Tip Sheet: Compliance Strategies

Rationale
The use of positive behavior supports (PBS) is mandated by federal law (IDEA, 2004). Within PBS, there are three tiers of support with corresponding goals and activities:
(Lewis & Sugai, 1999)
- o Tier 1 - Prevent academic and behavior problems: school wide academic & behavior interventions;
- o Tier 2 - Prevent the development of more serious problems and improve problem behavior: target interventions for students not responding to Tier 1;
- o Tier 3 - Decrease impact of antisocial behavior on a student's daily functioning: develop individualized intervention to meet the unique needs of student.

Using effective compliance strategies can facilitate the goals at all three tiers of PBS, especially at Tiers 1 and 2.

Give Effective Commands

Definition of Noncompliance: There are four types of noncompliance (Walker et al., 2004)
- Passive noncompliance: student simply does not to perform requested behavior but is not overtly noncompliant (simply ignores directive – not angry or hostile).
- Simple refusal: student acknowledge the direction but indicates via words or gestures that he/she does not intend to comply – not angry unless command persists or there are adult attempts to force the issues.
- Direct defiance: student displays hostility, anger, overt resistance and attempts to intimidate.
- Negotiation: student attempts to bargain, compromise; proposes alternative solutions.

By addressing noncompliance at the early stage, teachers can prevent the escalation of more serious behaviors.

Strategies (Walker et al., 2004)
- Only give as many commands as needed (decreased compliance occurs with increases in the number of commands given)
- Obtain student attention and eye contact
- Use more "initiating: (or "start") commands versus "terminating (or "stop") commands
- Deliver one directive or command at a time – for tasks with multiple steps, give a separate command for each step
- Use clear, concise, and specific language ("alpha" commands)
- Allow time for student to comply
- Only give the command two times – if not followed after second time, provide consequence for noncompliance
- Give direction from a distance of three feet.
- Use a matter-of-fact and nonemotional tone of voice (do not yell, plead or threaten)
- Reinforce compliance!

Literature to support the use of effective commands (Neef et al., 1983; Walker, 1995; Walker, et al., 2004; Walker & Walker, 1991)

Use Precision Requests

Definition: A method for delivering teacher directions to prompt compliance and consistently follow up noncompliance (Jenson & Reavis, 1997).

Steps (Jenson, & Reavis, 1997)
1) 1st request for compliance using "Please" and characteristics of effective commands
2) Wait 5 seconds – if there is compliance: REINFORCE!
3) Noncompliance: Repeat request using signal words: You **need** to …"
4) Compliance: REINFORCE!
5) Noncompliance: mild preplanned negative consequence (e.g., loss of opportunity to earn token for that time period)

Evidence: DeMartini-Scully et al., 2000; Kehle et al., 2000; Mackay et al., 2001; Musser et al., 2001; Neville & Jenson, 1984
Note: Consider using Precision Requests in combination with other strategies as part of a multicomponent intervention (e.g., Kehle et al., 2000)

Engage in Active Supervision

Definition – "those behaviors displayed by supervisors designed to encourage more appropriate student behavior and to discourage rule violations" (Lewis, Sugai, & Colvin, 2000; p. 110)

Implementation (Lewis, et al., 2000)
- Monitor large, common areas (e.g., gym, hallway, playground)
- Move and interact with students
- Scan: correct inappropriate behavior and reinforce appropriate behavior

Evidence: Colvin et al., 1997; De Pry & Sugai, 2002; Lewis et al., 2000; Schuldheisz & van der Mars, 2001

Offer Choices

Definition: Offering a student two or more options and allowing student to independently select an options

- Choice can provide students an opportunity to have control over their environments
- Choice can be used to encourage and support appropriate behaviors and academic growth in a variety of ways for students without disabilities and with high incidence and severe disabilities:
  - Choice of routine activity and steps within activity (Dibley & Lim, 1999)
  - Choice of academic task (Dunlap et al., 1994)
  - Choice of task sequence for students with EBD (Jolivette et al., 2001)
  - Choice of math intervention for general education students (Carson & Eckert, 2003)
  - Choice of task and reinforcement for students with severe disabilities (Cosden et al.,

1995)
- *Also see Morgan (2006) for classroom application.*

Evidence: see above

Use High Probability Request Sequence (HPRS)

Definition (Oliver & Skinner, 2003):
- The presentation of a series of directions that a student is likely to perform (i.e., high-p command) delivered immediately before a request that a student is less likely to perform (i.e., low-p command)
    - "High-p" teacher commands = 80% or better compliance
    - "Low-p" teacher commands = 40-50% or less
- Using a series of high-p requests to build behavioral momentum in order to increase the probability of compliance with the low-p request
- The high probability request sequence establishes a learning history

Steps (Davis, 1995)
1) Deliver a series of three to five high-p commands at a rapid pace
2) Provide praise for each performance of the high-p command
3) Deliver a low-p command
4) Provide praise for the performance of the low-p request

Example: A teacher can ask a student to give me five, touch your nose, clap your hands (high-p commands) just before directing the student to get out her textbook (low-p command).

Evidence:
Demonstrated effectiveness across academic settings (inclusion and special education classrooms) and across different disabilities, including students with severe disabilities as well as young children without disabilities (e.g., Lee, 2005; Davis et al., 1993; Davis & Brady, 1994; Davis & Reichle, 1996; Jung et al., 2008; Wehby & Hollahan, 2000).

References

Carson, P. M., & Eckert, T. L. (2003). An experimental analysis of mathematics instructional components: Examining the effects of student- selected versus empirically selected interventions. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 12, 35-54.*

Colvin, G., Sugai, G., Good, R. H., III, & Lee, Y-Y. (1997). Using active supervision and precorrection to improve transition behaviors in an elementary school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 12,* 344-361.

Cosden, M., Gannon, C., & Haring, T. G. (1995). Teacher-control versus student-control over choice of tasks and reinforcement for students with severe behavior problems. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 5, 11-27.*

Davis, C. A. (1995). Peer as behavior change agents for preschoolers with behavioral disorders. *Preventing School Failure*, *39*(4), 4-9.

Davis, C. A., & Brady, M. P. (1993). Expanding the utility of behavioral momentum with young children: Where we've been, where we need to go. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *17*, 211-223.

Davis, C. A., Brady, M. P., Hamilton, R., McEvoy, M. A., & Williams, R. E. (1994). Effects of high-probability requests on the social interactions of young children with severe disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *27*, 619-637.

Davis, C. A., & Reichle, J. (1996).Variant and invariant high probability requests: Increasing appropriate behaviors in children with emotional-behavioral disorders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 29,* 471–482.

De Martini-Scully, D., Bray, M. A., & Kehle, T. J. (2000). A packaged intervention to reduce disruptive behaviors in general education students. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 149–156.

De Pry, R. L., & Sugai, G. (2002). The effect of active supervision and pre-correction on minor behavioral incidents in a sixth grade general education classroom. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 11*, 255-264.

Dunlap, G., DePerezel, M., Clarke, S., Wilson, D., Suzanne, W., White, R., et al. (1994). Choice making to promote adaptive behavior for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27, 505-518.*

Dunlap, G., DePerezel. M., Clarke, S., Wilson, D., Suzanne, W., White, R., et al. (1994). Choice making to promote adaptive behavior for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27, 505-518.*

Jenson, W. R., & Reavis, H. K. (1997). Contracting to enhance motivation. In H. K. Reavis et al., (Eds.)*, Best practices: Behavioral and educational strategies for teachers* (pp. 65-71). Longmont, CA: Sopris West.

Jolivette, K., Wehby, J., Canale, J., & Massey, N. G. (2001). Effects of choice-making opportunities on the behavior of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 26*, 131-145.

Jung, S., Sainato, D. M., & Davis, C. A. (2008). Using high-probability request sequences to increase social interactions in young children with autism, *Journal of Early Intervention, 30*(3), 163-187.

Kehle, T. M., Bray, M. A., Theodore, L., & Jenson, W. R. (2000). A multi-component intervention designed to reduce disruptive classroom behavior. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 474-481.

Lee. D. L. (2005). A quantitative synthesis of applied research on behavioral momentum. *Exceptionality. 13.* 141-154.

Lewis, T., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (2000). The effects of pre-correction and active supervision on the recess behavior of elementary students. *Education and Treatment of Children, 23*(2), 109-121.

Mackay, S., McLaughlin, T. F., Weber, K., & Derby K. M. (2001). The use of precision requests to decrease noncompliance in the home and neighborhood: A case study. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 23*(3), 41-50.

Morgan, P. (2006). Increasing task engagement using preference or choice-making: Some behavioral and methodological factors affecting Their efficacy as classroom interventions. *Remedial and Special Education 27*(3), 176-187.

Musser, E. H., Bray, M. A., Kehle, T. J., & Jenson, W. R. (2001). Reducing disruptive behaviors in students with serious emotional disturbance. *Journal of School Psychology Review, 30*, 294-304.

Musser, E. H., Bray, M. A., Kehle, T. J., & Jenson, W. R. (2001). Employing precision requests and antecedent strategies to educe disruptive behavior in students with social and emotional disorders: A replication. School Psychology Review. 30, 294-304.

Neef, N. A., Shafer, M. S., Egel, A. L., Cataldo, M. F., & Parrish, J. M. (1983). The class specific effects of compliance training with "do" and "don't" requests: Analogue analysis and classroom application. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 16*, 81-99.

Neville, M. H., & Jenson, W. R. (1984). Precision commands and the "Sure I Will" program: A quick and efficient compliance training sequence. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 6*, 61-65.

Oliver, R. & Skinner, C. H. (2003). Applying behavioral momentum to increase compliance: Why Mrs. H. RRReved up the elementary students with the Hokey-Pokey. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19,* 75-94.

Schuldheisz, J.M., & van der Mars, H. (2001). Active supervision and students' physical activity in middle school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21,* 75-90.

Walker, H. M. (1995). The acting out child: Coping with classroom disruption. Longmont, CA: Sopris West.

Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2004). *Antisocial behavior in school: Evidenced-based practices* (2nd ed.). Belmont. CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Walker, H, M., & Walker, J, (1991). *Coping with noncompliance in the classroom: A positive approach for teachers*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Wehby, J, H., & Hollahan, M. S. (2000). Effects of" high-probability requests on the latency to

initiate academic tasks. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 33.* 259-262.

Yeager, C., & McLaughlin, T. F. (1995). Use of a time-out ribbon and precision requests to improve child compliance in the classroom: A case study. *Child and Family Therapy, 17*(4), 1-10.