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Abstract

The primary purpose of the proposed study is to improve students’ on-task and pro-social behavior in class, while simultaneously decreasing their disruptive behavior. To do this, I will use an intervention package called 3 Jars which is an adapted version of the 4 Jars Intervention, which consists of the following components: (a) randomized interdependent group contingencies, (b) randomized target behavior and student selection, and (c) unknown rewards in the form of a mystery motivator.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

With the institution of the Common Core Standards (January 2013) and a perceived disregard to teaching to student’s strengths; it is imperative that we increase the performance of special education students so as to best prepare them for the real world. Modern society, in its many changes and transitions needs individuals prepared to evolve in non-traditional employment options and trades. We can continue to prepare students for the real world with this in mind.

Recently, I attended an in-service work-shop where the presenter stated that there are no jobs/ careers for those who cannot successfully meet the Common Core Standards. Her point was based on a situation where her colleagues described how their home was set up with an elaborate electronic control panel that wirelessly controlled several different water stations within their specialty kitchen. She claimed that in order to be a successful plumber in the near future, one would need to perform well under the Common Core State Standards and the new mandates in today’s school systems.

I for one completely disagree with this statement. As a nation we are in dire need of people able to embrace vocational professions. I feel that students can be college-ready, but they can also choose other options. I feel that the design of the Common Core State Standards seems to frown upon the notion of students having successful careers without completing this new curriculum. As an educator, I can attest to the fact that there is a tremendous burden on students who are seeking a vocational program, or other career options.
Hence, the primary purpose of my study is to see how I can improve pupils’ productivity, on-task, and pro-social behavior in class, while simultaneously decreasing their disruptive behavior. To do this, I will use an intervention package called 3 Jars which is an adapted version of the 4 Jars Intervention. This intervention package consists of the following components:

(a) randomized interdependent group contingencies,

(b) randomized target behavior and student selection, and

(c) unknown rewards in the form of a mystery motivator.

Mystery motivators are incentive systems designed to deliver unknown rewards to pupils for appropriate behavior (i.e., in this case meeting daily target behavior criteria) (Rhode, Jenson, & Reavis, 1993).

To date, this intervention package has been used in at least eleven published research studies and is currently being used in five other studies approved by the SUNY Fredonia IRB committee.

These studies have found that interdependent group contingencies with mystery motivators can:

(a) improve students’ homework completion and accuracy rates (Moore, Waguespack, et al., 1994; Madaus, Kehle, Madaus, & Bray, 2003),

(b) decrease a wide range of disruptive pupil behaviors (Mottram, Bray, Kehle, Broudy, & Jenson, 2002; Theodore, Bray, & Kehle, 2003), and

(c) enhance interpersonal interactions among students at primary and secondary levels (Kehle, Bray, Theodore, Jenson, & Clark, 2000; Musser, Bray, Kehle, & Jenson, 2001).
Moreover, researchers reported that the powerful positive effect of the group contingencies were increased when different facets of the contingencies (e.g., whole class versus individual pupils and target behaviors are randomized) and when consequences are unknown to the learners (i.e., mystery motivators).

**Statement of the problem/rationale**

It is my job as a Special Educator to work magic and to teach and adapt to a curriculum that is completely inappropriate for the developmental levels of my students. Many of my students have developmental delays with their speech, fine motor, memory, and gross motor skill sets. According to the state, my curriculum must mirror that being taught in the general education classroom.

I need to find an approach that will increase students’ on task behaviors and decrease inappropriate behaviors, while simultaneously increasing student production. Due to the rigor of the Common Core Standards, it is imperative for my students to receive as many repetitions as possible during their time with me in order to set the foundational stage for their future learning. On task behaviors will greatly increase their ability to receive many more repetitions needed to acquire and maintain their skills.

**Personal & Professional Background**

Currently, I am a Kindergarten Special Education teacher within the Orchard Park School District. This is my third year with the district as a teacher and seventh year as an employee. I was a student at Orchard Park from kindergarten to my senior year of high school. I returned as a teacher aide shortly after receiving my degree from SUNY Fredonia.
The reason I wanted to become a special education teacher was my desire to provide an environment where these struggling students could have a chance. However, the Common Core Standards are severely limiting these chances for these students as the realm of the Core goes against the ideology of their developmental needs (Piaget, 1959).

Throughout my time at SUNY Fredonia, I learned a great deal from several professors in terms of scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1962) and the importance of creating an environment that teaches towards children’s developmental levels. I was not encouraged to just focus on teaching a set of standards. As an educator I must utilize my time wisely to build upon students’ developmental levels so my students can have a chance to achieve the learning they need to have a successful career and life.

**Classroom Setting**

Currently, my kindergarten classroom is situated in the first grade hallway at Ellicott Elementary School in Orchard Park. I have four students in my class that require special education services as well as many different related services. The related services they receive include: speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and counseling. Each student has a learning disability and one student has a specific diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder.

In addition to their learning differences, the students also struggle with motivation and attention. The classroom is arranged to encourage appropriate behavior with visual aids reinforcing the classroom rules. The classroom rules are short, positive, and written in simple language with a picture cue (i.e. use nice hands and feet, have looking eyes, listening ears, quiet mouths).

Additionally, there is large visual schedule to prepare them for the day’s activities.
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Posters, decorations, and other visually stimulating materials on the walls and ceiling are limited to alphabet posters, a word wall, and a bulletin board showcasing student work in order to decrease visually distracting materials.

The educational design I use in my classroom focuses on using multiple stations for whole group teacher led instruction, small group teacher instruction, teacher aide reinforcement of skills, and independent practice.

The classroom is also designed for multiple stations to occur simultaneously. For example, while several students work at the computer station with the aide overseeing, the remaining students work with me at the horseshoe table on phonics or in a guided reading group. Whole group instruction occurs either at the large carpet for the daily read-aloud or at the SMART Board where the morning message is read to establish the day’s theme.

One student requires significant redirection, motivation, and/or attention due to negative behavior. Therefore, small group instruction of two students is the general practice throughout the day.

Each day centers on a general schedule of six lessons:

1. computer based letter sound review;
2. phonemic awareness (i.e. phoneme segmentation, blending);
3. phonics (i.e. writing/reading CVC words);
4. High Frequency word reading/writing; guided reading/read aloud;
5. blended math with a general education kindergarten class;
6. blended Social Studies or Science.

The students generally take longer to complete each activity due to inappropriate classroom behavior such as: talking out of turn, making inappropriate noises, shouting, and/or physical contact with other students. In addition to behavior difficulties, the students also demonstrate decreased motivation, and/or frequent need for redirection. My students require increased time to process and learn new information with additional examples and differentiated instruction, secondary to their specific disabilities.

Due to these issues, a typical lesson takes additional time. It requires repetition of material. It also involves a loss of instructional time due to inappropriate behavior. This is why I am exploring an intervention package called Mystery Motivators.
Chapter 2

Mystery Motivators

Mystery Motivators are incentive systems designed to deliver unknown rewards to students for appropriately displayed behavior (i.e., in this case meeting daily target behavior criteria), (Rhode, Jenson, & Reavis, 1993). To date, this intervention package has been used in at least 11 published research studies. These studies have found that interdependent group contingencies with mystery motivators can:

(a) Decrease a wide range of disruptive pupil behaviors (Mottram, Bray, Kehle, Broudy, & Jenson, 2002; Theodore, Bray, & Kehle, 2003), and

(b) Enhance interpersonal interactions among students at primary and secondary levels (Kehle, Bray, Theodore, Jenson, & Clark, 2000; Musser, Bray, Kehle, & Jenson, 2001).

The research data indicates an increased effectiveness of the strategy due to the randomization of the contingencies (whole group vs. individual) and when the consequences are unknown (mystery motivator).

Establishing the Intervention

The specific steps followed in implementing the intervention package are described in the attached fidelity of implementation checklist (see Appendix B). Initially, I identified appropriate target behaviors for intervention based on pupil performance during baseline instruction. Baseline instruction consists of the normal or routine teaching practices used in the target classroom. Student performance was monitored for a minimum of three sessions or until student performance stabilized. Baseline data was used to identify target behaviors and to predict future
The intervention package was then implemented and pupil performance was compared across baseline and intervention phases to assess the impact on target students. These phases were be repeated to establish functional relationships between the intervention and target behaviors.

In this investigation, I used 3 Jars to randomize group contingencies and to keep the group reward unknown or a mystery. I selected appropriate target behaviors and set acceptable criteria based on baseline data. For example, I selected class work completion and set a criterion of 100% completed with no more than three reminders.

The target behavior(s) and criteria were then written on slips of paper and placed in the first jar on my desk. Each day, during circle time I selected one slip of paper. This was the target behavior monitored in class, and the criterion that needed to be met for students to earn rewards (e.g., 100% assignment completion with no more than three reminders).

All target behaviors and criteria were posted publicly in class. However, students did not know which target behavior and criteria was being monitored each day. This was done because previous research found that generalized behavior changes occurred more often when daily target behavior selection was randomized. Since the students were not aware of which target behavior was being monitored, they could have adjusted all behaviors in hopes of meeting the criteria and earning daily rewards (Kelshaw et al., 2000; Skinner et al., 1996).

After the target behavior and criterion were selected, I picked a slip of paper from Jar #2 that is labeled (groups or individuals). Slips of paper (i.e., 6 for each option) containing the following words (i.e., whole group, small group, or individual students’ names) were placed
inside the jar. The purpose of the second jar was to determine the contingency that was being evaluated that day in regards to the target behavior.

If a “whole group” slip of paper was selected, then the class’ average performance on the target behavior was assessed. Therefore, all class work assignments must be 100% completed and the class average no more than three reminders or above for students to earn a reward that day.

Slips containing the words “small group” also specified either: (a) Group 1, (b) Group 2. (Group refers to small group activities which are taking place during center time within this setting.) If Group 1 was selected, then all students in that group were monitored during class to determine if they met the pre-established criteria.

If an individual student’s name was drawn, then that student’s performance was monitored on the selected target behavior and criteria. For example, if Jesus’ name was drawn, then I only examined his paper against the target behavior and criterion. If the target student met the criterion, then contingent rewards were made available to the entire class.

Again, the individual’s name was not revealed to the class. Since students did not know whose behavior was evaluated, it is more likely that they would all try to meet the criterion (Kelshaw et al., 2000; Skinner et al., 1994).

If whole class, small groups, or individuals met the daily criterion, then they would be allowed to select one piece of paper from Jar #3 labeled “rewards”. This jar contained approximately 20 pieces of paper that contained the names of material, activity, or rewards (e.g., stickers, art supplies, no homework coupons, 5-minutes additional free time, preferred seating arrangements, etc.).
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Possible rewards were collected from students by having them submit ideas through a classroom discussion throughout the project. I selected appropriate and inexpensive consequences to include in jar # 3. Whichever reward was selected provided for the entire class during the most immediate and practical time.

Among the 20 possible rewards there were five “mystery motivator” slips of paper. Typically, mystery motivators consist of sealed envelopes that contain slips of paper with high preference rewards written on them. These envelopes have question marks written all over them. The envelopes are displayed throughout the classroom to garner interest. On those days when a “mystery motivator” slip of paper was selected from Jar # 3, students were allowed to vote on which envelope to select and open to determine that day’s reward.

It is possible that the entire class, small groups, and/or individual students would not meet daily target behaviors and criteria. When this occurred, the class were told that we did not meet the goal and they cannot choose from jar 3 that day. They would be encouraged to work hard the next day and told that they would have another chance to earn a reward.

Individual pupil’s names were not mentioned on days that the criterion was not reached. This would minimize any possible negative effects from the group contingencies and increase the likelihood that any students who failed to meet the criterion (i.e. including those that were not targeted that day) will think that they were “caught” that day (Kelshaw et al., 2000).
Chapter 3

Data analysis

Students have displayed varying degrees of behaviors that have limited the amount of repetitions needed to acquire skills taught in the classroom. The behavior that was evident throughout the four day baseline measurement was inattention. Inattention will be defined as the inability to maintain eye contact throughout instruction.

This inattention affected several key instructional outcomes throughout the week especially in terms of sight word acquisition, phoneme segmentation and blending, and letter sound acquisition.

Inattention is extremely detrimental for children with disabilities especially when multiple repetitions are required for the student to acquire the targeted skill. Phoneme segmentation is a required and difficult skill to acquire. Phoneme segmentation is the ability to hear and recite the individual phonemes within a presented word. For example, If I were to say to the student “cat”, they would have to recite the word cat, then break the word into three individual sounds; /c/ /a/ /t/.

Phoneme blending is the reverse of phoneme segmentation, but is equally as difficult to acquire. Phoneme blending is a fluency reading skill that teaches students to smoothly blend presented sounds together. Typically, in my classroom we pre-read a story by practicing words we will encounter by orally blending the words prior to reading the story. For example, I would place the letters t, a, and p on the board, then have the students say the sounds individually to ensure accuracy. We would then slowly say the sounds with no pause between each phoneme to create a word (i.e. tap)
Phoneme segmentation and phoneme blending are hard skills to acquire for typically developing children without behaviors, let alone, those with in attentive behaviors with developmental delays.

Not only does the inattention impact student success in terms of skill acquisition but the secondary behavior displayed by one particular student takes away from their successes. These behaviors are hindering the other student’s progress as it has taken up an extreme amount of my time to deescalate the situation.

The secondary behaviors that are being displayed are refusals and inappropriate vocal outbursts. The vocal outbursts vary from day to day, but they are consistent in response to a request during a difficult academic task. Several loud outburst that are observed in a typical week and are as follow: “I hate you”, “My mom says I don’t need to do that”, and “My arm is broken”. Typically, the student is yelling these statements at the top of his lungs followed by an uncontrollable crying. Not only is this behavior unfair to the other students, it is also unfair to the child displaying these behaviors as he needs to acquire the desired skills.

Students in my classroom deserve to have a full day educational experience with a decreasing amount of vocal outbursts and increased instances of on task behavior. This is the reason I have decided to implement the mystery motivator strategy in my classroom.

**Classroom implementation of intervention plan**

Students were presented with the mystery motivator strategy during circle time on Monday, April, 28, 2014. I explained the mystery motivator as an opportunity to win rewards for good behavior. I utilized the visual rule poster posted on the wall. Then I asked the rule reader to look at each rule and recite the rules posted to encourage proper behavior. We then
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discussed (daily) several examples of what these rules look like. The behavior chart is utilized to reinforce attentive listening, looking eyes, and quiet voices (i.e. appropriate vocal tone and acceptable language).

After going over the rules, I presented them with the three jars we would use during the week. I discussed how sometimes we need some extra help listening and using nice voices when we talk to each other. I also explained how we can use these three jars to help us earn rewards for following the rules. Together we made a shared list of the behaviors I would like them to use throughout the day. We utilized the rule poster to create the slips of paper for jar one. Together (very guided), we came up with 3 behaviors to improve; finish our phoneme segmentation practice with no more than 3 reminders, finish written phoneme blending practice with no more than 3 reminders and follow a direction given by an adult within 5 seconds with no yelling (verbal outburst)

After making the list of behaviors I pulled out the second jar to explain where I would be looking for these behaviors. We made a list of three groups I could “catch them” following the rules. We made slips of paper for “big group”, “small group”, and “by yourself with individual names”. After explaining the guidelines for the second jar, I then pulled out a large box with question marks placed on all sides. Together we made a list of rewards that we could win if we meet the criteria (“do our jobs with no more than three reminders/ comply with a direction within 5 seconds”). The students were excited throughout the explanation mainly because they were going to have the chance to pick from each jar throughout the day.

Throughout the week we used the three jars during our reading and math blocks. The success of the behavior method was inconsistent as it worked well for students with learning
disabilities, but not as much could be said for the child who is on the Autism spectrum.

Throughout the week the three students with disabilities enjoyed the mystery motivator game as they looked forward to the reward aspect of the program. Each of the three students with learning disabilities decreased their need for redirection throughout the intervention. During our whole group instruction each of LD students were able to complete the phonemic awareness task (orally blending sounds, orally segmenting sounds) by following the direction within 5 seconds. Fortunately (for the students), two of the days we drew an individual contingent, which had one of the students with a learning disabilities name on it. Since the individual student was able to meet the criteria set by the Jar 3 all of the students were invited to choose a slip from Jar #3 as a group. The students were extremely excited for the little army men they were able to choose from the mystery prize box, whereas, the little girl choose a fun sparkle pencil.

Unfortunately, for students following directions, they were unable to meet the criteria set for two of the days during whole group. The criteria set on these subsequent days unsuccessful days was to complete the phonemic awareness task with no more than two reminders. For example, I asked the students to repeat the word of cat, then say its individual sounds why simultaneously writing the letters. Most of the four students were able to comply with the task with less than two reminders. However, the student with Autism Spectrum Disorder was unable to successfully complete the task with the set criteria. This child needed 8 and 10 reminders to complete the set of 8 words respectively. Averaging out the amount of reminders to complete the task did not meet the criteria set of no more than two reminders in a whole group.

Over the four days there was a steady decrease in inattentive behaviors from three students with learning disabilities, but on average an increase in reminders from the student with
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Autism. After four days of data collecting I decided to stop the intervention plan due to increased inattentive behaviors, refusals, and vocal outburst from the student with Autism. The inappropriate behaviors increased in frequency throughout the week, but did not escalate in terms of severity. The inappropriate behaviors displayed by the individual student with Autism were typical of the behaviors explained in the baseline with an increase of frequency. I deemed the strategy inappropriate for the student as he requires instant gratification (need for immediate praise) in order to maintain appropriate classroom behaviors. By withdrawing the instant gratification of a sticker or star on the star chart, the student was unable to maintain eye contact, follow directions, and/or use appropriate vocal tone with as much accuracy as the baseline data.
Conclusion

Could the Three Jars Mystery Motivator intervention improve instruction? This question has two answers as there are two distinct groups of children in my classroom. If I were to maintain the intervention for the students with learning disabilities, then I would answer the question with a yes. I would answer yes because the students showed a decrease in behaviors that limited their need for redirection.

I would also have to answer no due to an adverse effect for the second distinctive group/child within my class. The intervention did not maintain its desired effects with this particular student due to his need for instant gratification in order to maintain appropriate classroom behavior. The strategy requires students to wait the length of the lesson to receive a reward for desired behavior, but this student is unable to internalize the concept. Therefore, the intervention is not appropriate for this particular student.

Unfortunately, with such a small classroom with only four children, I do not believe the intervention strategy would improve instruction. It would be unethical in my point of view to continue the intervention plan when 25% of the student population displays an increase in frequency of inattentiveness, refusal of work, and vocal outbursts. However, I feel the intervention could be successful with a demographic that did not include students who required instant gratification of desired behavior.
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Appendix C

Group Contingencies with Randomization of All Contingency Components

Three Jars Intervention

Fidelity of Treatment Record

Investigator: ___Nathan Grundtisch___ Date: ________________

Observer: ___

Time session began: ________________ Time session ended: ________________

Directions: Observe the investigator as s/he implements the intervention and use the scoring code below to note the presence and/or absence of each tutoring component.

Scoring Code: + Behavior demonstrated

- Behavior not demonstrated

NA Not applicable

General Implementation

1. Investigator announces criteria for students to earn reinforce (e.g., 5 or fewer checks for disruptive behavior) and the classroom rules that must be followed.
2. Investigator announces possible rewards if students successfully meet the pre-established criteria.

3. Possible reinforcers were identified by seeking pupil input (e.g., asking them, watching them, having them complete reinforcement menus, and/or using suggestions from anonymous box). (You may need to ask investigator how reinforcers were identified).

4. Classroom rules are posted and reviewed by the investigator.

5. Investigator has a checklist of student names and spaces to record checks for target behaviors.

6. Investigator provides a halfway check to entire class.

7. Three labeled jars are visible in classroom; Jar #1 is labeled behavior and criteria, Jar #2 is labeled groups or person and Jar #3 labeled reinforcers.

8. At the end of the designated time period, investigator selects a piece of paper from Jar #1 identify target behavior(s) and criteria (i.e., pieces or paper list each target behavior and criteria and “all” which means all behaviors are being targeted).

9. Investigator then selects a slip of paper from Jar #2; (pieces of paper with the words “whole class”, “Group #” or a specific student printed on them).

10. Investigator then evaluates pupil performance on basis of first two jar selections; if pupils meet pre-established criteria, then investigator congratulates students and randomly selects one pupil to pick a reinforce
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from Jar #3.

_____ 11. If individual or group fails to reach criteria, then investigator announces that they did not meet the criteria and encourages them to work hard the following day.

_____ 12. Teacher does not mention name of individuals when criteria is not reached.

_____ 13. Following session, investigator makes a smooth transition to the next instructional activity.

Total _____/13 (Please record the number of behaviors observed plus the number of NA)

_____ % Procedural fidelity

Anecdotal Comments:
### Data Collection Sheet

**Target Behaviors and Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Reward:</th>
<th>Negative Interactions. Criteria: 0</th>
<th>Mark with a √ if student reaches criteria.</th>
<th>Off-task behavior. Criteria: 3</th>
<th>Mark with a √ those that comply.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whole Group Specify:**

____________________

____________________

____________________

____________________
How to use this data collection sheet:

Fill in the date each day at the left upper corner. Then fill in which group you will be monitoring. (i.e. whole-class, small group: advanced, on-level, strategic intervention, or individual). Each day you will highlight the target behavior you are looking at, and the students on the left so that data collection is a much faster thing. If you are monitoring the whole class you do not need to highlight all the students just be sure to mark it under the group heading in the top left corner. The small groups are predetermined; list students by their groups to make data collection and observations easier to record. In the left corner you will also see reward. This is for marking if the students met the criteria for that day and received a motivator, if they did simply write Y or yes, or if they failed write N or no. In column three, “work productivity”, each student will be working on each of these items for 15-20 minutes every day. Mark a check every time the benchmark is reached. For whole group instruction the benchmark will be predetermined by the investigator. The observer will record the benchmark for whole group instruction where it says “specify”. This form is designed for use for the observer.
Appendix E

Consumer Satisfaction Survey

Three Jars

Directions:

Please read each item aloud to your students and ask them to circle the number that best represents their feelings about that particular item. Emphasize the importance of completing the rating individually and privately.

I. Importance of Instructional Goals

1. Is it important to do well in Kindergarten?

2. Is it important is it for students to get along well?

3. Is it important is it for students to stay on task during center-time?

II. Acceptability of Instructional Procedures

4. How much did you like using Jar #1 to determine which goal/behavior would be monitored each day?
5. How much did you like using Jar #2 to figure out whose behavior would be monitored each day?

6. How much did you like using Jar #3 to find out what rewards the class earned that day?

7. Do you like playing the # Jars game?

8. How much did you like picking one of the mystery motivator envelopes?

III. Satisfaction with Strategy Outcomes

9. How well did you do?

10. How well did you do with the 3 Jars?
Grundtisch, 2014

11. How much did the 3 Jars Game help you learn your letter sounds?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]

12. How much did 3 Jars help you to get along better with others in class?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]

13. Does 3 Jars seem like something that should be done in other classes?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]

14. Could 3 Jars be harmful to other students?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]

15. How fair was 3 Jars to everyone in class?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]

16. Did other students think that you were smarter after using 3 Jars?

[Smiley] [Neutral] [Sad]
Hello Mr. Pietrantone,

I am Nathan Grundtisch, currently finishing my Master's Degree at SUNY Fredonia in the Curriculum & Instruction program. In order to complete my thesis I will like your permission to conduct research in your school. I will be using an intervention package called interdependent group contingencies with mystery motivators. The goal of this intervention is to improve students' classroom academics and behavior. The school and students will both remain anonymous. This intervention will not take away from students' instructional time and there are no potential physical, psychological, social, legal, or other types of risks in this study. In order for me to conduct this research I must have your consent via email to give to the Institutional Review Board before I am able to begin my study. If you would like more information regarding my study I would be more than welcome to email you a detailed description. Otherwise I just need for you to reply stating that you approve of the study.

Thank you,

Nathan Grundtisch
Appendix G

Principal’s approval email

------------ Forwarded message ------------
From: <PPietrantone@opschools.org>
Date: Tue, May 14, 2013 at 5:20 AM
Subject: Re: Masters project
To: Nathan Grundtisch <ngrundtisch@gmail.com>

Nathan
I approve of your study.
Good Luck.

Paul Pietrantone
Principal

Sent from my iPad

On May 13, 2013, at 9:01 PM, "Nathan Grundtisch" <ngrundtisch@gmail.com> wrote:
Hello Dr. Benson,

I will begin the study on April 21st and end it on May 9th.

On Wed, Apr 2, 2014 at 9:53 AM, Ana Klein <AnaMaria.Klein@fredonia.edu> wrote:

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Paul Benson <Paul.Benson@fredonia.edu>
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2014 at 9:38 AM
Subject: HS: Study Dates
To: Nathan A Grundtisch <ngrundtisch@fredonia.edu>, Ana Klein <anamaria.klein@fredonia.edu>

Dear Nathan,

Writing to request the start and end dates of your research titled: The Effects of the Three Jars and Mystery Motivations on In-Class Productivity and Behavior in a Self-Contained Kindergarten Class".

Thanks,

Paul B.

Paul Benson, Ph.D.
Grants Development Specialist
Human Subjects Secretary
Office of Sponsored Programs
E230B Thompson Hall
SUNY Fredonia
Fredonia, NY 14063
Office: 716.673.3569
Cell: 716.753.6438
Fax: 716.673.3802