

Acceptability and Reported Use of Daily Behavior Report Cards Among Teachers



Sandra M. Chafouleas
University of Connecticut

T. Chris Riley-Tillman
East Carolina University

Kari A. Sassu
University of Connecticut

Abstract: In this study, a sample of teachers was surveyed regarding their reported use and acceptability of daily behavior report cards (DBRCs). Almost two thirds of responding teachers indicated that they have used versions of DBRCs in their practice. Respondents' use of DBRCs was not restricted to a single purpose or situation. Additional findings suggested that the format of DBRCs varies widely, suggesting that teachers have found the DBRC to be highly adaptive in representing a broad array of possibilities rather than having a single, scripted purpose. An additional noteworthy finding relates to the general acceptance of DBRCs by teachers as both behavior-monitoring tools and as components in interventions. In summary, results provide support to previous claims that the DBRC is both a used and accepted tool in practice, suggesting that DBRCs deserve closer attention in research and practice related to positive behavior supports. Limitations, future directions, and implications are discussed.

Several uses of daily behavior report cards (DBRCs) have been reported in the literature. DBRCs have been used as a component of a positive behavior intervention (e.g., self-monitoring; Shapiro & Cole, 1994) and also as the method for collecting information about behavior over time (e.g., monitoring effects of medication for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder [ADHD]; Pelham, 1993). Other common terms for versions of the DBRC have included home-school note, good behavior note, behavior report card, and so on. According to Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, and McDougal (2002), a DBRC refers to the rating of a specified behavior at least daily and then sharing that information with someone other than the rater. As an example, a teacher might use a DBRC to rate how well Johnny paid attention in math class. Then that teacher might share that rating with Johnny and, as part of an intervention, link a consequence (e.g., a sticker) to that rating. In a review by Chafouleas and colleagues (2002), it was suggested that DBRCs may be feasible (e.g., Nolan & Gadow, 1994; Pelham, 1993), acceptable (e.g., Turco & Elliott, 1986), effective in promoting positive student behavior (e.g., Blechman, Schrader, & Taylor, 1981; Dougherty & Dougherty, 1977), and provide a way to increase parent-teacher communication (e.g., McCain & Kelley, 1993). Given these

laudable characteristics, one would assume that DBRCs would be popular among educators. Although reference to frequent use has been made in the literature, to date no examination of use among teachers has occurred. The purpose of this study was to investigate the popularity of DBRCs through a survey of reported use and acceptability in a sample of teachers.

Defining the DBRC

As previously mentioned, although flexibility exists in creating DBRCs, they share common characteristics, including (a) specifying a behavior, (b) rating the behavior, typically at least daily, (c) sharing obtained information across individuals (e.g., parents, teachers, students), and (d) using information as either part of an intervention or to monitor behavior (Chafouleas et al., 2002). This broad definition allows flexibility to use a DBRC according to the specific needs of a situation. For example, a teacher implementing a self-monitoring intervention with an elementary student to decrease disruptive behavior during instruction might use a DBRC with a smiley-face scale (e.g., ☺, ☹). The student and teacher might independently rate student disruption twice a day and then compare rat-

ings. A positive consequence would then be delivered based on meeting preestablished criteria and similar ratings. In contrast, a team of high school teachers might use a DBRC to rate daily student homework completion using a checklist (e.g., yes/no) or Likert-type scale (e.g., 1–5), with the completed card going home to parents at the end of the week. Other factors to consider when creating DBRCs include the focus of the rating (e.g., individual vs. classwide), the setting (e.g., home, school), and the schedule (e.g., daily, weekly) for delivery of consequences (for a review, see Chafouleas et al., 2002). In summary, the flexible nature of the DBRC allows for multiple variations of its use to match the demands of a situation.

Uses for the DBRC

Much of the extant literature referencing various forms of the DBRC has regarded it as part of an intervention. The objectives of intervention have ranged from improving academic performance (e.g., homework completion; Blechman et al., 1981) to producing positive changes in behavior (e.g., reduction of disruptive behavior; Bailey, Wolf, & Phillips, 1970). Target populations also have varied widely, from preschool (e.g., McCain & Kelly, 1993) through adolescent (e.g., Schumaker, Hovell, & Sherman, 1977) ages and including students in both public (e.g., Forgatch & Ramsey, 1994) and private school (e.g., Bailey et al., 1970) settings. Furthermore, the DBRC often is incorporated into an intervention package, such as a behavior contract or a self-monitoring program. For example, Crone, Horner, and Hawken (2004) included daily behavior reporting via teacher completion of a DBRC as an integral piece of their Behavior Education Program (BEP). The BEP involves provision of daily positive behavior support (PBS) and monitoring for at-risk students. In one instance of using the DBRC as the sole intervention piece, Dougherty and Dougherty (1977) used a DBRC to increase homework completion and decrease talk-outs in a class of fourth-grade students. Although specific consequences were not outlined in the study, parents were notified of the intervention, and the DBRC was sent home to parents at the end of the week. As another early example of using the DBRC as the primary intervention tool, Lahey, Gendrich, Gendrich, Schnelle, Gant, and McNees (1977) implemented use of a DBRC to increase positive behavior (e.g., decrease in distracting behavior and increase in rest behavior during kindergarten rest period). In this study, a letter to parents suggested that positive reinforcement be provided when receiving a card indicating good behavior, yet follow-up data regarding this suggestion was not collected. An example of the use of a DBRC as part of a more complex intervention package can be found in a study conducted by Blechman and colleagues (1981). In this study, the effects of two variations of an intervention on student consistency in math work completion were exam-

ined. In both conditions, a DBRC (i.e., good-news note) was used, but in one of the conditions, parent contact and a contingency contract were added. In summary, DBRCs have been successfully used in intervention across a number of purposes and situations.

Although less frequently discussed, another use for the DBRC involves behavior monitoring. That is, the DBRC can be used as a tool to collect information about behavior. And, this information can be collected repeatedly over time, thus serving as a measure of behavior monitoring. Several studies have examined the strengths and weaknesses of using the DBRC as a data-monitoring tool (see Chafouleas, McDougal, Riley-Tillman, Panahon, & Hilt, 2005; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman, Sassu, LaFrance, & Patwa, 2004; Steege, Davin, & Hathaway, 2001). For example, some have compared the consistency of profiles obtained using a DBRC to the results from systematic direct observation (Chafouleas et al., 2004; Steege et al., 2001). Others have analyzed the level of training needed to accurately use a DBRC (e.g., Chafouleas et al., 2005). In summary, results of this line of investigation have supported some positive outcomes of using the DBRC to measure behaviors in school settings. In comparison to systematic direct observations conducted by an external observer, the DBRC can provide greater efficiency from both time and resource perspectives. That is, relatively little training is needed to use a DBRC, it only takes a few seconds to complete, and it can be completed by the classroom teacher. Additionally, the potential for artificial reactivity (e.g., atypical behavior in response to an external presence) may be decreased by eliminating the external observer. However, it has not been suggested that the DBRC serve as a replacement for other methods of data collection such as systematic direct observation. It is important to note that use of the DBRC in place of direct observation may raise some concern regarding reliability and validity of data. In order for DBRCs to be used effectively as assessment tools, reasonable efforts must be made to check reliability. In summary, although threats to reliability and validity of data must be considered, strengths of the DBRC as a behavior-monitoring tool lie in its potential to sustain such monitoring with minimal resources and reduced reactivity.

Rationale for Current Study

Although additional research that examines the strengths and weaknesses of DBRCs is needed, many appealing reasons for using them have been identified. A potential dual role for the DBRC in both intervention and behavior monitoring adds to already identified positive features of a flexible and resource-efficient tool. Given these appealing characteristics, it seems important to understand the current popularity of DBRCs in practice. In addition, part of that understanding may include examination of teacher acceptability of DBRCs as intervention and/or behavior-

monitoring tools. Acceptability, which can be considered a subset of the larger domain of social validity, refers to the need for positive consumer feedback in validating the use of a technique (Eckert & Hintze, 2000). Considering that acceptability has been hypothesized to be likely related to use as well as fidelity of implementation (see Eckert & Hintze for a review of conceptual models of acceptability), acceptability is an important concept to explore. Information about different facets of acceptability and current use among teachers, such as how, when, and in what forms DBRCs are used, will aid in understanding how to better incorporate DBRCs in practice as well as provide directions for future research. It is important to understand and value teacher opinions about interventions when using a team approach to problem solving. The purpose of this survey study was to examine reported use and acceptability of DBRCs among a national sample of teachers.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Participants included 1,000 teachers from a national database of teachers whose names were randomly selected using no stratification variables. A database of 5,000 teachers was purchased from Quality Educational Data and was sampled from a total database including 3.8 million teach-

ers. This database contained all educator information that was publicly available in the United States at the time. The sample was stratified nationally and included teachers from both private and public schools. From that sample of 5,000 teachers, 1,000 were randomly selected to be included in this study. Of the 1,000, 11 surveys were returned as undeliverable, and 123 teachers returned completed surveys (12.3%). Participants from 39 states were represented in the returned sample. The majority of participants were female ($n = 99$) and had 13 or more years' experience in the field ($n = 65$). Additionally, the majority of participants reported working in public school settings ($n = 113$), with most working in suburban ($n = 50$) and rural ($n = 44$) settings, and fewer working in urban settings ($n = 28$). More participants reported working with elementary-age students ($n = 55$), followed by those working with high school-age students ($n = 46$), and then middle school-age students ($n = 34$) and preschool-age students ($n = 7$). A summary of demographic information is presented in Table 1.

MATERIALS

A survey packet was created to assess participant-reported use and acceptability of DBRCs. The packet first asked participants to provide demographic information. Next, participants were asked to report their use of the DBRC. At the top of this section, a two-sentence descriptor of the DBRC was included. The DBRC was described as involving briefly rating student behavior and then sharing that information with another person. It was also described as a tool to monitor student behavior and/or to be used as an intervention to change student behavior. In this section, participants were first asked to indicate any previous use of a DBRC (i.e., yes/no). If the participants responded yes regarding any previous use of a DBRC, they were then asked to respond to a number of questions assessing various dimensions of that use. These questions were grouped into the following categories: General Information, Sharing of Information, Type of Rating System, and Consequences. The General Information section included questions pertaining to the terms used for the DBRC, reasons for using the DBRC, types of behaviors rated with the DBRC, population with whom the DBRC was used, and estimated frequency of use of the DBRC. The Sharing of Information section included questions about how DBRC results are communicated and with whom the results are shared. The Type of Rating System section included questions such as how often behaviors are rated, who rates the behavior, and the type of rating system (e.g., narrative comments, scale, checklist) used. The Consequences section included questions regarding the types of positive or negative consequences given based on the DBRC data, frequency of consequence delivery, and persons responsible for and the setting for providing consequences. Participants were

Table 1. Demographic Information

Characteristic	%
Years' teaching	
0–3	3
4–7	10
8–12	18
13 or more	70
Population of area	
Urban	23
Suburban	41
Rural	36
Age group ^a	
Preschool	6
Elementary	45
Middle	28
High	37
Student type ^a	
General education	84
Special education	46
Average class size	
5–15	35
16–25	46
26 or more	19

Note. $N = 123$.

^aCategory totals may exceed 100%, as participants were asked to select all applicable choices when responding.

asked to check all applicable responses to each question regarding use of the DBRC.

The final part of the packet involved acceptability of the DBRC as an assessment and as an intervention tool. Acceptability was assessed through use of a 6-item scale that incorporated a 6-point Likert scale and responses that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). The 6 items consisted of 3 different elements adapted from the *Assessment Rating Profile-Revised* (ARP-R), developed by Eckert, Hintze, and Shapiro (1999). The ARP-R has strong psychometric characteristics, and is frequently used in acceptability research. Only 3 items were selected to keep the entire survey completion time reasonable. The 3 items that were selected for inclusion had the highest factor ratings for overall acceptability. They were worded with regard to assessment (e.g., "Overall, this assessment would be beneficial for the child") and then repeated with regard to intervention (e.g., "Overall, this intervention would be beneficial for the child") to create the total of 6 items. A descriptor of the use of the DBRC in assessment and intervention preceded presentation of the associated questions. For example, under the heading "Assessment" was a descriptor that the DBRC can be used to document changes to child behavior (e.g., to monitor the effects of medication on a child's behavior). A second statement asserted that in assessment the DBRC rating information is used solely as a method for measuring behavior. Under the heading "Intervention," use of the DBRC as an intervention to change behavior (e.g., increase homework completion, decrease verbal outbursts) was included. A second statement was included indicating that when used in intervention, the DBRC rating might be directly shared with the student and/or consequences provided based on the rating.

PROCEDURE

Each participant received a mailing during the fall of 2003 that included a cover letter about the study and the previously described DBRC survey. The cover letter provided a brief introduction to the research study, an invitation to participate, a description of the research purpose and procedures, estimated time for completing survey materials, the voluntary nature of involvement, assurance of confidentiality, and the benefits and inconveniences of participating in the project. Participants who did not respond within 1 month were provided another opportunity to participate through a second mailing of the same packet of materials.

Results

REPORTED DBRC USE

Participant responses to the General Information section of the survey are presented in Table 2. First, it is important

to note that sampling bias may be of concern in that teachers who had used DBRCs might have been more likely to return the survey than those who had not. With this caution in mind, 64% of respondents indicated that they used some form of a DBRC, and those endorsing use were not limited to a single demographic characteristic. That is, approximately 75% of teachers working with either elementary or special education students indicated use of the DBRC, but 58% of teachers working with general education students also endorsed use, along with 65% of middle and 45% of high school teachers. In addition, large differences in endorsement of use did not exist depending on teacher experience. Although approximately two thirds indicated use of a DBRC, the term used to describe it was not consistent across participants. Of those participants reporting use of a DBRC ($n = 79$), terms used to describe the

Table 2. Responses to the General Information Section of the Use of DBRC Questionnaire

General information	%
<i>Have you ever used a tool like the DBRC?</i>	64 ^a
<i>Do you use another term for the DBRC?</i>	
Daily report card	24
Home-school note	22
Home note	14
Good behavior note	11
Other term	38
<i>For what purpose do you use a DBRC?</i>	
Communicate about behavior	62
Change behavior	60
Monitor behavior	32
Other reason	11
<i>What type of behavior is addressed with the DBRC?</i>	
Identifying positive behavior (e.g., good deed)	81
Reducing negative behavior (e.g., calling out)	77
<i>Which category of behavior is rated?</i>	
Specific behavior (e.g., physical aggression)	89
General behavior (e.g., on-task)	76
Other	5
<i>With whom do you use the DBRC?</i>	
Individual student	86
Whole class	19
Small group	9
Other	3
<i>Please characterize your use of the DBRC:</i>	
Occasional use for specific situations	54
Routinely used as part of class management plan	32
Frequent use for specific situations	19
Other use	5

Note. DBRC = daily behavior report card.

^a $n = 123$ for this question, whereas all other questions are based on $n = 79$. That is, only those teachers responding yes to the first question completed the remaining items. Category totals may exceed 100%, as participants were asked to select all applicable choices when responding.

DBRC included “daily report card” (24%), “home note” (14%), “home-school note” (22%), “good behavior note” (11%), or some other term (38%). In addition, participants reported that they used such instruments for a variety of purposes; whereas 32% reported that they use DBRCs to monitor or observe student behavior, 60% reported that they employ them to change student behavior, and 62% reported they used DBRCs to communicate with others about behavior. DBRCs were reportedly used for identifying both positive (81%) and negative (77%) behaviors at approximately the same rate. Participants also reported use of the DBRC to rate both general behaviors (e.g., on-task) and specific behaviors (e.g., physical aggression,

homework completion) to a similar extent (76% and 89%, respectively). The majority of respondents reported that they most often employed the DBRC with individuals (86%), although some used them with small groups (9%) or the whole class (19%). With regard to frequency of DBRC use, 54% of respondents reported that their use of the DBRC was “occasional” for a specific situation. Fewer reported that they used DBRCs “frequently” (19%) for a specific situation. However, a somewhat large percentage (32%) of respondents reported that they use the DBRC “routinely” as a part of a class management plan.

A summary of participant responses on the Sharing of Information section is presented in Table 3. Participants reported that they share information gathered by the DBRC with parents (91%), the student (67%), another educator (46%), or other individuals (20%). With regard to how DBRC information is communicated to others, most participants reported using written format (92%), although some reported that they did so verbally (25%) or in a graphed format (8%). As shown in Table 4, information gleaned from questions regarding Type of Rating System suggested 43% of respondents reported average use of the DBRC to be once daily, whereas fewer reported using it more than once daily (27%), weekly (23%), or not at all (1%). The majority of respondents indicated they were responsible for rating the target behavior (70%), although some responded that the teacher and student together were responsible for rating (34%), some other person was responsible (8%), or the student did the rating (10%). The rating systems used included checklists (e.g., yes/no; 48%), rating scales (e.g., 1 = *never* to 3 = *often*; 41%), narrative comments (60%), and other (10%).

Finally, responses to questions contained in the Consequences section are presented in Table 5. With respect to the types of positive consequences administered when using a DBRC, 87% reported use of verbal (e.g., praise), 61% reported use of tangible (e.g., stickers), 32% reported use of some other form, and an additional 6% reported no use of any positive consequence. In contrast, with regard to negative consequences given when using a DBRC, more respondents reported using removal of privileges (66%) than verbal consequences (52%), with 13% also reporting removal of tangible items (e.g., tokens). Nearly 28% reported that they administered some other form of negative consequence, and an additional 9% reported that they did not use any form of negative consequence. When asked about the frequency with which consequences were delivered, participants reported that consequences were administered at the end of the period (35%), the end of the day (27%), the end of the week (35%), or at some other point (19%). Persons responsible for the administration of consequences included the teacher (84%), a parent (52%), another school professional (28%), or some other individual (8%). Finally, most respondents (91%) reported that the consequences were administered in the school setting,

Table 3. Responses to the Sharing of Information Section of the Use of DBRC Questionnaire

Sharing of information	%
<i>With whom do you share the results of the DBRC?</i>	
Parent	91
Student	67
Another educator	46
Other	20
<i>How do you communicate the results of the DBRC?</i>	
Written	92
Verbal	25
Graphed	8

Note. DBRC = daily behavior report card. $N = 79$. Category totals may exceed 100%, as participants were asked to select all applicable choices when responding.

Table 4. Responses to the Rating System Section of the Use of DBRC Questionnaire

Rating system	%
<i>On average, how often do you rate behaviors using the DBRC?</i>	
More than 1× daily	27
Daily	43
Weekly	23
Not at all	1
Other	17
<i>Who rates the behavior targeted by the DBRC?</i>	
Self (teacher)	70
Teacher and student	34
Student	8
Other	10
<i>What type of rating system do you utilize in your DBRC?</i>	
Narrative comments	60
Checklist (e.g., __yes __no)	48
Rating scale (e.g., 1 = <i>never</i> to 3 = <i>often</i>)	41
Other	10

Note. DBRC = daily behavior report card. $N = 79$. Category totals may exceed 100%, as participants were asked to select all applicable choices when responding.

whereas approximately half (54%) indicated that consequences were administered in the home setting.

DBRC ACCEPTABILITY

Mean ratings of participant acceptability regarding the use of DBRCs for behavior-monitoring purposes are presented in Table 6. As noted, participants' acceptability of the procedures used in this assessment (i.e., the collecting and sharing of information about behavior) fell in the range of *slightly agree* to *agree* ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.08$). Although ratings of this assessment's ability to handle the student's problems were slightly lower, ratings still fell within the range of *slightly agree* to *agree* ($M = 4.57, SD = 1.07$). Participants' perceptions of the overall benefit of this assessment for the child resulted in ratings also falling within the *slightly agree* to *agree* range ($M = 4.73, SD = .98$).

Mean ratings of acceptability of the DBRC for intervention purposes were similar to those for assessment purposes, although slightly higher. Participants' acceptability of the procedures used in this intervention (i.e., the process of rating behavior and sharing information and/or providing consequences) and perceptions of the intervention's overall benefit to the child were similar, falling in the range of *slightly agree* to *agree* ($M = 4.74, M = 4.76$, respectively). Although slightly lower, ratings of this intervention's ability to handle the student's problems also fell within the range of *slightly agree* to *agree* ($M = 4.67, SD = 1.04$). Overall, respondents perceived the DBRC to be an acceptable tool for the purposes of both assessment (i.e., behavior monitoring) and intervention, although ratings of its use as an intervention technique were slightly higher.

RELATIONSHIP OF REPORTED USAGE AND ACCEPTABILITY

To explore the relationship between reported usage and acceptability, a series of post hoc analyses (one-way ANOVAs) were conducted. For this analysis, the results from the 3 acceptability items were summed into an acceptability variable for each of the two purposes (i.e., assessment, intervention).

In relation to the acceptability of the DBRC for use in assessment purposes, the most interesting results from the post hoc analyses related to the question "Who rates the behavior targeted by the DBRC?" Participants who reported that the student rated the targeted behavior were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 8.486, p = .005$, than participants reporting that they did not have students rate the target behavior. Consistent with this finding, participants who indicated that they used both the teacher and a student to rate the target behavior also were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 4.663, p = .034$, than those who did not include student involvement. Finally, participants who indicated that they used some other person to rate the

Table 5. Responses to the Consequences Section of the Use of DBRC Questionnaire

Consequences	%
<i>What types of positive consequences are given when implementing the DBRC?</i>	
Verbal (e.g., praise)	87
Tangible (e.g., sticker)	61
None	6
Other	32
<i>What types of negative consequences are given when implementing the DBRC?</i>	
Removal of privileges	66
Verbal (e.g., reprimand)	52
Removal of tangible items (tokens)	13
None	9
Other	28
<i>How often are consequences delivered?</i>	
End of period	35
End of day	27
End of week	35
Other	19
<i>Who is/are responsible for providing the consequences to the student?</i>	
Teacher	84
Parent	52
Other school professional	28
Other	8
<i>In which settings are the consequences delivered?</i>	
School	91
Home	54
Other	5

Note. DBRC = daily behavior report card. $N = 79$. Category totals may exceed 100%, as participants were permitted to select all applicable choices when responding.

target behavior also were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 7.339, p = .008$, than those who did not endorse rating by another. A second interesting finding resulted with regard to the question "What types of negative consequences are given when implementing the DBRC?" Participants who indicated that they removed a tangible item as a consequence of DBRC information were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 16.409, p < .000$, than participants who did not use this consequence.

In relation to acceptability of the DBRC as an intervention component, some similar findings resulted from these analyses. First, in relation to the question "What types of behaviors are addressed with the DBRC?" participants who noted that they used the DBRC to reduce negative behavior were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 3.994, p = .049$, than participants who did not report using it to reduce negative behavior. Second, in relation to the question "What types of negative consequences are given when implementing the DBRC?" participants who indicated using the removal of a tangible item based on DBRC

Table 6. Teacher Acceptability of DBRCs as an Assessment and Intervention Tool

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Assessment		
I like the procedures used in this assessment (i.e., the collecting and sharing of information about behavior).	4.75 ^a	1.08
This assessment is a good way to handle the child's problems.	4.57 ^a	1.07
Overall, this assessment would be beneficial for the child.	4.73 ^b	.98
Intervention		
I like the procedures used in this intervention (i.e., the process of rating behavior and sharing information or providing consequences).	4.74 ^b	1.09
This intervention is a good way to handle the child's problems.	4.67 ^b	1.04
Overall, this intervention would be beneficial for the child.	4.76 ^a	1.00

Note. DBRC = daily behavior report card. Judgments were made on a 6-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*).

^a*n* = 112. ^b*n* = 113.

information were significantly less accepting, $F(1, 75) = 5.358, p = .023$, than those who did not. This finding is consistent with teachers' responses in relation to assessment acceptability.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to collect information regarding reported use and acceptability of DBRCs among a sample of teachers. Although possible sampling bias suggests caution in overinterpretation of the findings, results of this study support previous assertions regarding the popularity of DBRCs among educators. That is, almost two thirds of responding teachers indicated that they have used versions of the DBRC in their practice. And, although use was more popular among teachers working with elementary or special education student populations, use of DBRCs was widely indicated across populations. Thus, use of DBRCs does not appear to be limited to a particular type of situation. Additional findings in the current study provided information about the variety of ways in which DBRCs are used. Variability was reported in the surveyed categories of use, including the type of behavior, frequency of use, type of communication used regarding results, frequency with which behaviors are recorded, who does the rating, the subject of analysis, the target behavior, and the consequences resulting from the DBRC data. Together, these findings suggest that teachers have found the DBRC to be highly adaptive in representing a broad array of possibilities, rather than having a single, scripted purpose. An

additional noteworthy finding relates to the general acceptance of DBRCs by teachers as both components of interventions and behavior-monitoring tools. However, although using the DBRC as an assessment tool may have positive features with regard to necessary resources, it is important to note the lack of research regarding necessary prerequisites to ensure appropriate levels of reliability of data collection.

With regard to the specifics of the DBRCs used by those teachers who indicated prior use, several interesting findings were revealed. First, it appears that participants were more likely to use the DBRC as part of intervention (i.e., change or communicate about behavior) than as a method of data collection about student behavior. In addition, participants reported approximately equal use for either identifying positive or reducing negative behaviors. Specific behaviors (e.g., physical aggression) were targeted slightly more often than general behavior (e.g., on-task). DBRCs were overwhelmingly used with individual students over either small groups or the whole class, and participants were most likely to indicate occasional or routine use. With regard to sharing DBRC information, participants were most likely to share information with parents, and to do so in written format. Daily rating of behavior, completed by the teacher alone, was more common than other forms of rating. Interestingly, a system involving narrative comments for the DBRC was more often endorsed than a checklist or rating scale format. This endorsement may appear surprising given the presumed time commitment for completing narrative comments over checklists or Likert-type ratings. Given the single-item checklist format for assessing type of system used in this study, future research may be warranted to clarify the popularity of and dimensions of narrative comments. Finally, although the period of time for delivery of consequences was approximately equally endorsed (e.g., end of day, end of week), preferences were noted with regard to the type of consequence. Verbal consequences, either positive or negative, along with removal of privileges, were the most highly endorsed consequences. Responsibility for delivery of consequences most often fell to the teacher, within the school setting.

As previously mentioned, overall acceptability was found for DBRCs as both behavior-monitoring tools and as components in interventions. Perhaps more interesting findings related to acceptability can be found with regard to the post hoc analyses of acceptability and reported usage. Several findings warrant discussion in relation to future hypothesis generation. First, considering the finding that participating teachers' acceptability ratings of the DBRC as an assessment tool were significantly lower when the student, the teacher and student, or another person was responsible for completing the DBRC, it appears that teachers believe it is important that they have control over the DBRC rating. However, this finding was not replicated

in relation to using the DBRC as an intervention tool, in that teachers' acceptability ratings of the DBRC as an intervention tool did not significantly alter with changes in the reported rater. In relation to intervention acceptability, results indicated that teachers who endorsed using the DBRC to reduce negative behaviors or utilized a negative consequence (removal of tangible items) were significantly less accepting of the DBRC as an intervention tool. This finding suggests that perhaps framing the DBRC to address positive behavior may be more welcomed by teachers.

Several limitations to the present investigation warrant discussion. First, the low response rate in this study suggests the potential of a nonrepresentative sample based on response bias. This threat to external validity can only be fully addressed by replication of the study; thus, liberal generalization of these findings to other teachers is not suggested at this time. However, although the response rate was low, it also should be noted this is not uncommon with published research using a national sample of teachers. For example, Wehmeyer, Agran, and Hughes (2000) found a 12% response rate from a national sample of 9,762 teachers, and Moon, Brighton, and Callahan (2003) had a 16% response rate from a national mailing of a survey to 8,044 elementary teachers. A second limitation lies within the assessment of use, in that it was based on reports from the participants. Given that the extent of reported usage and actual usage was not examined and could potentially vary, future researchers may wish to consider options to reduce reliance on self-report data. A third limitation relates to the examination of the relationship between acceptability and reported usage. Considering that these analyses were post hoc in nature, the results should be considered preliminary in nature. As more attention is paid to empirical examination of factors important to successful use of an innovation, further work exploring these relationships as applied to DBRCs can be done. However, the finding that teachers reported overall acceptability for DBRCs in behavior monitoring is exciting given the need for feasible behavior assessment tools that can supplement direct observation. Future investigations that explore the strengths and weaknesses of using the DBRC as a data-monitoring tool appear warranted. For example, researchers may wish to examine the decision reliability of DBRCs. That is, would similar decisions be made about student behavior when using data obtained from DBRCs versus direct observation? An additional design possibility may involve asking teachers to rate the value of several illustrated examples of DBRCs rather than asking them to envision their own versions of DBRCs, thus more closely approximating those forms of the DBRC that are supported in the literature. Finally, given the many options that exist in creating a DBRC, it seems important for future analysis to examine what features of the DBRC (e.g., who is responsible for measurement, how often measurement occurs) are

more effective with regard to a role in building positive behavior supports involving both behavior monitoring and intervention.

Despite the limitations, results of this survey provide beginning knowledge about how DBRCs likely may be used in practice, which in turn can help guide recommendations regarding their use in behavior intervention. For example, results tentatively suggest that it may be important that the teacher serve as the rater, that DBRCs be used to increase positive behavior rather than reduce negative behavior, and that consequences not include removal of tangible items but might include verbal praise. Furthermore, preferences for the format of the actual card might be ascertained when initiating use of a DBRC, given reported reliance on all types (checklist, rating, narrative). Additionally, the possibility of jointly assigning responsibility for consequences between school and home might be explored. Although further research attention is needed to fully understand the effectiveness of DBRCs as behavior-monitoring and intervention tools, existing evidence supporting their potential coupled with findings in this study of their overall popularity suggest DBRCs could be a useful tool that would be welcomed in practice. Overall, implications for using and recommending use of DBRCs in school settings may be made. Because results of this study suggest that DBRCs are already used frequently by teachers, better use (i.e., higher treatment integrity) may result from dissemination of recommendations for possible adaptations to better meet needs of specific situations (see Riley-Tillman, Chafouleas, Eckert, & Kelleher, 2005; Riley-Tillman & Chafouleas, 2003). In summary, findings from this study provide support to previous claims that the DBRC is both a used and accepted tool in practice, suggesting that DBRCs deserve closer attention in research and practice related to PBS.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Sandra M. Chafouleas, PhD, is an associate professor in the Neag School of Education at the University of Connecticut. Dr. Chafouleas's primary areas of research interest involve the prevention of reading difficulties and the application of evidenced-based strategies to the classroom. **T. Chris Riley-Tillman**, PhD, is currently an assistant professor with the psychology department at East Carolina University. Dr. Riley-Tillman's primary areas of research interest involve studying the usage of empirical research by practicing school psychologists and developing and validating assessment and intervention methodologies that are both empirically supported and feasible. **Kari A. Sassu** is a doctoral student in the School Psychology program at the University of Connecticut. Her current interests include bullying behavior, particularly in females. Address: Sandra M. Chafouleas, Department of Educational Psychology (U-2064), University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269; e-mail: sandra.chafouleas@uconn.edu

AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors would like to thank Carmen Tate and Evelyn Biliias for their help with creating the measures and conducting the survey mailing, and Mahri Elinoff for her editorial feedback.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, J., Wolf, M., & Phillips, E. (1970). Home-based reinforcement and the modification of predelinquents' classroom behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 3, 223–233.
- Blechman, E. A., Schrader, S. M., & Taylor, C. J. (1981). Family problem solving versus home notes as early intervention with high-risk children. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 919–926.
- Chafouleas, S. M., McDougal, J. L., Riley-Tillman, T. C., Panahon, C. J., & Hilt, A. M. (2005). What do daily behavior report cards (DBRCs) measure?: An initial comparison with direction observation for off-task behavior. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 669–676.
- Chafouleas, S. M., Riley-Tillman, T. C., & McDougal, J. (2002). Good, bad, or in-between: How does the daily behavior report card rate? *Psychology in the Schools*, 39, 157–169.
- Chafouleas, S. M., Riley-Tillman, T. C., Sassu, K. A., LaFrance, M. J., & Patwa, S. S. (2004). *Daily behavior report cards (DBRCs): An investigation of consistency of data across raters*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Crone, D. A., Horner, R. H., & Hawken, L. S. (2004). *Responding to problem behavior in schools: The Behavior Education Program*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Dougherty, E. H., & Dougherty, A. (1977). The daily report card: A simplified and flexible package for classroom behavior management. In L. A. Hersov & M. Berger (Eds.), *Aggression and antisocial behavior in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 73–93). London: Pergamon.
- Eckert, T. L., & Hintze, J. M. (2000). Behavioral conceptions and applications of acceptability: Issues related to service delivery and research methodology. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 15, 123–148.
- Eckert, T. L., Hintze, J. M., & Shapiro, E. S. (1999). Development and refinement of a measure for assessing the acceptability of assessment methods: The Assessment Rating Profile–Revised. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 15, 21–42.
- Forgatch, M. S., & Ramsey, E. (1994). Boosting homework: A video tape link between families and schools. *School Psychology Review*, 23, 472–484.
- Lahey, B. B., Gendrich, J. G., Gendrich, S. I., Schnelle, J. F., Gant, D. S., & McNeese, M. P. (1977). An evaluation of daily behavior report cards with minimal teacher and parent contacts as an efficient method of classroom intervention. *Behavior Modification*, 1, 381–394.
- McCain, A. P., & Kelley, M. L. (1993). Managing the classroom behavior of an ADHD preschooler: The efficacy of a school-home note intervention. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 15, 33–44.
- Moon, T. R., Brighton, C. M., & Callahan, C. M. (2003). State standardized testing programs: Friend or foe of gifted students? *Roeper Review*, 25, 47–60.
- Nolan, E. E., & Gadow, K. D. (1994). Relation between ratings and observations of stimulant drug response in hyperactive children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 23, 78–90.
- Pelham, W. E. (1993). Pharmacotherapy for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *School Psychology Review*, 22, 199–227.
- Riley-Tillman, T. C., & Chafouleas, S. M. (2003). Using interventions that exist in the natural environment to increase treatment integrity and social influence. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14, 139–156.
- Riley-Tillman, T. C., Chafouleas, S. M., Eckert, T. L., & Kelleher, C. (2005). Bridging the gap between research and practice: A framework for building research agendas in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 459–473.
- Schumaker, J. B., Hovell, M. F., & Sherman, J. A. (1977). An analysis of daily behavior report cards and parent-managed privileges in the improvement of adolescents' classroom performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 10, 449–464.
- Shapiro, E. S., & Cole, C. L. (1994). *Behavior change in the classroom: Self-management interventions*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Steege, M. W., Davin, T., & Hathaway, M. (2001). Reliability and accuracy of a performance-based behavioral recording procedure. *School Psychology Review*, 30, 252–261.
- Turco, T. L., & Elliott, S. N. (1986). Students' acceptability ratings of interventions for classroom misbehaviors: A study of well-behaving and misbehaving youth. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 4, 281–289.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2000). A national survey of teachers' promotion of self-determination and student-directed learning. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34, 58–68.

Action Editor: Robert H. Horner

Copyright of Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions is the property of PRO-ED and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.