



Faculty Publications

2007-10-01

The Effects of Peer Praise Notes on Socially Withdrawn Adolescents: A Classroom Intervention

Julie Nelson
julie_golf@hotmail.com

Natalie Webb

Paul Caldarella
Paul_Caldarella@byu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)


BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Nelson, Julie; Webb, Natalie; and Caldarella, Paul, "The Effects of Peer Praise Notes on Socially Withdrawn Adolescents: A Classroom Intervention" (2007). *Faculty Publications*. 1274.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/1274>

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Effects of Peer Praise Notes on Socially Withdrawn Adolescents: A Classroom Intervention

Julie A. Peterson Nelson, Ph.D.
Natalie Webb, B.S.
Paul Caldarella, Ph.D.



Outline

- Background Literature
- Method
- Results
- Discussion

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Background Literature

- Socially Withdrawn Students
- Interventions
- Praise
- Teacher Praise
- Peer Praise
- Written Praise



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Socially Withdrawn Students

- Research has shown that those students who are socially withdrawn or isolated have difficulty learning appropriate social conduct which places them at risk for difficulties later in life (Oden, 1980; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992).
- Children who were avoided, neglected, or teased were at high risk for developing behavioral and emotional disorders (Gresham, MacMillan, & Bocian, 1998).

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

- Students find interactions with withdrawn students to be aversive or less rewarding than interactions with other students (Stormshak, et al., 1999).
- Many students avoid interactions with students who have behavior or emotional disorders (McDowell, 1988; Myerson & Hale, 1984).



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Interventions

- One approach aimed to increase students' social involvement is to design educational systems that increase prosocial behavior, rather than simply aiming to prevent antisocial behavior (Winette & Winkler, 1972).
- Prosocial behaviors should be reinforced, teaching students that prosocial behaviors are valued (Skinner, Cashwell, & Skinner, 2000).

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

- Peer approval is a powerful source of prosocial influence and may be an effective target for intervention (Skinner, et al., 2000).



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Praise

- Praise is viewed as positive reinforcement which encourages desirable behavior, while extinguishing undesirable behavior (Thomas, 1991).
- If delivered correctly, praise increases students':
 - on-task behavior (Ferguson & Houghton, 1992)
 - motivation in the classroom (Thomas, 1991)
 - academic success (Sutherland & Wehby, 2001)

Teacher Praise

- Praise has been widely recommended as an important reinforcement method for teachers. It can build self-esteem, provide encouragement, and build a close relationship between student and teacher (Brophy, 1981).



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Peer Praise

- Positive Peer Reporting (PPR or “tootling”):
 - Students verbally report their peers’ prosocial behaviors
 - PPR has been effective in increasing the social interactions of withdrawn students (Skinner, et al., 2002).
- PPR:
 - Increased the social involvement of three socially withdrawn children
 - Peers were a source of positive reinforcement for the prosocial behavior of at-risk children (Moroz & Jones, 2002).

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Written Praise

- The effects of peer to peer written praise have not been thoroughly explored.



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Research Question

- What are the effects of peer-written praise notes on the social involvement of three socially withdrawn middle-school students?

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Method

- Participants
- Setting
- Measures
- Group Contingency
- Observations
- Experimental Procedures

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Participants

- Three adolescents (age 12-14) attending a public Jr. High school in the Western United States



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Setting

- Participants were screened using Stages One and Two of the Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD) and identified as displaying internalizing symptoms.
- Participants were enrolled in Successful Skills for Living and Learning (SSL), a class for students at risk for emotional behavioral disorders.
- The three participants were selected by the teacher and the PI.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Measures

- Participants' interactions were observed and recorded 4 days a week during a 15-minute Peer Activity Time.
- Students' Peer Activity Time activities included:
 - Listening to music
 - Talking to their friends
 - Hanging out together on the couch in the back of the room
 - Playing games alone or with others (e.g., Jenga, cards, domino's, hackysack, etc.)

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Target Behavior: Social Involvement

1. Social engagement: any positive verbal or nonverbal interaction with a peer (e.g., talking, actively listening, playing together, etc.)
2. Participation: involvement in a game with structure or rules

(Not included in social involvement was playing alone, talking to an adult, parallel play, standing near peers while watching them play a game, or any negative interaction.)



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Target Behavior: Social Involvement

Example:

- Christine is playing a card game with Courtney
- Clay and John are sitting on the couch talking and laughing

Non-example:

- Jack is sitting at his desk playing dominos alone
- Dylan is wandering around the room observing his classmates while they play games

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Group Contingency

- Group contingencies were used to reinforce the writing of praise notes.
- Students rank-ordered a list of activities they wanted to earn.

Please number each activity from 1–6. #1 is the activity you would like to do the *most*, #6 is the activity you would like to do the *least*.

- Doughnut and chocolate milk party
- Fiesta Party (chips, salsa, Sangria)
- Smallville* movie, popcorn, and soda
- Burgerking: receive \$3 for breakfast
- Outside games (kickball) and candy party
- Dodge ball in the gym and candy party

Observational Method

- Partial interval recording: Observation sessions occurred during Peer Activity Time and consisted of 72, 10-second intervals (12 minutes).



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Observation Form

Observation Form: Sample

Period: 1 2 3

Day of week: _____

Observer _____

Student name: _____ (students' real names were not used)

Date: _____

Start: _____

End: _____

Primary

Reliability

Interval (10 second intervals)	+=Active 0= not interacting	Who initiated the interaction? (first initial of student)	Who was the recipient of the interaction? (first initial of student)	Students Involved in interaction? (first initial of students)
1	+	J	C	J, C, S
2	+			↓
3	0			

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Interobserver Agreement

- Prior to data collection, the two observers conducted practice sessions. When interobserver agreement exceeded 90%, training was terminated.
- Interobserver agreement: During 33% of the observations, the secondary observer simultaneously recorded the interactions. Interobserver agreement was 98%.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Experimental Procedures

- Experimental Design
- Baseline Data
- Intervention
 - Treatment Integrity
 - Tracking of Praise Notes
 - Peer Praise Notes Content

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Experimental Design

- An A-B-A single subject design across participants was used.
- This design was selected because it has been used in prior studies on PPR.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Baseline Data

- Baseline data was gathered simultaneously for each participant.
- When baseline data was stable, treatment began.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Intervention

- Students were asked to write a praise note to each of their classmates every week; they were reinforced for doing so.
 - Students received instruction on writing effective praise notes
 - Teacher wrote a PPN on an over head projector
 - To: Colton
 - Message:
 - Specific: “I really liked your role-play in class.”
 - General: “You are cool!”
 - From: Randy
 - Students wrote 2-3 praise notes each morning as soon as the bell rang.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Treatment Integrity

- A checklist was completed by the PI to ensure the treatment was implemented in a consistent manner across classrooms.
- 100% treatment integrity

Example

1. During our unit on peer relations, you will be encouraged to write praise notes to your classmates.
2. Each morning there will be two Peer Praise Notes on your desk. You will be given time to write praise notes after journaling time.
3. (Teacher demonstrates the steps of writing a praise note by writing on a praise note transparency on the overhead projector):
 - a. To: Sam
 - b. Write a message to a classmate. You can write something specific like *"I liked your role-play. You were very ..."*

Literature

Method


Results

Discussion

In Class Tracking of Praise Notes

- Public posting was used to reinforce the writing of praise notes (i.e., a poster was hung on the wall indicating the number of praise notes written so far that week, as well as the class goal).

(The PI praised students for praise notes written that day and asked one student to move the dial.)



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Praise Note

Date: 4/28/2007

To: David

I really liked your
role-play in class.
You are cool!

From: Sam

Adapted from *How Full is Your Bucket?*
Tom Rath & Donald O. Clifton, PhD.

**Peer
Praise
Note**

Date: _____

To: _____

From: _____

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Praise Note Content

Categories	Percentage
You're Cool/Awesome/You Rock	25%
You're Good at ___/Talented	16%
You're Funny	15%
Specific Compliment	10%
You're a Good Friend	8%
I'm Glad You're in My Class	7%
Good Work in Class	6%
Thanks for ___/Appreciation	6%
You Have a Good Personality	6%
You're Nice/Kind	4%
Other (e.g., you're smart, you're quiet, what's up?, etc.)	20%
Total	377 Peer Praise Notes

Some of the notes contained more than one message, hence, the total percentage exceeds 100%

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Praise Note Content

- 32% of praise notes under the category “You’re Good at ___/Talented” referred to games played during Peer Activity time.
- 50% of praise notes under the category “You’re Fun to Play With” referred to playing with that person during Peer Activity Time.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Results

- Interaction With Peers
- Daily Praise Notes
- Initiations and Responses
- Results
- Social Validity


Literature

Method


Results

Discussion

Interaction With Peers: Student J



Daily Praise Notes: Student J




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Interaction With Peers: Student A




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Daily Praise Notes: Student A




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Interaction With Peers: Student R




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Daily Praise Notes: Student R




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Responses and Initiations: Student J




Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Responses and Initiations: Student A



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Responses and Initiations: Student R



Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Results

- The data suggests the treatment was effective for all 3 participants
 - All participants' interactions increased
- The target behavior did not reverse
 - Participants' interactions did not decrease when treatment was removed

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Social Validity: Teacher

The teacher believed the intervention to be beneficial for all students
Intervention Rating Profile-15, (Witt & Elliott, 1985)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree/Agree
I would suggest the use of Peer Praise Notes to other teachers.					X
This intervention (Peer Praise Notes) is a fair way to handle students socially withdrawn behavior.					X
I like the procedures used in the Peer Praise Notes Intervention.					X
Overall, Peer Praise Notes would be beneficial for the students.					X

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Social Validity: Students

Of 16 students:

“Peer Praise Notes could help a student who does not socialize very much with classmates.”

- 81% agreed or strongly agreed

“Peer praise Notes would be effective in improving a child’s social involvement with classmates.”

- 75% agreed or strongly agreed

“Peer Praise Notes would be appropriate for a variety of students.”

- 75% agreed or strongly agreed

“Overall, Peer Praise Notes would be beneficial for the students.”

- 69% agreed or strongly agreed

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Discussion

- Given the potential risks to students who are socially isolated or withdrawn, it is necessary to thoroughly examine our treatment approaches.
- Data suggests Peer Praise Notes produced distinguishable improvements in the social involvement of socially isolated adolescents.
- This study extended previous research by:
 - examining a Junior High school population (adolescents rather than elementary students)
 - utilizing written peer praise (previous research examined teacher praise or verbal peer praise -“tootling”)

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Limitations

- Classes were small (5-10 students); limited number of students with whom to interact.
- Method: behavior did not reverse
 - Interactions with peers became reinforcing
 - replication is in process with a multiple baseline single subjects across participants design

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

Challenges

- Intervention is time consuming
 - Writing praise notes
 - Reviewing praise notes
 - Peer Activity Time (3-4 days a week for 15 min.)
- Students with lower levels of writing skills
- Inappropriate praise note content
- Some students do not receive praise notes some of the time
- Inappropriate behavior during Peer Activity Time (roughhousing)
- Teacher non-involvement in Peer Time

How to implement PPN in your classroom:

1. Introduce and discuss *How Full is Your Bucket*: a rationale for PPN (Tom Rath & Donald O. Clifton, PhD.)
2. Instruct and demonstrate how to write effective praise notes:
3. Introduce intervention:
 - a. Place “bucket” in the room
 - b. Place “drops” (PPN) by the bucket
 - c. Allow time for students to write “drops” to their peers and place in the bucket
 - d. Review PPN for appropriate content and give them to students
 - e. Provide a place for students to keep their PPN (e.g., inside their journal or notebook)
4. Establish reinforcement (e.g., group contingencies—class activities, public posting)
5. Track student interactions during class activities to determine whether PPN provided desired results

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

References

- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher Praise: A Functional Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(1), 5-32.
- Ferguson, E. & Houghton, S. (1992). The effects of contingent teacher praise, as specified by Canter's Assertive Discipline. *Educational Studies*, 18(1), 11-18.
- Gresham, F.M., MacMillan, D. L., & Bocian, K. (1997). "Behavioral earthquakes": Low frequency, salient behavioral events that differentiate students at-risk for behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 21, 277-292.
- Oden, S. (1980). A child's social isolation: Origins, prevention, intervention. In G. Carteledge & J.F. Milburn (Eds.), *Teaching social skills to children* (pp. 179-202). New York: Pergamon.
- McDowell, J.J. (1988). Matching theory in natural human environments. *Behavior Analyst*, 11, 95-109.
- Moroz, K.R., & Jones, K.J. (2002). The effects of positive peer reporting on children's social involvement. *School Psychology Review*, 31(2), 235-245.
- Myerson, J., & Hale, S. (1984). Practical implications of the matching law. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 17, 367-380.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Skinner, C., Cashwell, T., & Skinner, A. (2000). Increasing tootling: The effects of a peer-monitored group contingency program on students' reports of peers' prosocial behaviors. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37(3), 263-269.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion

References

- Skinner, C.H., Neddienrip, C.E., Robinson, S.L., Ervin, R., & Jones, K. (2002). Altering Educational Environments Through Positive Peer Reporting: Prevention and Remediation of Social Problems Associated with Behavior Disorders. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(2), 191-202.
- Sutherland, K.S., & Whelby, J.H. (2001). The effect of self-evaluation of teaching behavior in classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Special Education, 35*(3), 161-171.
- Stormshak, E.A., Bierman, K.L., Bruschi, C., Dodge, K.A., Coie, J.D. & The Conduct Problems Prevention Research group. (1999). The relation between behavior problems and peer preference in different classroom contexts. *Child Development, 70*, 169-182.
- Thomas, J. (1991). You're the greatest! A few well-chosen words can work wonders in positive behavior reinforcement. *Principal, 71*, 32-33.
- Winette, R. A., & Winkler, R. C. (1972). Current behavior modification in the classroom: Be quiet, be docile. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 5*, 499-504.
- Witt, J. C., & Elliott, S. N. (1985). Acceptability of classroom intervention strategies. In T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.), *Advocates in School Psychology, 4*, 251-288. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Literature

Method

Results

Discussion