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ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF A CLASS-WIDE GROUP CONTINGENCY TO INCREASE TOOTLING

Amy Lynn Agosta
University of Dayton

Advisor: Sawyer A. Hunley

Tootling is an intervention that has been shown to increase the number of positive statements students make about their classmates. Using an A-B quasi-experimental design, the frequency of tootling and prosocial behavior of students, as measured by their teachers using the Student Protective Factors Screening Scale (SPFSS), was examined. Results indicated that use of the tootling intervention increased the rate of tootles during a four week period in the experimental group. Results from the SPFSS indicated that item 5 (students being engaged and motivated to well in school) and item 6 (students being connected with teachers and school) were statistically significant, while all other items were not. In this study, the results indicate that that the tootling intervention impacted the frequency of reporting positive behavior, but did not highly impact the prosocial behaviors of students.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Studies have shown that the number of problem behaviors in schools is rising (Luiselli, Putnam, & Sonderland, 2002; McCurdy, Manella, & Eldridge, 2003). These problem behaviors can interrupt a child’s functioning often causing adults to label them “unmanageable” (McCurdy et al., 2003). According to McCurdy et al. (2003), schools have the opportunity to reverse these problem behaviors by, “providing a stabilizing and enriching environment where important academic and social skills are taught and where influential adult-child relationships can flourish” (p. 159). To do this, it is suggested that schools focus on the setting events associated with problem behavior instead of focusing on the individual (McCurdy et al., 2003). Setting events associated with problem behavior include, “(a) an overuse of punitive methods of control; (b) poorly defined or unclear rules regarding student behavior; (c) weak or inconsistent staff support, including support from other teachers and administrative follow-through; and (d) few allowances for individual student differences” (McCurdy et al., 2003, p. 159).

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a method to reshape or replace problem behaviors. It can involve changing settings and events that may contribute to the occurrence of such behaviors. By definition PBIS is, “an applied science that uses change methods to redesign an individual’s living environment to first enhance
the individual’s quality of life, and, second, to minimize his or her problem behavior” (Carr, Dunlap, Horner, Koegel, Turnbull, Sailor, Anderson, Albin, Koegel, & Fox, 2002, p. 4). PBIS has unique features that focus on a comprehensive lifestyle change for individuals, as well as, their support providers and the idea that this change is enduring (Carr et al., 2002).

PBIS uses a three-tiered prevention model that consists of: (a) Primary Prevention that occurs school-wide or class-wide for all students, staff, and settings, (b) Secondary Prevention that occurs in a specialized group for students with at-risk behaviors, and (c) Tertiary Prevention that occurs for individual students with high-risk behaviors (Sugai & Horner, 2002). PBIS prevents misbehavior by specifically teaching and reinforcing expected behavior and using data to acknowledge success and to help the school problem-solve areas of concern (Netzel & Ebner, 2003).

One concern that has received considerable attention in the school psychology literature is social competence (Gresham, 2002). Social competence is defined as the ability to develop interpersonal relationships; to meet the demands of teachers and peers; and to adapt to changing conditions in one’s environment (Walker et al., 1983). It is an evaluative term based on judgments including: that a student has performed competently on a social task put forth by significant others (e.g., teachers, parents, peers), comparisons to explicit criteria (e.g. number of social tasks correctly performed), and/or comparisons to a normative sample.
Social competence is important because it has widespread benefits for children. It contributes to positive outcomes and provides an essential foundation for student success in school and the community (Gettinger, 2003). According to Gettinger (2003), “socially competent learners are able to select and control behaviors in which to engage (and which behaviors to suppress) in any given context to achieve objectives set by themselves or established by others (teacher, friend, peer group, etc.)” (p. 301). Because social competence has great importance for current and future success of all students, an intervention in the Primary Prevention Tier within PBIS can serve as a good tool to promote social competence. This study investigates the impact of the tootling intervention (students telling their teacher when students engage in positive behavior) on the frequency of tootling and on the promotion of social competence for students in a multi-age, second and third grade classroom.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Social Competence

When children enter the school system they are expected to have certain skills that will enable them to negotiate the academic and social demands of the school environment. For example, students are expected to have had exposure to print, use adequate language skills, comply with basic requests, execute problem-solving skills, and possess a variety of interpersonal skills (O'Shaughnessy, Lane, Gresham, & Beebe-Frankenberger, 2002). Students who lack the requisite skills are at risk for a variety of negative outcomes, including academic underachievement, failed social relationships with their peers, and strained relationships with their teachers (Walker & Severson, 2002).

Social skills are specific behaviors that a student exhibits to perform competently on a social task such as making requests, starting a conversation, or giving a compliment (Gresham, 2002). Good social skills are critical to successful functioning in life. These skills allow us to know what to say, how to make good choices, and how to behave in diverse situations (NASP, 2002). According to NASP (2002), the extent to which children and adolescents possess good social skills can have an effect on academic performance, behavior, and relationships.
The development of a repertoire of social skills is related to positive short-term and long-term outcomes for students. In a longitudinal study investigating protective factors of inner city youth, youth with effective social skills were found to have lower rates of depression (Smokowski, Mann, Reynolds, & Fraser, 2004). Likewise, the relationship between effective social skills and lower rates of externalizing and internalizing behavior problems in youth has been demonstrated consistently in numerous studies (e.g., Alvord & Grados, 2005; Criss, Pettit, Bates, Dodge, & Lapp, 2002; Steinhausen & Metzke, 2001). Students who have not demonstrated the use of appropriate social skills by about third grade are likely to continue to display some degree of antisocial behavior (Kazdin, 1987; Patterson et al., 1989) and co-occurring learning disabilities (Hinshaw, 1992; Kavale & Forness, 1998) throughout their lives.

Social skills are not only important to prevent antisocial behavior, but they are also important for students to be successful in school as well as the community. Social skills training for all students in the primary prevention tier of PBIS is a useful tool for preventing school failure.

The acquisition of and fluent use of specific social skills leads to an overall level of social competence, but these terms are not interchangeable (Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995). According to Gresham (2002) “social skills are behaviors that must be taught, learned, and performed, whereas social competence represents judgments or evaluations of those behaviors within and across situations over time” (p. 1030).
Research indicates that in school-aged populations, social competence is identified as one of the best predictors of behavior problems (Gresham, Macmillan, & Bocian, 1997).

*Primary Prevention Interventions*

Research in social skills suggests that there are potential areas for improving existing social skills through training programs. A limitation to most social skills training programs is that they focus primarily on skill acquisition rather than skill practice (Skinner, Neddenreip, Robinson, Ervin, & Jones, 2002).

In the educational setting, students who display disruptive behaviors are often punished for their problem behaviors and little is said about their positive behaviors. By not acknowledging positive behaviors, children who display disruptive behavior are taught what not to do instead of what to do. Instead, students would benefit from the acknowledgement of their positive behaviors. Class-wide interventions such as group contingencies, class-wide positive peer reporting, and tootling allow teachers to facilitate social skills lessons in the classroom along with their academic lesson plans. By using interventions that promote positive social skills for all students; antisocial behavior caused by a lack of social skills is prevented, and social competence is promoted.

*Randomized interdependent group contingencies.* Randomized interdependent group contingencies reinforce social skills within an entire group. With this model, a group of students receives the same reinforcer contingent upon some aspect of the group’s behavior. For example, all members of a classroom may earn 15 minutes of
extra recess contingent upon the class averaging more than 85% on an exam. This also works with a wide range of behaviors problems that may occur in the classroom. Theodore, Bray, Kehle, and Jenson (2001) found that disruptive behavior (defined as noncompliance, obscene language, touching or talking to other students who were working, verbal putdowns, and listening to their walkman too loud so that others could hear) dramatically decreased through the use of randomized interdependent group contingencies.

**Class-Wide Positive Peer Reporting.** Bowers and colleagues (1999) used positive peer reporting (PPR) procedures to focus the attention of all students in a class on one target student to change that student’s behavior(s). For example, all students earned points in a group home for reporting positive behaviors displayed by the randomly chosen target student. This procedure increased the positive behaviors displayed by the students.

**Tootling.** Tootling is a group contingency that is not much different than class-wide positive peer reporting. Tootling is a class-wide intervention that is aimed at students recognizing positive behaviors displayed by classmates. Using this tier I intervention, social skills are taught and practiced by an entire class to promote social competence. A group contingency is used to reinforce students for practicing the new behavior. A class-wide intervention, coined “tootling” by Skinner et al. (2000) used interdependent group contingencies to reward the entire class for reporting positive
behavior of their classmates. The term “tootle” was used because it is the opposite of tattling, or negative behavior reporting (Skinner et al., 2000).

In the 2000 study, Skinner and his colleagues implemented the tootling intervention in a fourth-grade classroom. The purpose of this study was to determine if the frequency of tootles is greater during intervention phases. This class was comprised of 13 male and 15 female African American students. The researchers gave specific examples of tootling and told students to write down prosocial behaviors exhibited by their classmates. The students placed their comments into the box on the teacher’s desk. At the end of the first day of baseline, experimenters returned to the classroom to report the frequency of tootles and to encourage students to continue tootling. The baseline was measured by counting the number of tootles that occurred without the intervention.

The students then entered the intervention phase. In this phase, experimenters explained how to tootle again. They placed a decorated box on the teacher’s desk and told the students that when they reached a certain number of tootles the entire class would be rewarded with extra recess. A progress chart was displayed in the front of the room and the students were encouraged to tootle every day. After the students reached their goal a withdrawal phase was implemented where students were encouraged to continue tootling but no reward was offered. With the opportunity of a reward removed, the number of tootles decreased to baseline levels.

Throughout this program, tootles were much higher during intervention phases.
Research on tootling has focused on the frequency of tootling during intervention phases. The studies show that students learn quickly how to provide written reports of prosocial behavior, and the interdependent group contingency increases the rates of tootling.

Morrison and Jones (2006) combined the prominent features of tootling and positive peer reporting (PPR) into one intervention in two third grade classrooms. A multiple baseline across subjects design was used to evaluate the effects of PPR on the average daily scores per week on the adapted Critical Events Index (CEI). The CEI is a checklist of 33 low-frequency, high intensity unwanted behaviors designed by Walker and Severson (1992). The adapted CEI consists of 19 behaviors that the teacher can use for class evaluation at the end of each school day.

Results showed that the number of critical events decreased during intervention phases. Also, three class-wide sociometric nominations during baseline revealed a mean of 5 “socially isolated” (e.g., receiving only one or fewer peer selections) students. Critical events during transitions to lunch also decreased for both classes. Peer approval was noted as a powerful source of prosocial influence on not only the participant, but on the classroom as a social system. Positive peer reporting capitalized on peer approval and as a result had a positive effect on social skills.

The purpose of this study is to replicate the Morrison and Jones (2006) study. However, the current study differs from Morrison and Jones because it is being utilized to examine how the tootling intervention affects prosocial behavior in the classroom setting.
The results from this study should inform educators about the benefits of using tootling as a Tier 1 behavioral intervention that promotes positive behavior.
CHAPTER III

Methods

Purpose of the Study

This study is a replication of the Morrison and Jones (2006) study which investigates the use the tootling intervention and positive peer reporting as a Primary Prevention intervention to promote social competence for all students. The research hypothesis is that the implementation of intervention with elementary students will not only increase the frequency of the tootles compared to baseline results, but will also increase the classrooms’ positive behavioral ratings as a whole by the teacher.

Participants

The participants in this study included students in two multi-grade classrooms comprised of second and third graders at Hilliard City Schools, which is a large suburban school located in central Ohio. This population includes students who come from predominantly middle-class families. The control group consisted of 19 students (9 second graders and 10 third graders). The experimental group consisted of 20 students (10 second graders and 10 third graders).

Sampling Procedure

The participants were chosen through convenience sampling. Consent forms were mailed to all parents of students in both the experimental and control groups. All consent
forms were returned.

Research Design

An A-B quasi-experimental design was used in which one intervention class was compared to one control class. In Phase A, students in both the control and experimental groups were taught about what tootling is and encouraged to tootle when they saw their peers do something good for the week. Both the control and experimental group teachers filled out the Student Protective Factors Screening Scale (SPFSS) for data collection. See Appendix A for the SPFSS questions. In Phase B, the experimental group was introduced to the group contingency intervention with the possibility of a reward. The independent variable in the final phase was the tootling intervention that included tootling, public posting of results, and the reinforcer. There were two dependent variables: 1) The rate of tootling was measured strictly by counting how many appropriate tootles are turned in daily. The rate of change was determined by taking the average amount of tootles turned in during baseline and comparing it to the average number of tootles turned in during the intervention phase 2) the SPFSS was used to measure the positive behaviors displayed by all students.

The researcher used multi-item checklist for all phases of the intervention. In addition, the teacher completed 3-item integrity checklist weekly to ensure the intervention was implemented as intended. (See Appendix).
Tooting Intervention

Phase I-a: training students. Before the intervention was implemented, the researcher spent one 20-minute session with both the control and experimental classes to show the students how to identify and report incidental instances of prosocial behavior. The researcher used a group recitation format to teach students to tootle (report positive peer behaviors). Examples of prosocial behaviors were given and students were asked to come up with examples of their own. After the students provided their own examples, they gave examples of how they help others at home and at school. The researcher then defined tattling (i.e. telling the teacher when a peer does something wrong) and tootling (i.e. telling the teacher when a peer does something helpful) and gave examples of each. The students are then asked to come up with some examples of tootling and praise and corrective feedback was given (Skinner et al., 2000). After the students gave appropriate verbal examples of tootling, index cards were passed out to all of the students. The students were then instructed on how to write a tootle: Who (classmate) did what (helping behavior) for whom (who they helped). The researcher read some of the tootles out loud and praised the ones that fit the operational definition of a tootle and gave corrective feedback on the ones that did not after the students turned in their written tootles.

Phase I-b: The next day, before students entered their classrooms, note cards were taped to each of the students’ desks in both classrooms, and a shoebox with a slot cut into the top and wrapped in festive paper was placed on the teachers’ desk. A brief
A review session about tootles was conducted. Students were then instructed to write down tootles about classmates when a helpful behavior was observed and to put their cards in the shoebox.

At the end of each day the teacher reviewed the index cards. If two students reported the same instance, both instances were counted. Post-training data collection consisted of five data points on the frequency of tootling without a reinforcer. To measure positive behavior, the teacher filled out the SRFSS during the training week for each student.

**Phase II: group contingency for tootling:** The treatment was administered to the experimental class and was composed of an interdependent group contingency with class-wide publicly posted feedback. The researcher returned to the experimental classroom and described the interdependent group contingency to the students. Students were given a class-wide goal of 100 tootles in six weeks in order to receive a reward, which was voted on by the class and approved by the teacher. The reinforcer the class chose was to watch a movie with snacks. A poster with a picture of a ladder was hung in front of the room to track the students’ progress toward their goal of 100 tootles. At the end of each day, the teacher counted the number of tootles that were turned in and recorded it. In the morning, the helper of the week adjusted the public feedback accordingly. After the class met their goal, the teacher again filled out the SRFSS to measure positive behavior.
Measures and Analysis

The Student Protective Factor Screening Scale employs the same matrix used by
the Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS, Drummond, 1993). Unlike the SRSS, however,
which gathers teacher’s ratings for each student in the class on seven behavioral risk
factors (e.g., stealing, negative attitude, aggressive behavior), the SPFSS involves teacher
ratings of students on seven protective factors: (a) demonstrates competence, is
optimistic, and has a sense of purpose; (b) has effective social skills, relates well to
others, has good friendship skills; (c) shows respect and concern for others, empathy; (4)
identifies with a pro-social peer group; (5) engaged and motivated to do well in school;
(6) connected with teachers and school; and (7) family is supportive and invested in
student’s school success. These protective factors were selected for inclusion in this
universal screening instrument because: (a) they have been identified by empirical
research as strong correlates of positive developmental outcomes, and (b) they are readily
observable and measurable by teachers within the school context. The SPFSS has been
shown to have adequate test-retest reliability, inter-rater reliability, and criterion validity
for all sub-behaviors (Morrison & Thomas, 2006). The SPFSS represents a positive,
prevention approach to the early detection and intervention of behavioral and emotional
concerns. The teachers rated all students on each of these behaviors.

The frequency of tootles and pre and post SPFSS in the experimental group will
be compared to that of the control group.
CHAPTER IV

Results

In the 2000 study, Skinner and his colleagues showed that the frequency of tootling was higher during intervention phases. In this study, the result was similar as shown by Graph 1. This graph shows that the experimental group (the students who went through the tootling intervention with reinforcers and public postings) tootled at a much higher frequency than the control group (the students who did not go through the tootling intervention). The intervention group tootling frequencies differed from a training week of 34 to a post-intervention average of 26.6 tootles per week, which is a difference of 7.4 tootles. The control group frequencies differed from training week of 24, to a post-intervention average of 1.2 tootles per week, which is a difference of 22.8 tootles.

![Graph 1. Difference in frequency of tootling from the experimental group versus the control group.](image-url)
An independent-samples $t$ test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that the students' who were in the group that the tootling intervention in which a reinforcer was offered (experimental group) would have increased positive behavioral ratings, as measured by the SPFSS, as opposed to the control group.

The overall score on the SPFSS reflects the sum of Items 1-7. The test was not significant, $t(24.25) = 1.72, p = .099$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 19.20, SD = 1.32$) were rated as having comparable positive behavioral ratings to the students in the control group ($M = 17.89, SD = 3.05$). However, further analysis of each item on the scale focused on the individual components that have been found in the literature to be critical to resilience and the development of social competence.

Item 1: Demonstrates competence, is optimistic, and has a sense of purpose. The test was not significant, $t(31.266) = 1.632, p = .11$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.8, SD = .41$) were comparable with demonstrating competence, optimism, and a sense of purpose to the students in the control group ($M = 2.53, SD = .61$).

Item 2: Has effective social skills (Relates well to others, has good friendship skills). The test was not significant, $t(34.65) = 1.492, p = .145$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.8, SD = .41$) were comparable with the effectiveness of their social skills to the students in the control group ($M = 2.58, SD = .51$).

Item 3: Shows respect and concern for others (Empathy). The test was not significant, $t(33.76) = 1.21, p = .234$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.85, SD = .17$)
Item 4: Identifies with pro-social peer group(s). The test was not significant, $t(36.81) = -1.53, p = .134$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.50, SD = .51$) were comparable in their identification with pro-social peer group(s) to the students in the control group ($M = 2.74, SD = .45$).

Item 5: Engaged and motivated to do well in school. The test was significant, $t(31.42) = 2.72, p = .030$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.8, SD = .41$) were rated as being more engaged and motivated to do well in school than students in the control group ($M = 2.42, SD = .61$).

Item 6: Connected with teachers and school. The test was significant, $t(29.15) = 2.32, p = .028$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.85, SD = .37$) were rated as being more connected with teachers and school than students in the control group ($M = 2.47, SD = .61$).

Item 7: Family is supportive and invested in student’s school success. The test was not significant, $t(37) = .706, p = .485$. Students in the experimental group ($M = 2.6, SD = .50$) were rated as having comparable family support with school success to the students in the control group ($M = 2.47, SD = .61$).

A treatment integrity checklist consisting of three items was completed each day by the experimental group teacher to ensure that the intervention was being completed as
intended. See Appendix C for the checklist. There were three days that the checklist was 67% completed. On these days the teacher did not complete one step, which was encouraging the class to tootle at the beginning of the day. During the intervention phase, these were the only three days where the list was varied. The teacher completed the integrity checklist a mean of 93% of the time during the intervention phase.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The results of this study support the findings of Skinner and his colleagues (2000). The experimental group tooted at a much higher frequency than the control group. This result was expected because the experimental group had an incentive to tootle and the teacher reminded the class on a regular basis to write tootles when they noticed their classmates doing something good.

The results of this study do not show support for the hypothesis that students who participated in the tootling intervention with publicly posted feedback and a reinforcer for tootling had higher positive behavioral ratings as measured by the SPFSS than the control group. The SPRSS measures seven different positive behaviors. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and the total sum of Items 1-7 were not significantly different between the experimental and control groups. All of these items are related to social skills and overall disposition of the students. Items 5 and 6 were significantly different between the experimental and control groups. These items were related to motivation to do well in school and feeling connected to their teachers. This result is unexpected because the tootling intervention focused more on positive behaviors rather than performing well on academic tasks.

There are a few factors that could have influenced the results. First, the teacher of the experimental group had a student teacher during the intervention phase. The teacher
checklist was completed as intended with a range of 67-100%. One week, the teacher did not encourage the students to tootle each day of the week. The items on the integrity checklist were completed a mean of 93% of the time. In addition, the teacher of the class may have seen her class in a different way, since she was doing more observing than teaching. The students may have been responded differently when they had the student teacher as an instructor.

There was not much difference between pre and post-test scores for either the experimental or control groups. On Item 1, only three students had a change in rating from the pre-test to the post-test in the experimental group and only one student had a change in rating in the control group. On Item 2, no students had a difference in rating for the experimental group, and one student had change in rating in the control group. On Item 3, four students had a change in rating, and two students had a change in rating in the control group. On Item 4, eight students had a change in rating (some increased come decreased) in the experimental group, and two students had a change in rating on the control group. On Item 7, one student had a change in rating in the experimental group, and one student had a change in rating in the control group.

The results showed that Items 5 and 6 on the SPFSS were statistically significant with the experimental group having higher ratings than the control group. On Item 5, three experimental students had a change in rating from the pre-test to the post-test, while three control students had a change in rating. On the whole, the control group teacher
rated her students lower on both the pre and post-tests on Item 5. Item 5 is about students being engaged and motivated to do well in school. A possible factor for the low scores in the control group is the number of students going through the Intervention Assistance Team for academic difficulty. The teacher of the control group referred several of her students to go through academic interventions, and this may have affected the way she scored their motivation to do well in school.

On Item 6, six students had a change in rating in the experimental group, five of which were an increase. In the control group one student had a change in rating, which was an increase. Overall, the control group teacher rated her students much lower on both the pre and post-test. Item 6 is about the student feelings connected with their teacher and school. It is possible that the control group teacher related academic success with feeling connected with the teacher and school and thus rated them lower on both the pre and post-test.

This study did have its limitations. Baseline data for the frequency of tootling were difficult to gather, because students needed to know what tootling was before the frequency could be calculated. Another limitation of this study was the SPFSS scale itself. The teacher was asked to rank the students on a scale of 0-3. If this scale had more variation, there might be more differences noted to indicate smaller changes in behavior. Also, teacher’s perceptions were subjective. More external factors could have played into the ratings of the students by their teachers.
Although the tootling intervention did not affect positive behavior ratings by teachers, the students did work collectively toward their reward. Tootling with publicly posted feedback encourages students to notice positive behaviors of peers. Also, working toward a class-wide reward encourages students to work as a team to obtain the goal.

In future studies, it would be interesting to examine how sharing the tootles with the class would affect how students felt about themselves and their peers. It is possible that students who are well known for being “tattled” on in class for negative behaviors, might benefit from hearing tootles about themselves. This might be a good intervention to assist children who are socially outcasted by their peers.
APPENDIX A

Student Protective Factors Screening Scale
Student Protective Factors Screening Scale  
(SPF-7)

Directions: Please rate each student in your class using the following scale:
0 = Never, 1 = Rarely, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Demonstrates competence, is optimistic, and has a sense of purpose</th>
<th>Has effective social skills (Relates well to others, has good friendship skills)</th>
<th>Shows respect and concern for others (Empathy)</th>
<th>Identifies with pro-social peer group(s)</th>
<th>Engaged and motivated to do well in school</th>
<th>Connected with teachers and school</th>
<th>Family is supportive and invested in student’s school success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Morrison &amp; Thomas, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Parent Consent Form
Parent Consent Form

To the parent(s) of __________________________ Date __________________

The faculty members of the Department of Counselor Education and Human Services of the University of Dayton are requesting your help in the training of school psychologists. An important part of this training requires the graduate student to work with students in schools.

With your permission, the graduate student Amy Agosta will work with your child and the classroom teacher, under the supervision of the school’s school psychologist ________________________________, to identify a specific academic or behavior area with which your child may need help. As a result of this assessment, the graduate student will provide instructional recommendations and in some cases carry out these recommendations with your child.

Assessment may include the administration of tests, record review, classroom observations, rating scales and interviews with you, the classroom teacher, and your child. Feel free to ask the graduate student any questions you may have about these procedures.

You can be assured that the test results will remain confidential. Should you wish to be informed of the outcomes of the assessment, the graduate student will furnish you with a general description of the results, after the field supervisor and the course instructor have reviewed the results. Keep in mind that the results of assessment conducted during graduate training are not considered valid or reliable for use in making any educational decisions.

Please sign this consent form, which indicates your agreement to participate in this training.

If you have any questions about these procedures, you may reach me at the University of Dayton (937.229.3624). Thank you for your willingness to support our efforts.

Sincerely,

Sawyer Hunley, Ph.D.                                       Julie Q. Morrison, Ph.D.
University of Dayton Supervisor                              University of Dayton Supervisor
Assistant Professor                                             Assistant Professor
School Psychology Program                                      School Psychology Program

I give my permission for the school psychology student to work with my child as described above.

Parent Signature __________________________________ Date ________________
APPENDIX C

Treatment Integrity Checklist
TREATMENT INTEGRITY CHECKLIST

Baseline

1. The teacher will fill out the SPFSS for all students in the class.

Training

1. In both classrooms, the researcher will talk about what a prosocial behavior is and give examples.
2. The researcher will then ask the class to provide their own examples of how they help one another.
3. The researcher will define tattling (telling the teacher when someone does something wrong).
4. The researcher will define tootling (telling the teacher when someone does something helpful).
5. The researcher will give examples of tootling.
6. The researcher will ask the students to give tootling examples. Praise is given for appropriate tootles, and corrective feedback is given for examples not fitting the criteria.
7. Index cards are passed out and students are asked to write down an example with who (who performs the behavior), did what (the behavior), for whom (who they helped).
8. A few examples are read out loud and praise or feedback is given.
9. In group recitation format, the students are asked what kinds of activities they enjoy so that a reinforcer can be determined for the intervention.

Training Week Data Collection

1. The researcher will again define tootling and ask for examples providing praise and feedback.
2. Index cards are passed out to all students.
3. The first day students are encouraged to tootle. Index cards are to be placed in a shoebox on the teacher’s desk. The teacher will provide corrective feedback for the first day only.
4. The teacher will calculate how many appropriate tootles are turned in each day and record it.
5. At the end of the week after the training of tootling, the teacher will fill out the SPFSS.

Intervention

1. The researcher will come in and ask how tootling went the week before and ask for some examples they used the week before with praise or corrective feedback.
2. The students will be informed that they reach a cumulative total of 100 tootles they will receive a to-be-determined reinforcer. And they are encouraged to continue tootling.
3. The next day, the experimenter will come in with a poster-board resembling a ladder with an icon, which represents the class. Also, a shoebox that is colorfully decorated will also be placed in the teacher’s desk.
4. The researcher will ask how many tootles the class had the day before and will place the icon on the ladder accordingly.
5. From that day on, the teacher will move the icon up the ladder accordingly, or will have a student helper adjust the icon, and encourage the students to tootle at the beginning of the day.
6. At the end of each week, the teacher will fill out the SPFSS.

Teacher Checklist

___ 1. Announce to the class, “Remember to look for nice things your peers are doing and tootle!”

___ 2. At the end of the day, go through and record the number of appropriate tootles.

___ 3. At the beginning of each day, tell the class how many tootles they collected the day before and have the helper of the day adjust the publicly posted feedback.
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