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INTRODUCTION

• Child noncompliance is a frequent problem among clinic-referred youth. Clinicians are presented with the challenge of increasing compliance levels in both the home and school setting.

• A compliance training model features a variety of components aimed at increasing compliance and decreasing disruptive behaviors. The components from this model are based on the procedures discussed by Forehand and McMahon (1981) as well as past and current research utilizing components from the package.

• Even though these procedures have been demonstrated as effective strategies for noncompliance, the compliance package has not been established as effective intervention for improving positive social interactions.

• Therefore, Positive Peer Reporting, which has been established as an effective intervention for social interactions (Skinner et al., 2002) was also implemented.

METHOD

Participant and Setting

Kevin was a 4-year-old male in a Midwestern day care facility who was referred for noncompliance and aggression.

Kevin’s classroom had a 10:1 ratio.

Another professional was added to the classroom at pivotal times (i.e., recess, lunch, transition times) to provide additional support in the classroom.

Procedure

Dependent Variables

• Data were collected for compliance and social behaviors twice (i.e., during instruction or centers and recess to transition to lunch) throughout a day. The observations periods were approximately 40 minutes.

• Compliance: Compliance was recorded if the child initiated the task or directive within 5 s of the delivery of the command/instruction.

• Positive Social Behaviors: cooperating, assisting, and playing with peers, and/or appropriate verbal behaviors.

• Negative Social Behaviors: aggression and/or inappropriate verbalizations.

• No Social Behavior: a child being in proximity to a peer and exhibiting no verbal or social behavior.

Independent Variables

• Compliance Training Components: Time in/Attends (Verbal/Physical), Effective Instruction Delivery (Directive, Descriptive, 5 second rule, Proximity, Contingent Praise), and Time Out.

• Positive Peer Reporting (PPR) was adapted from a step-by-step procedure described by Skinner et al. (2002).

• The teacher conducted a training session with the class.

• PPR was defined as the opposite of tattling.

• A child’s name would be drawn from a hat each day to be the star.

• The rest of class were to watch to the star’s behavior.

• They had the opportunity to report positive behaviors.

Design

• An A-B-B+C design was utilized for this case study. Compliance training is represented as B while B + C is represented by Compliance training and PPR.

RESULTS

Baseline Mean (Range) Mean (Range)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>68% (55-80%)</td>
<td>10% (5-15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social Behaviors</td>
<td>1% (0-2%)</td>
<td>3% (0-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Behaviors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34% (27-41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity w/ No Social</td>
<td>99% (98-100%)</td>
<td>40% (25-55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance Training Mean (Range) Mean (Range)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>91% (85-100%)</td>
<td>84% (60-90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social Behaviors</td>
<td>11% (0-27%)</td>
<td>9% (0-27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Behaviors</td>
<td>13% (0-39%)</td>
<td>4% (0-14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity w/ No Social</td>
<td>7% (41-89%)</td>
<td>8% (59-100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance increased with stability. Social behaviors had more variability across time.

Compliance Training & PPR Mean (Range) Mean (Range)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>96% (90-100%)</td>
<td>98% (90-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social Behaviors</td>
<td>67% (44-78%)</td>
<td>64% (22-94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Behaviors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3% (0-6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity w/ No Social</td>
<td>32% (22-56%)</td>
<td>15% (3-31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance remained high. PPR had positive effects on all social behaviors.

DISCUSSION

• This study demonstrates that compliance training can have positive effects on compliance. The data may also indicate that compliance training is not enough to teach replacement behaviors such as positive peer interactions.

• PPR demonstrated positive effects for prosocial behaviors. Research has focused on one or the other but not in conjunction. Better compliance in the classroom may not necessarily mean better relationships with peers.

Limitations:

• External validity is highly limited.

• The design was an A-B-B+C, several potential confounds were not controlled or measured including time and order effects.

• Interventions are both packages or include several variables. To what degree each component did or did not contribute is not known.

• Future research should examine the individual and combined effects of these two interventions. The research should also expand to different populations as to provide external validity.
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