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A multiple baseline across behaviors was employed to demonstrate generalization effects across settings. A 14 year old shy female was presented with a social skills treatment package to increase the rate of eye contacts, verbalizations and smiles in vivo. One of the intervention phases included role-playing of social situations with a peer. A second phase required the occurrence of desired responding while playing foosball—the same activity which took place in vivo during generality data collection. A third intervention required interaction assignments to be completed in vivo. Results indicate inconclusive evidence of an increase due to the treatment package. A general analysis of social behavior and suggestions for future research follows.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many researchers have reported generality across sessions within the social skills training setting (Elder, Edelstein & Narrick, 1979; Steel, 1977; Zielinski & Williams, 1979; Lancioni, 1982; Matson, Esvelt-Dawson, Andrasik, Ollendick, Petti, & Hersen, 1980; Bates, 1980; Bornstein, Bellack & Hersen, 1977). In these reports, the general procedure consisted of the subject role-playing in contrived social settings, feedback, modeling and reinforcement. Subjects mastered the appropriate responses measured along various dimensions, such as eye contact, verbal expression, voice volume, response latency, facial expression and others, and then novel role-play situations were presented. By comparing situations, all of the aforementioned studies concluded that generality of stimulus conditions can occur across role-play situations.

However, to assume generalizability of role-playing to the in vivo setting would be premature. To alleviate this problem, Bellack, Hersen and Turner (1978) compared the role-play assessment results of the Behavioral
Assertiveness Test-Revised (or Bat-R) to clinical interviews and treatment groups of psychiatric patients. Although component responses such as eye contact, speech duration, response latency, intonation and overall assertiveness were highly correlated across BAT-R role-play scenes, they were not related to responding in interviews and treatment groups. In contrast, responding during clinical interviews and treatment groups were highly intercorrelated. As a result, they advised caution "in drawing generalized conclusion from Bat-R type responding until a direct comparison is made between such responses and actual assertiveness in vivo." Bates (1980) found similar results in a study teaching general interaction skills (e.g., small talk, asking for help, differing with others, handling criticism) to moderately and mildly retarded adults. Although desired responding to learned role-play scenes occurred in training, such responding did not occur in vivo when presented with the same scene.

Two studies measuring heterosocial skills were reported in which male-female interactions were assessed on variables such as eye contact, response duration, response latency, loudness of speech, voice intonation, smiling, asking questions, speech disruptions, overall effectiveness, naturalistic interaction and self-
disclosures directed at members of the opposite sex. Bellack, Hersen and Lamparski (1979) found only moderate and low correlations between component responses made during role-playing and those that occurred during naturalistic observations with male and female undergraduates, respectively; again, suggesting difficulty with generalization from the use of role-play tests. Wessberg (1979) studied role-playing as well and did observe generalization from role-play to contrived waiting room periods. Unfortunately, it was accompanied by anxiety (evidenced by rigidness of posture, excessive arm and hand movements, shaky voice).

Only a few studies have demonstrated generality of responding across settings. Using an undergraduate population, Derry and Stone (1979) combined role-play practice plus cognitive self-statement training (i.e., participants were urged to practice their responses to themselves prior to emitting their overt response). Those who received the combined procedure were able to maintain assertive responding 13 weeks later during a telephone assessment, while those who received role-play practice only did not. In another study, Lancioni (1982) employed the use of peers as social skills tutors. Working with eight to ten year old mentally retarded subjects and using normal children as tutors, he used "vicarious
reinforcement" whereby tutors reinforced peers with praise and edibles contingent upon delayed imitation of body position, cooperative play and polite verbalizations. Upon getting generalization effects, Lancioni maintained that "generalization responding is high and stable when the response occasions presented for probing are similar to those used for training" (p. 38). In yet another study, Matson and Zeiss (1979) tested a "Buddy System" whereby retarded-psychiatric patients used report cards to indicate their own and their partners instances of socially inappropriate statements, arguing, tantrum behavior and interruptions. The effects of this procedure were maintained at a six week follow-up assessment.

In a study similar to the present investigation, Cooke and Apolloni (1976) attempted to demonstrate generality of responding in a free-play setting. Immediately following role-playing, instructions, modeling and praise to teach smiling, sharing and making positive physical contacts in training, generality data were collected in vivo. Results indicated that smiling and positive physical contacts generalized to the free-play setting. However, no substantial results in generalization of verbal complimenting occurred.

In sum, the former studies demonstrated that appropriate responding generalized across role-play scenes
within the training setting. The latter studies furthered this investigation to include in vivo settings. However, the contradictory results of the few in vivo studies reported substantiates the need for further inquiry.

The present study was a follow-up of Lancioni's (1982) hypothesis, which maintains that when the response occasions presented for probing are similar to those used for training, generalization is more likely to occur. The purpose of the present experiment was to investigate some of the variables relevant to maintenance of responding across settings. As a result, the present investigation included the following features:

1. Peer, rather than experimenter-presented prompts were used in training. (This is probably most salient of features since the prompt comes from, and is directed to, a peer in the natural environment.)

2. Interaction assignments were given with instructions to be completed in the natural setting, thus, assuring desired responding occurred in that setting.

3. Response generality data were collected in vivo to circumvent the assessment problems mentioned above.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

The study took place in a special education program for emotionally impaired children. Training took place in a recreation room which included foosball, ping pong, pool, video games and board games (of which the latter two were almost never used). The generalization setting was the same room. However, generality data were collected in the afternoons during free-time recreation periods.

The subject was a 14 year old shy female who made very little eye contact, spoke infrequently and softly, seldom interacted with others and was generally compliant in school. At home, however, reports indicate tantrum behavior (i.e. kicking, screaming, non-compliance) when the subject did "not get her way." Additional testimony of behavior in a recent foster placement indicates conduct similar to that seen in school.

The peers chosen to present prompts were volunteers who earned points based on cooperation.

It is important to note that during generalization data collection, the above definition of verbalization was used. However, during training specific verbal responses were required (see role-play situations page, Appendix).
Procedure

Initially a baseline measure was taken in vivo for all three behaviors—eye contact, verbalizations and smiling. Then utilizing a multiple baseline design, eye contact was trained, followed by verbalizations. Smiling remained in baseline throughout the study.

Treatment consisted of session training and interaction assignments completed in vivo. Session training consisted of two intervention phases: (a) role-playing and (b) foosball. Each session took place in the school recreation room at different times on Monday, Wednesday and Friday mornings. The sessions began with a review of the assignment followed by 10 minutes of role-playing. First, the experimenter read the narration of a randomly chosen social situation followed by the appropriate peer presented prompt (see Appendix). The subject was then instructed to respond "... as if this were actually happening." Praise followed desirable responding and corrective feedback (pointing out correct elements and areas of improvement) and additional practice followed undesirable responding. A new situation was never presented until the previous situation was completed twice consecutively. Also at this time the subject and peer received 10 points for properly completing the situation. Later these were exchanged for extra
privileges in the recreation room or used to purchase candy, trinkets, etc., from the "store."

During eye contact training, the criterion for recording an occurrence was the subject's eye contact with the peer for at least three seconds. When verbalizing was added, criteria were the subject's eye contact with the peer for at least three seconds, plus a verbal statement similar to that specified on the role-play situation page (Appendix).

In an attempt to maximize the similarity between stimulus conditions in training and those in vivo, a phase was introduced whereby the subject was prompted to make the target response(s) while engaged in the activity which typically occurred in the generalization setting. During recreation room periods the subject typically played foosball. Therefore, the foosball phase required the student to make the desired responses while playing foosball with the experimenter and peer. Although specific prompts were not presented during this phase, 10 points were awarded for each occurrence of the desired response (directed at either the peer or the experimenter). Hence, the awarding of points at the end of session for desired responding and the number of individuals in the room (three in session compared to about 5 to 10 during actual recreation periods were the
only conditions in training that were not the same as in vivo.

The third intervention variable was interaction assignments. Given at the end of each session, these assignments focused on the present and previously taught component behaviors. For example, one assignment required the subject to look at everyone in the classroom during gym. Another assignment, completed during classroom free-time, required walking up to a student, making eye contact, and requesting a card game. As with training, points were also given for reporting the successful completion of assignments (which were monitored by the experimenter).

Each assignment was described to the subject and any questions about it answered. A 3x5 index card contained the instructions on one side and a place to indicate the completion or non-completion of the assignment on the other side. Further instructions requested the appropriate markings on the card, placing it in the envelope, sealing it, and turning it in to the teacher.
Dependent Measures

The dependent measures were smiling, verbalizations and eye contacts. A smile was defined as, a turning up of the corners of the mouth and an increase in the protrusion of the skin over the cheek bones. A verbalization was any vocal response audible to the observer, with the exception of coughs and sneezes. Lastly, eye contact was defined by two characteristics: (a) the subject's eyes open and looking towards an individual's face, and (b) the individual being looked at must have their face directed within 90 degrees of an imaginary plane running vertically between the subject and the other individual.

It is important to note that during generality data collection, the above definition of verbalization was used. However, during training specific verbal responses were required (see role-play situation page in Appendix).

Measurement

Different means were used for training and generality assessment. During role-play training sessions, situations were practiced until criterion performance was attained. The total of these presentations was divided by the number of different situations presented to arrive at a mean for the session. For example, if four situations were practiced, and it took three trials to meet criteria for the first situation, two for the second, and so on,
the total number of trials would be divided by four to arrive at a mean for the session. Since points were also awarded based on the number of situations completed, an incentive was provided to maximize the number of completed situations.

A time sampling technique was used in vivo to measure the three component behaviors. A cassette recording indicating five second observations occurred during afternoon free-time interaction periods in the recreation room, at which time verbalizations, smiles and eye contacts were recorded.

A student participating in the same activity was used as a reference student. Through much of the study, the reference individual was the same person. However, data were also collected on other individuals. Hence, both an individual reference measure and composite reference measure were determined. Within sessions, observation alternated between the subject and the reference student. Hence, approximately three minutes of actual observation occurred during each session (3 minutes observation + 3 minutes recording x 2 students = 12 minutes).

To serve as a reliability measure, a second observer recorded data in approximately 15% of all observations. To facilitate accuracy the use of a second earphone was used to assure common observations. Reliability was
calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the number of agreements plus disagreements. The figures arrived at for eye contact, verbalizations and smiles were 91%, 95%, and 89% agreement, respectively.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Session Data

For each session of the role-play phase, data were collected on the number of trials completed prior to criterion performance for each situation. These measures were then averaged across situations to arrive at a mean for the session. Results from both eye contact and eye contact/verbalization phases indicated that desired responding occurred after only a few trials. Prior to criterion performance the mean number of trials were 1.8 (SD=.78) and 1.9 (SD = .73) during eye contact training and eye contact/verbalization training, respectively.

In Vivo Data

Since a time sampling technique was employed for assessment in vivo, the resultant data are presented in percent of observation intervals in which one or more instances of the particular behavior occurred.

During the second role-play phase when both eye contact and verbalizations were being trained, again, 26% of the observed intervals included at least one eye contact (SD = 15). In the second foosball phase, 30% of
the intervals included at least one eye contact \( (SD = 16) \).

Reference measures of eye contact were 38% \( (SD = 17) \) for the composite measure. It is also noteworthy that subject measures were lower than reference measures of 87% of the days which data were collected.

Verbalizations were the second behavior trained. During baseline, the subject made at least one verbalization in 3% of the intervals observed \( (SD = 4) \) and 10% \( (SD = 13) \), respectively. It is also important to note that the medians for both baseline and training were zero.

The individual and composite reference measures for verbalizations were 35% \( (SD = 3) \) and 36% \( (SD =17) \), respectively. Furthermore, only one day (during baseline), or 1.5% of all days in which data were collected, were the reference measures below that of the subject.

Finally, subject smiling, which remained in baseline throughout the study, occurred in only 5% \( (SD = 4) \) or the intervals prior to the eye contact/verbalization training in the foosball phase. During that phase, smiling increased to a mean of 21% \( (SD =16) \). The individual and composite reference measures of smiling were 30% \( (SD = 20) \) and 27% \( (SD =19) \), respectively.
Figure 1: square - subject; circle - composite reference individual; triangle - individual reference.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The influence of the independent variable on the component behaviors studied is questionable. In support of an intervention effect, the percent of observed intervals in which subject eye contact occurred increased 9% from baseline to role-play phases, then reverted back to baseline measures during the foosball phase; thus, suggesting the role-playing phase was effective and the foosball phase was not. An intervention effect is further evidenced by the increase in the eye contact/verbalization role-play phase; again, suggesting only role-playing increased responding.

However, the effect suggested by these fluctuations are suspect due to a 5% increase in reference measures of eye contact during role-playing, large subject variability in responding, and lack of increase in the upper range of intervals (which eye contact occurred) per session. Furthermore, it seems likely that responding would increase as a result of replacing role-playing with foosball—a intervention more closely resembling stimulus conditions in vivo.
The second foosball phase is the only period of the study in which a substantial increase of all three component behaviors occurred. To analyze this, it would be helpful to consider the following anecdotal information.

A domineering male classroom peer left the program at the same time the foosball phase began. This student's behavior was such that others' interactions were seldom followed by additional interactions. For example, a compliment, eye contact, smile, etc. directed toward this individual, or to others in his presence, would likely evoke a response which resulted in attention for that individual. For example, a response such as, "Nice shot!" would likely be a discriminative stimulus for the return response of, "Ya, I'm bad."

At the time the above student left, and possibly for the same reason, the subject began to increase interactions with one female and one male student in the class. Subject eye contact with these individuals tended to be correlated with that of the reference measures; thus, providing evidence of an interaction between the student and reference individual. During this period, verbalizations increased slightly and also tended to be proportional with reference measures. Similarly, smiling increased to the level of the reference measures and also

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
correlated with those measures. This was the only time during the study that subject responding matched the rate of reference responding.

It is difficult to claim an experimental effect based on the information provided. The possible confounding effects mentioned above occurred simultaneously with the onset of the final intervention phase. This, and the fact that similar interventions resulted in no apparent behavior change render the effect of the intervention questionable.

To conclude, Lancioni (1982) identified similar stimulus conditions across settings as a necessary component for the acquisition of an appropriate social repertoire. The present study maximized those similarities and found no effect. Although similar stimulus conditions are probably a necessary component, a closer examination of extraneous variables is required before an effective technology of social behavior can be developed. The following analysis offers a more detailed examination of those variables.
CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN INTERACTIVE BEHAVIOR

To further our understanding of social behavior, the following theoretical analysis takes a closer look at the factors governing social behavior. Included in this discussion are: (a) the history of the individual, (b) antecedential variables, (c) consequential variables, and (d) dimensions of responding.

History

Desirable and aversive behavioral consequences determine, in part, the nature and frequency of future responding. For example, if crying results in food or mother's caress, the strength of that response may increase under similar circumstances. As the child grows and is exposed to a wide variety of contingencies, an effective interactive repertoire is shaped.

If for some reason that repertoire is not acquired, the individual will be less able to take advantage of potentially reinforcing occasions. Hence, social skills training has been developed whereby an appropriate interactive repertoire improves through behavioral rehearsal, modeling, corrective feedback and reinforcement.
However, to be effective, a social skills deficit must exist before social skills training can increase appropriate interactive behavior. It is difficult to determine if this was the case in the above experiment. Reports indicated that parental consequation of desired behavior was inconsistent, and inappropriate behavior was reinforced. For example, tantrum behavior (i.e., screaming, kicking, crying) often resulted in avoidance of chores.

But this does not necessarily mean that an appropriate interactive repertoire was not shaped or maintained at other times. Nearly immediate acquisition of desired behavior during training would suggest that much of that repertoire already existed. In addition, interactive behavior observed in vivo is not necessarily a measure of one's social skills. An individual may not be operating under contingencies which result in reinforcing events upon exhibiting elements of that repertoire. The same criticism also applies to testing measures such as role-playing or paper-and-pencil tests. Although responding may appear to indicate a skills deficit, one cannot be sure the stimulus conditions found in a testing setting will evoke desired behavior even though the behavior is part of the individual's repertoire.

In the present study, continued practice may have
been aversive and may have provided the incentive needed to maintain desired performance in training. If so, the subject did not receive the same incentives in vivo. Therefore, the appropriate behavior did not occur.

A better test of the existence of a social skills repertoire might be to examine the person's history to see if the desired behavior were ever exhibited; and if so, under what conditions. This could possibly save much time and effort trying to teach a set of skills that already exists. Unfortunately, there are two drawbacks. First, as alluded to previously, one may not have access to an accurate account of that history. And second, the repertoire could have extinguished due to a lack of maintaining contingencies. However, if a social skills repertoire does exist, the problem is then a matter of arranging contingencies in the current environment so that the behavior occurs. The following section discusses the elements of these contingencies.

Antecedental Variables

Interactive responding is generally only rewarded under particular stimulus conditions. Although there is a wide variety, others' vocal behavior is the most obvious stimulus. "What are you doing?" is a discriminative stimulus in which the response (or lack of response) is likely to result in a certain consequence. Responses that
have resulted in desirable outcomes in the past are most likely to recur, while those consequated with undesirable events are least likely to recur.

The ease of which eye contact and facial expressions is under stimulus control is slightly more complex. Unlike vocal behavior, which affects auditory receptors regardless of one's ear orientation, the sight of another's eye, or to a lesser extent, a particular facial expression, is a stimulus only when another person is looking back. The next section takes a closer look.*

If, in the past, person B's eye orientation and facial expression directed towards person A have been precursors for either desirable or aversive events for A, and if A's behavior can affect that event, A would be reinforced for attending to the presence or absence of that stimulus. For example, if person B verbally reprimands person A, and if person A can avoid the reprimand by leaving the room, A will soon learn to glance, use peripheral vision, or attempt direct eye contact to come in touch with the discriminative stimulus (i.e., B's looking behavior) or S-Delta (B's other, irrelevant behavior).

*For this discussion, person A will be the person whose behavior we are trying to analyze, and person B, the person with whom A is interacting.
Probably more prevalent, is the case where person B's eye orientation towards A serves as a discriminative stimulus for a desirable event for A. As in the above examples, A may make glances, use peripheral vision, or attempt direct eye contact with person B when B's behavior can be reinforcing. If the desirable event from A—a smile perhaps—is contingent upon say, eye contact with a, we would expect A's "looking" behavior to be maintained.

Note also that eye contact and facial expressions may themselves be rewarding. They acquire conditional reinforcement properties through numerous instances of being paired with events such as smiles and desirable vocal behavior, or even the removal of aversive events (e.g. when one stares at an unwanted person long enough and they turn away).

Given the history of inconsistent consequation in the current study, it would follow from our analysis that parental eye contact and facial expressions have not been paired with desirable events; and hence, have not acquired conditioned reinforcement properties. Therefore, one would expect that interactive behavior which usually results in these events would be low (at least in the presence of the subject's parents).

As for classroom interactions, the behavior of the previously mentioned domineering peer may have served a
similar role. It is then plausible to suggest that the effects of these interactions generalized to all interactions. Then when the domineering peer left, interactive behavior with others resulted in the presentation of reinforcing events.

Next, third party behavior may also serve as a discriminative stimulus. For example, if a teacher reprimands a student, and the student has a history of sullenness upon such occasions, the reprimand might serve as a discriminative stimulus. It may indicate to another student sitting in front of the reprimanded student (with a history of interacting with the reprimanded student) that an interaction with that student would not be desirable. All of this could occur independently of any observation of the reprimanded student. Thus, the teacher's behavior is the discriminative stimulus.

And finally, extraneous variables may also affect potential for reinforcement. The sight of a tragic incident, a joyous occasion, the common experience of unusual stimulation (e.g., an earthquake) all serve as stimuli in the presence of which particular behavior patterns are generally reinforced. To use the previous example, perhaps the sullen student always becomes elated when the lunch bell rings (extraneous variable). Thus, the ringing of the bell serves as a discriminative
stimulus for initiating an interaction, since in the past interactions were reinforced under these conditions.

Consequential Variables

If stimulus conditions are such that A behaves in a way which results in the presentation of a desirable event or removal of an aversive event by B, the behavior which A exhibits will be reinforced. For example, a smile in the presence of B results in reinforcing praise. We might now predict that person A will respond to gain access to B, under relevant motivational conditions (i.e., when B's praise is reinforcing).

On the other hand, we would not expect A to make a response that results in B's presence if, in the past, it has resulted in an aversive event that could only be removed by interacting with B. For example, suppose a teacher's lecture (aversive event) may be interrupted by interacting with the teacher. One would not expect responding to occur that results in the teacher's presence just so a second behavior could terminate the lecture.

Dimensions of Responding

The next section takes a look at the dimensions of responding. Given a stimulus change for person A, A can: (a) make no response, (b) make an overt response, (c) make a covert response or response analogy, or (d) make a
covert response/response analogy and an overt response.

The first instance describes a case where an individual does not attend to a given stimulus. This occurs in everyday life when somebody says something and we do not respond simply because we "were not listening." This usually occurs when we are involved in another activity offering strong reinforcement for attending to that activity only. This is also a characteristic of some forms of psychotic behavior where attending has been punished to the extent that stimuli seldom, if ever, evoke an overt response.

Second, one may simply make an overt response (e.g., ask a question) which is in turn a discriminative stimulus for another's behavior (e.g., answer the question). This is probably most likely to occur when person A has a strong interactive behavioral repertoire (i.e., history of being reinforced for exhibiting interactive responses.)

Third, as a result of B initiating an interaction, an individual may make a covert response or response analogy.* Such behavior is likely to occur when an individual has a history of being reinforced for attending

*A covert response is the same as an overt response but is at such low strength that it is undetectable by others (e.g., speaking so low that one's larynx is moving, but not at a sound producing level). Response analogies include such behavior as imagery or thinking. This type of behavior, no matter how strong, cannot serve as a stimulus for others. (in general). If individuals can increase reinforcement
by responding, they will have to make that response (e.g. thoughts) will remain at the covert or response analogy level. For example, teachers might not be reinforced for overtly reacting to a student's inappropriate behavior, so they might covertly respond, "I wish he would stop," but make no overt response detectable to the child.

Fourth, an individual may make a covert response followed by an overt response. This often occurs when speaking. For example, one may answer a question "to himself" (response analogy) perhaps edit it, then make the improved response at the overt level.

Conclusion

In conclusion, only with a closer examination of the history of individuals and contingencies controlling behavior in the present environment can we arrive at a thorough understanding of social behavior. The author believes that too often a dearth of appropriate social behavior is presumed to be an indication of a social skills deficit.

It may be that massed social skills training requires less response effort and is, therefore, more economical than a detailed analysis of the history and controlling variables for each individual exhibiting inappropriate interactions. However, such an approach has a deleterious
effect on the development of a science of social behavior. Therefore, for the practitioner, such a strategy may be useful as a first attempt to bring about a desired behavior change. But for scientific inquiry, the procedure suffers from a superficial analysis of the variables affecting social behavior.

As an alternative the author suggests increased emphasis on the study of past and present variables controlling behavior in vivo. As a result, a desired behavior change can be programmed by establishing effective contingencies. In other words, it is suggested that future research should focus more on the contingencies which control social behavior in vivo rather than the development of the topographical features of that behavior in the laboratory.
APPENDIX

ROLE-PLAY SITUATIONS

1) You are watching a movie in the other class and you go out to get a drink of water. When you come back Jon is sitting in your seat.

Prompt: (Peer is sitting in seat pretending to watch a movie.)

*Appropriate Verbal: Response must indicate that the seat belongs to the subject.

2) You are up to bat in gym class and the pitcher keeps throwing bad pitches. How do you respond when the pitcher says . . .

Prompt: "Why didn't you hit it? That was a good pitch.

Appropriate Verbal: Response must indicate that a new pitch is desired, and must not refer to the student's ability to pitch, e.g., "I am waiting for a better pitch." "The pitches could be better." "Please pitch it again."

3) You are running to home plate and one of the students hits you with the ball when he should have tagged you with the ball.

Prompt: "Got you!"

Appropriate Verbal: Response must indicate undesirability of throwing the ball, e.g., "Please don't throw the ball," "You are not allowed to throw the ball."

4) You are wearing a new jacket to school. How do you respond when one of the students says . . .

*Verbal responses have to be similar to those provided, but not verbatim.
Prompt: "Hey, that's really nice."

Appropriate Verbal: Response must contain some form of "thank you."

5) You are eating lunch and someone offers you a candy bar, but you don't really want it. How do you respond when they smilingly say . . .

Prompt: "Here, have a candy bar."

Appropriate Verbal: Response must contain some form of "thank you."

6) You've just helped one of the other students complete a math problem they could not do on their own. How do you respond when they smilingly say . . .

Prompt: "I understand it now. Thanks a lot."

Appropriate Verbal: Response must include some form of "you're welcome."

7) You've earned 600 points this morning and everybody has been congratulating you on your accomplishment. However, your getting tired of it. How do you respond when the sixth student, unknowing that you are tired of the praise says...

Prompt: "Wow, that is great, congratulations!"

Appropriate Verbal: Response must contain some form of "thank you."

8) You are talking with one of your friends at gym and another student keeps talking with you and interrupting your conversation. What do you do when he anxiously says . . .

Prompt: "Would you listen to me?"

Appropriate Verbal: Response must indicate that the student is talking with someone else, e.g., "I'm talking to someone else, please don't interrupt." "I'll talk to you in a minute, when I'm finished."
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