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Abstract
Teacher praise is one of the most important elements of teaching and learning. Behavioral consultation with and without performance has been shown to be an effective method for increasing instructional praise. The authors used an ABCBC design to investigate the effects of an interdependent group oriented contingency (GC) and the GC plus performance feedback (GC+P) on the rate of praise per student of six pre-service teacher group leaders during an eight week summer camp for children with disabilities. The results showed that the GC was partially or totally effective in increasing praise for three of the participants over baseline levels and the GC+P was effective in increasing praise of all six participants. The results are discussed within the context of literature on behavioral consultation.
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Teacher praise is an instructional behavior that is an essential element of effective instruction (Emmer, 1988; Heward, 2003; Sutherland, Wehby, & Yoder, 2002). Praise has been demonstrated to have a positive effect on student behavior in a variety of research studies (e.g., Kirby & Shields, 1972; Lannie & McCurdy, 2007; Sutherland et al., 2002; Sutherland & Wehby, 2001; Sutherland, Wehby, & Copeland, 2000). Teacher praise is also important because it allows students to feel valued and important. Furthermore, teacher praise is important because it helps students to develop a positive self-concept. Effective teacher praise is not repetitive and does not create a sense of stagnation. Fourth, praise should be contingent (O’Leary & O’Leary, 1977). The praise should be contingent on the performance of the behavior to be reinforced. Fifth, praise should be used contingently (Paine et al., 1983). The person giving the praise should show them what they say by using enthusiastic and expressive language and not monotonous phrases. Sixth, praise is non-disruptive (Paine et al., 1983). The praise statements should not disrupt the academic learning environment. Finally, praise should be immediate. Praise should follow within one to two seconds after the appropriate behavior occurs. Teachers should follow the “if-then” rule. This rule means that if the student is doing something that you want to encourage, then the student should receive praise for that behavior (Paine et al., 1983).

However, researchers have noted that teacher praise is used infrequently and ineffectively in classrooms (Sutherland et al., 2000; Alber & Heward, 2001; Alber, Heward, & Hippler, 1998; Kohn, 1993; Brophy, 1981). Studies have shown that teachers provide an extremely low rate of praise to students in the general and special education classrooms (Brady & Taylor, 1989; Gable, Hendrickson, Young, Shores, & Stowitschek, 1983). One reason for the low rates of praise in the classroom may be that teachers are resistant to using praise as a reward and/or reinforcer because praise may be harmful to children (Skinner, Williams, & Needleen, 2004; Lepper, Keavney, & Drake, 1996; Ryan & Deci, 1996; Kohn, 1993). A second reason for low rates of praise by teachers is that the classroom is an extremely busy place where praiseworthy efforts by students are often unnoticed by the teacher (Craff, Alber, & Heward, 1998). Another reason for low rates of praise is that teachers give more disapproval statements than approval statements. White (1975) found that the rates of teacher approval was relatively high during first and second grades, but the rates dropped with each grade level and continued throughout high school. He found that the number of teacher disapproval statements increased every grade after second grade. Thomas, Presland, Grant, & O’Leary (1979) found similar results, in that more attention is paid to undesirable behaviors than to appropriate behaviors. In most classrooms, the rates of disapproval statements exceed the rates of approval (Sutherland & Wehby, 2001; Sutherland et al., 2000). Other studies have also reported low rates of teacher praise (Baker & Zigmond, 1990; Deno, Maruyama, Espin, & Cohen, 1990).

Many teachers need help increasing the rate of praise statements toward their students (Alber & Heward, 2001; Elwell & Tiberio, 1994). Increasing the rate of teacher praise may increase such academic behaviors as student motivation, task engagement, and actual learning (Sutherland et al., 2000). Sutherland, Wehby, & Yoder (2001) suggested that teachers with high rates of praise have high rates of opportunities to respond to academic requests (OTR) while teachers with low rates of praise have low rates of OTR.

One method used to increase teacher praise is behavioral consultation and performance feedback. Usually behavior consultation consists of brief, daily or weekly meetings between a direct care staff person such as a teacher, and a clinician for the purpose of providing support in learning and behavioral goals (Noell, Witt, Slider, Connell, Gatti, Williams, et al., 2005; Sutherland, Wehby, & Copeland, 2000). For example, Jones, Wickstrom, & Friedman (1997) used behavioral consultation alone and in conjunction with performance feedback (data based information on the rate of praise) to increase the level of praise for three teachers of students with disabilities. Jones et al., (1997) found that without performance feedback the teachers were not using praise very often or very effectively. Likewise, Reine, Lewis-Palmer, & Martin (2007) found visual performance feedback in the form of graphic representations of the rate of teacher praise to be an effective method for increasing teacher praise.

Much of the research on the use of behavioral consultation to increase teacher use of praise has occurred within the context of the classroom. We could find no research that specifically investigated the use of behavioral consultation and performance feedback on praise outside of the context of the school setting. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the use of daily behavioral consultation with and without performance feedback on the rates of praise statements made by teacher group leaders at a summer camp for students with disabilities.

Method
Participants and Setting
The study was conducted during a day camp for students with disabilities in a large urban area in the southern United States. The summer camp ran five days a week for four hours per day. The eight-week camp was comprised of thirty children campers with disabilities per week. Their ages ranged from six years old to twenty-one years old. The campers had various disabilities such as Down Syndrome, autism, cerebral palsy, and intellectual disabilities. However, the campers did not attend the entire eight-week camp. There were new campers each week. The campers all had moderate to severe disabilities. Campers participated in such activities as free play, organized games, swimming, arts and crafts, and social skills instruction.
The participants in the study were six pre-service teacher group leaders, two female and four male, whose ages ranged from 18 to 30 years of age and who had little experience working with students with disabilities. Four of the participants were undergraduate students seeking a degree in education in fields such as music, general education, and special education. One of the participants was a graduate student majoring in special education. One participant was a graduate of a local university with a degree in business, but wanted to go back to school to get a degree in special education. The participants served as group leaders during the camp and were responsible for supervision of the campers and the volunteer helpers. Group leaders also had to teach a daily social skills lesson as well as conduct daily evaluations in the form of progress reports on the behavior of the campers.

### Measurement

Because the participants had a variable number of campers each day due to illness or non-attendance the rate of praise statements per camper made by each participant was the dependent variable. The number of campers each day for each participant ranged from four to seven campers. Overall, the number of campers per participant was equivalent across group leaders and conditions. The data reported in Figure 1 below were taken when participants were observed during randomly selected ten-minute sessions each day. Neither the participants nor the students knew when praise statements were going to be counted. During these times the number of praise statements given towards children was counted using a hand held counter to count the frequency of the praise statements of the participants by the researcher who had been trained in collecting data using this method. Reliability was collected using the total agreement method (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 2007) and was calculated by the following formula.

\[
\text{agreement \% = \frac{\text{smaller tally}}{\text{larger tally}} \times 100}
\]

Reliability data were collected in 24% of the sessions by a second trained observer. Reliability averaged 90% across sessions. The range was from 77% to 100%.

### Design and Procedures

The study employed an A-B-C-B-C withdrawal design (Kennedy, 2005). There were five phases (baseline, group oriented contingencies, group oriented contingencies with performance feedback, group oriented contingencies with performance feedback). Each phase change was initiated following two to three days of a stable rate of group leader praise in each phase. Prior to the baseline participants were trained on praise procedures during two thirty-minute sessions over the course of the first two days of camp. The training consisted of the primary researcher directly instructing the group leaders on the research supporting direct behavioral praise statements in the classroom, giving examples and non-examples of direct behavioral praise statements, modeling, and role play. Role play consisted of the primary researcher playing the role of the teacher and the group leader playing the role of the children. During this time, the researcher demonstrated examples and non-examples of praise and encouraged the group leaders to identify each statement as an effective praise statement or not. Examples of praise statements included, "Way to go", "I like the way you _____", "Awesome job", and "Keep up the good work." Non-examples of praise statements included, "Yes", "OK", and any negative statement about the child when they completed a task or exhibited an appropriate behavior. As a reminder to the participants, signs were posted in several areas of the recreation center saying, "Have you praised your students lately?" and "Praise, it does a body good." No other contingencies for praise were in place during baseline.

During the group oriented contingency (GC) phase the first author met with the participants each morning and encouraged them to remember to provide lots of positive feedback to their campers. As an incentive to increase praise, the participants were divided into two teams of three with 15 children with disabilities children per team (T1, T3, T5 v. T2, T4, and T6). Praise statements of each team member were added together for a weekly total for that team. At the end of each week, the team with the most praise statements was treated to a snack at a local ice cream establishment by the first author.

### Results

Figure 1 depicts the rate of praise statements per camper (PPC) given by each participant across experimental conditions. When the GC alone condition was implemented the PPC for T1, T3, and T6 increased over baseline levels. For T1, the range increased to 3.8 to 4.2 PPC while the range for T3 and T6 increased to 1.3 to 1.6 and 2.0 to 2.6 respectively. The three participants averaged 4.0 (SD = .17), 1.5 (SD = .11), and 2.5 (SD = .35) PPC respectively. For T2, T4, and T5 the average PPC did not increase for T2 and increased only slightly for T4 from 1.1 baseline to 1.2 PPC (range, 1.0–1.3, SD = .16). T5 had an increase of 1.7 from 1.4 in baseline (range, 1.3–2.0, SD = .29). Overall, PPC had a mean of 1.9 across the six participants during this condition. When the performance feedback phase (GC+) was implemented, the data show an increase in the PPC across all six participants over baseline and the GOC alone conditions. T1 showed a small increase from 4.0 to 4.7 average PPC (range 4.0–5.2.
Implications for Practice

One important contribution to this study is to replicate and extend the data to show the generality of behavioral consultation with performance feedback as a research supported method for also improving the behavior of teachers outside of the traditional school setting. Conceivably, demonstrating good behavior on the part of an instructor is important for students to see and hear not only for the effects of reinforcement but also as a model of socially appropriate behavior. The final contribution of this study is that participants all said they enjoyed the game and thought that it helped them to deliver more praise and deliver more praise contingently. When we embarked on this study we were somewhat concerned that the adults would find GC juvenile. Instead, they appeared to have fun with the game and trying to meet their goal. The limitations notwithstanding, we believe behavioral consultation, GC, and performance feedback is an appropriate, worthwhile, non-coercive tool that can be used by administrative staff to increase the most important means a teacher has to reinforce good behavior.
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Discussion

In general, the data show that daily consultation and the GC was partially or totally effective in increasing group leader praise for three of the participants (T1, T3, and T6) but was not as effective for the other three participants compared to baseline. However, the GC coupled with performance feedback (GC+) was effective in increasing praise over baseline and the GC alone condition for all six of the participants. These effects were replicated in a second GC+ condition. The most pronounced gains were with T2 and T4 who saw their rate of praise double when the performance feedback was implemented. The findings from this study were consistent with other studies that found that behavioral consultation and performance feedback increased praise of the participants (e.g., Reinke et al., 2007).

Limitations

One limitation of this study was that the participants were not fully trained teachers. Although improving teacher praise is a worthy goal for any teacher, veteran teachers performance during GC and the GC+ condition may be markedly different from the results we obtained. Another limitation is that the participants did not get to choose the reinforcer. Typically when a GC is implemented the learner gets to choose the reinforcer (Cooper et al., 2007). Although we made every attempt to identify potential reinforcers, we settled for a reinforcer that all the participants could agree to and one that we could afford. A third limitation to this study was that the effect of the increased frequency of praise on the behavior of the campers was not measured. Due to the fact that the campers changed weekly, data could not be collected to measure this variable. Finally, another limitation of this study is that the effectiveness of GC+ was not replicated against baseline conditions. Thus, it was not possible to see a possible functional relation between the GC+ and baseline conditions due to a lack of replication.