____ “I am confident that I will use these skills with my children”
_____ “I am confident that I will teach these skills to caregivers as part of my profession”
_____ “I am confident I will use these skills daily”
_____ “I am confident I will use some of the skills if I can remember”
_____ “I am confident I will not use these skills”
10. Please estimate your annual income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>$10,000-20,000</th>
<th>$20,000-30,000</th>
<th>$30,000-40,000</th>
<th>$40,000-50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-70,000</td>
<td>$70,000-80,000</td>
<td>$80,000-90,000</td>
<td>$90,000 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please share any further comments you may have regarding the lottery: