

International Encyclopedia of Rehabilitation

Copyright © 2010 by the Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange (CIRRIE).

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system without the prior written permission of the publisher, except as permitted under the United States Copyright Act of 1976.

Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange (CIRRIE)
515 Kimball Tower
University at Buffalo, The State University of New York
Buffalo, NY 14214
E-mail: ub-cirrie@buffalo.edu
Web: <http://cirrie.buffalo.edu>

This publication of the Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange is supported by funds received from the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research of the U.S. Department of Education under grant number H133A050008. The opinions contained in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of CIRRIE or the Department of Education.

Self Evaluation and Visual Impairment

Divya Jindal-Snape
School of Education, Social Work and Community Education
University of Dundee
Nethergate
Dundee, Scotland
<http://www.dundee.ac.uk/eswce/staff/djindalsnape.php>

Introduction

Self-evaluation is a comparison between the individual's own performance and the performance criterion (Spates and Kanfer, 1977). It has been suggested that it is the most important, yet least researched, component of the self-regulation model proposed by Kanfer. Cartledge and Milburn (1986) have pointed out that self-evaluation refers to the comparison between self-observed behavior and the criteria or performance standard an individual sets for the behavior. In self-evaluation the child gets a chance to develop according to his own pace. The criterion for comparison is set by the child, himself. He compares his present behavior with his own previous behavior rather than with somebody else's. Rather than being controlled by someone else he controls his own behavior. Self-evaluation addresses the concept of 'rights of the child'. Hence, it is directly related to the concept of Quality of Life. Further, self-evaluation is a technique that has been effectively used in the peer-mediated approach as a means of increasing social interaction (Sainato, Goldstein and Strain, 1992). According to Sainato et al. (1992), self-evaluation facilitates generalization programming. They further suggested that future research should investigate the usefulness of self-evaluation procedures for generalization programming of peers' social interactions.

Although self-management and self-evaluation was used effectively to generalize and maintain social skills of children, and was also recommended by researchers working with individuals with visual impairment (DeMario and Crowley, 1994; McAdam et al., 1993; Storey and Gaylord-Ross, 1987), no attempt was made to assess the effectiveness of self-evaluation for the improvement, generalization and maintenance of social skills of children with visual impairment. Therefore, it was not clear whether self-evaluation would be effective with them as well or not. In addition, if it was effective, what form would it take? Would there be any differences in the method of self-evaluation? Would any modifications be necessary? This research (which was conducted as 6 studies of single case multiple baseline designs between 1994 and 1996 in inclusive schools in New Delhi, India; see Jindal, 1997) attempted to clarify these points and several key findings were made, as discussed below. Further, it suggested some aspects of self-evaluation which were never pointed out before, hence extending the concept of self-evaluation to include the role of the environment. For further information on multiple baseline designs, please refer to Kazdin (1982).

Studies: Results and Discussion

A summary of these studies is available in [Table 1](#).

Study 1: Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills of Girls with Visual Impairment using Different Strategies

In Study 1, based on the review of Chandler, Lubeck and Fowler (1992), multiple generalization-promotion strategies were used, namely reinforcing generalization, training loosely, multiple exemplars, prompting, positive reinforcement, etc. Although the target behaviors improved during training, generalization and maintenance were observed only in the case of stereotypic behavior (Jindal and Kato, 1994). Therefore, despite using various strategies, generalization and maintenance could not be achieved. All the strategies used in Study 1 had one factor in common, i.e., all the strategies were administered by external agents. The most important factor, i.e., the child herself was not given a chance to control her behavior. Study 1 suggested that for generalization and maintenance of social skills, the child himself/herself should control his/her own behavior.

Study 2: Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills by a Child with Visual Impairment using Self-evaluation Procedures: Transfer of Control from External to Internal

In Study 2, three phases of external reinforcement, peer-evaluation, and self-evaluation were conducted. It was seen that although peer-evaluation was equally effective in improving social skills, self-evaluation was more effective in generalizing and maintaining them (Jindal-Snape, Kato and Maekawa, 1998). During the phase of external reinforcement, there was no generalization or maintenance. This study contradicted the results of a study by Fowler (1986), in which peer-monitoring and self-monitoring procedures were compared. Her results indicated that improvements achieved during peer-monitoring were maintained for the most part during self-monitoring, but inappropriate behaviors did not reduce any further. However, in Study 2 it was found that the inappropriate behavior declined considerably during the self-evaluation phase. Further, the child (Child D) was also able to discriminate the time, place and type of behaviors which are acceptable and unacceptable, during the self-evaluation phase.

Another important implication of this study was the importance of appropriate feedback. It was seen that after experiencing feedback during the peer-evaluation phase, Child D asked peers for feedback for direction of gaze during the self-evaluation phase, even though he was not prompted to do so. This study suggested that self-evaluation was effective in generalizing and maintaining social skills of children with visual impairment. However, as peer-evaluation might have played a role in the effectiveness of self-evaluation, in Study 3 it was removed to see the role of self-evaluation more clearly.

Study 3: Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills of a Girl with Visual Impairment using Self-evaluation Procedures: Effect of Prior Verbalization

In Study 3, three phases of external reinforcement, self-evaluation with prior verbalization, and self-evaluation without prior verbalization were conducted. Again, it was observed that although external reinforcement helped in the modification of behavior initially, treatment gains could not be generalized or maintained. Further, not only was

there greater improvement during the self-evaluation phase, but also the treatment gains generalized and maintained. No difference was found in the phases of self-evaluation with prior verbalization and self-evaluation without prior verbalization. However, the child (Child Y) was observed to try to verbalize before the daily sessions started in the phase of self-evaluation without prior verbalization. Therefore, although it is possible that verbalization plays some role in the effectiveness of self-evaluation, it is difficult to say so on the basis of this study alone (Jindal-Snape, 2003). Nevertheless, this study also proved the effectiveness of self-evaluation in the generalization and maintenance of social skills.

In Study 3, external reinforcement was used initially as suggested by Storey and Gaylord-Ross (1987), and it also helped in modifying the behavior. Therefore, it was considered necessary to examine the effectiveness of self-evaluation in improving, generalizing, and maintaining social skills of children with visual impairment by itself.

Study 4: Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills of Children with Visual Impairment: Self-evaluation and Role of Feedback

Study 4 was conducted with phases of self-evaluation only (Jindal-Snape, 2004). As mentioned earlier, in Study 2 Child D was observed to ask for feedback related to his direction of gaze. In Study 3, it was observed that although the treatment gains generalized to other behaviors, they did not seem to generalize to direction of gaze. On the basis of these findings from Studies 2 and 3, the necessity of feedback for direction of gaze was also studied in Study 4. Study 4 suggested that self-evaluation could improve, generalize and maintain social skills of children with visual impairment, even in the absence of external reinforcement. Further, it implied that feedback was necessary for improving direction of gaze, and also for accurate self-evaluation related to it. It also suggested that it might not be necessary for social skills like those related to conversation and on-task behavior where the consequences of his behavior are clear to a child with visual impairment. In other words, it implied that for children with visual impairment, feedback is essential for improvement and accurate self-evaluation of social skills requiring visual feedback, for example skills such as appropriate direction of gaze. Further, Study 4 suggested that this feedback can be provided by a trainer or other external agents, and can be effective in bringing about positive changes in behavior. However, when given in this way, it may not only obstruct generalization and maintenance, but the child might also consider it to have been imposed on him. Therefore, this feedback might be more effective if provided naturally by the significant others in the environment. However, during the studies there was evidence that environment fails to give this feedback. Therefore, the conclusions drawn on the basis of Studies 1 to 4 are that self-evaluation is more effective than any other strategy for improving, generalizing and maintaining social skills of children with visual impairment.

These studies pointed towards a difference in the concept of self-evaluation, that is, although till now self-evaluation has been considered to be a way of giving feedback to oneself (Cartledge and Milburn, 1986), it was found that self-evaluation did not provide feedback per se. It made the child more aware of its presence, and that this feedback is actually provided by the environment as a natural consequence for the emitted behavior.

For some behaviors, due to certain limitations, the child may not be able to pick up this feedback correctly, leading to inaccurate self-evaluation. For example a child with visual impairment is unable to self-evaluate correctly as to whether or not he was looking in the direction of the person he was conversing with. Usually, the other person also looking away might be the natural consequence or feedback, which the child with visual impairment is unable to observe. The second natural feedback might be that the other person stops talking or stops answering, when not looked at. This can be observed usually when there are only two individuals at the scene, a child with visual impairment and his sighted peer. The conversation which initially starts with a prompt from the teacher or trainer recedes after a minute or two (as seen with all the children who participated in these studies). If there are more than two children, the conversation continues, but with almost no active participation from the child with visual impairment, and he is at a loss to understand the reason. Therefore, for such behaviors, it is necessary that feedback be provided concretely and clearly by the environment. Further, when thinking about self-evaluation for children with visual impairment, it is important to remember that although they can improve, generalize and maintain most social skills, there are some social skills which require visual cues that are difficult for them to pick up. According to MacCuspie (1996, p. 37), "Limited access to both learning and using visual cues can be observed to detract from the social development of children with visual impairment from a very early age." Similarly, nonverbal communication and feedback, which are important components of social interaction, are available to sighted children but are not easy for children with visual impairment to follow. It has been observed that the significant others in the environment (e.g., teachers, peers, family), unless prompted, fail to supply feedback that is meaningful to an individual with visual impairment (Jindal-Snape, 2004). Not receiving this feedback to reinforce appropriate behavior or to discourage those that are seen to be inappropriate, put children with visual impairment at a disadvantage (MacCuspie, 1996). This limited feedback from the environment that these children receive can affect their attainment of social skills, e.g., initiating and maintaining interactions, and using direction of gaze to show willingness to engage (McGaha and Farran, 2001). Therefore, it is difficult for them to not only improve their behavior but also self-evaluate accurately. Thus, it can be concluded that although self-evaluation is effective in generalizing and maintaining social skills, it is necessary to increase adequate and meaningful feedback from the environment, and to provide it through natural contingencies and by the agents present in the child's natural environment.

On the basis of the above-mentioned studies and other studies, further studies were undertaken to increase feedback from the environment. There are two possible ways of increasing feedback from the environment, training the environment to provide feedback (e.g. Epstein and Borduin, 1984), and training the child to prompt the environment, so as to elicit this feedback (Mank and Horner, 1987).

Study 5: Training the Significant Others in the Environment to Provide Feedback

In Study 5, a child with visual impairment (Child R) self-evaluated his social skills, whereas a peer (Child Ko) was reinforced to provide feedback. It was observed that although self-evaluation was effective for correcting direction of gaze from the very

beginning, it became more effective with the introduction of feedback (Jindal-Snape, 2005a). Later on, despite inconsistencies in feedback, direction of gaze seemed to stabilize, suggesting that once Child R learnt to self-evaluate accurately, he could do it even without feedback from the environment. Further, as also seen in Study 6 with Child S, for social skills like on-task behavior, Child R did not need any external feedback, and he could self-evaluate accurately without it. This further lends support to the assumption that feedback from the environment is required only for social skills requiring vision. The trained peer, Child Ko started to give feedback even after the reinforcement phase was over. Further, providing of feedback generalized to a certain extent, as she was observed to give unprompted feedback to another child with visual impairment. However, this feedback fluctuated. It might suggest the necessity for using an agent present in the natural environment to prompt or reinforce for giving feedback.

Other peers were seen to model Child Ko in giving feedback. Even the peer who was not present when Child Ko was being trained for giving feedback, started to give feedback. This might suggest the possibility of peers modeling the teacher as well. Therefore, the role of the teacher in providing feedback becomes very important, and it suggests that teachers should provide adequate and appropriate feedback.

Study 6: Feedback from the Environment: Self-recruiting Feedback

In Study 6, a child with visual impairment self-evaluated his behavior and also prompted peers for feedback (Jindal-Snape, 2005b). The present study partially supports the findings of Mank and Horner (1987) that a self-recruited feedback package, which included self-monitoring and recruiting of feedback, was effective in not only increasing the social skills but also in maintaining them. However, the two studies differ in that they suggested recruiting feedback after self-monitoring and deciding the occurrence and appropriateness of the behavior, whereas in the present study recruiting it before self-evaluation is recommended. It was observed that although self-evaluation alone could increase the duration of desirable direction of gaze, it was further enhanced by the self-recruitment of feedback. Further, the child (Child S) recruited feedback not only when prompted but also in the next phase when there was no prompt by the trainer. Also, Child S was observed to recruit feedback from other peers, showing that recruitment of feedback generalized. Self-recruited feedback also enhanced the accuracy of self-evaluation. However, although self-recruitment of feedback generalized to other subjects and settings, Child S never recruited feedback for skills related to conversation. This suggests that for social skills like the ones used during conversation, the consequences such as response from peers might itself work as feedback, and no direct verbal feedback regarding the occurrence of behavior is necessary. It would be interesting to take another social skill requiring visual cues as non target behavior to confirm this finding.

This study brought out clearly the necessity of providing direct verbal feedback for accurate self-evaluation and modification of social skills requiring visual cues. Further, as assumed in the previous studies, the results suggest that for skills not requiring visual cues, where consequences in the form of others' behaviors are understandable even without vision, such as conversation, self-evaluation can be effective on its own. The results also suggest that self-recruitment of feedback is an effective way of gaining

feedback from the environment, as it generalizes to other settings and peers as well. That is, the child can recruit this feedback even in the absence of people present in the training setting, and also in a new setting. Further, not only did the peers start providing feedback, they also started providing information about the social environment (e.g., when somebody entered or left the room). Additionally, the other peers were seen to model the trained peers and provide feedback.

Therefore, Studies 5 and 6 suggested that feedback was effective in accurate self-evaluation of social skills requiring visual cues. In both the studies it was found that the accuracy of self-evaluation, and also social skills improved considerably after feedback from the peers. Further, once the children with visual impairment learned to perform the social behavior, and to self-evaluate accurately, they could continue to do so even in the absence of feedback. This suggests that with initial provision of feedback, the children can generalize and maintain their behavior even in the absence of significant others. However, much more generalization was seen in the case of Child S. This might be because here again the child was controlling the contingencies himself.

Further, it was observed in both cases, that non-trained peers also learnt to give feedback. It is possible that they did so through modeling and due to formation of rules. This suggests that if such feedback and information was provided by the teacher in the day to day life in a natural way, the children will also model it. This could save not only time and energy, but can also lead to the rapid and natural development of social skills.

Further, as also observed in Study 2, self-evaluation helps the child in becoming more aware of the environment, and he becomes more capable of looking for cues and feedback (Couch and Magrega, 1992). Therefore, self-evaluation helps a child in realizing that there are cues and feedback present in the environment on the basis of which he can modify his behavior.

Therefore, these studies provided evidence that self-evaluation is effective in improving, generalizing, and maintaining social skills. Although more evidence is necessary, the effectiveness of self-evaluation might be due to prior verbalization. Feedback picked up from the environment due to increased awareness of his own behavior and the consequences provided by the environment, and also control of the contingencies by the child himself might also play a role in the effectiveness of feedback. Feedback from the environment is necessary for accurate self-evaluation and modification of social skills by individuals. Especially in the case of children with visual impairment, it has to be provided adequately and in a way that is understandable to them. However, this feedback seems to be necessary only for social skills requiring visual cues. Further, once the child is able to modify a social skill and also learns to self-evaluate accurately, he can generalize and maintain it even in the absence of immediate feedback from the environment. It can be concluded that feedback from the environment is essential for social skills requiring visual cues and that it is the responsibility of the environment to provide it accurately and in an appropriate way. Both the strategies of providing feedback, that is, the child with visual impairment recruiting feedback, and also training the environment to provide feedback, were effective.

Unlike previous research that considered self-evaluation to function as feedback, this study suggests that self-evaluation is not feedback in itself. It makes the person self-evaluating more aware of the feedback that is actually supplied by the environment as consequences of his behavior. The consequences are the factor on the basis of which a person judges as to whether he could achieve the criteria he had set. A person cannot self-evaluate accurately without this feedback from others. It is in the absence of this feedback or in not recognizing this feedback that the self-evaluation process fails. Once this process is set right, no more intervention might be required as can be seen by the fact that behaviors generalized and also maintained even after eight months of intervention.

Conclusion

Although most researchers have considered self-evaluation to be feedback per se (Cartledge and Milburn, 1986), the present studies suggest that although self-evaluation might act as feedback at a later stage, it is actually the consequences of the behavior being evaluated that act as feedback initially. The consequences provided by the environment act as the feedback on which self-evaluation is based. The individual uses this feedback that is usually provided by the environment as natural consequences, to evaluate his behavior. The individual does not evaluate only by comparing the criteria and his behavior, he needs to know the consequences of the behavior, and he actually compares the criteria not with the behavior only but also with the feedback (in the form of natural consequences) as to whether or not he could perform the behavior, which also cue him to the appropriateness of his behavior. This conclusion was drawn, because in the case of behaviors where consequences could be understood easily, such as during conversation, the children with visual impairment did not have any problems in self-evaluation, but for behaviors for which usually the feedback provided by the environment is visual or nonverbal and difficult to pick up, children with visual impairment could not accurately self-evaluate. The behaviors that are particularly visual, for example smiling, direction of gaze, etc., have to be supported with cues and feedback that are non visual. It is necessary to analyze the non visual cues and feedback present in the natural environment that can be utilized by a child with visual impairment to facilitate accurate self-evaluation. Additionally, it is important to analyze the cues used by them, which lead to inaccurate self-evaluation. However, further investigation of this aspect is necessary to clarify this assumption.

Further, it was observed that not only the social skills but also self-evaluation generalized to other settings and maintained over time. It is likely that there were some natural contingencies in the environment that led to the generalization and maintenance of self-evaluation, namely social reinforcement. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate these contingencies, as they may play an important role in generalization and maintenance per se.

In Study 1, it was seen that although social behaviors did not maintain after an intervention consisting of reinforcement, prompting and peer-evaluation, stereotypic behaviors maintained at low levels. Further investigation of the reasons behind this finding is warranted. Additionally, an interesting issue here seems to be that the initial

evaluation by the peer of the opposite sex might have led to relatively better generalization in the case of Child Ka as compared to Child N. Further research regarding this factor might also be interesting.

In Study 3, it was observed that once the appropriate behavior increased during self-evaluation with prior verbalization, it also maintained during the phase of self-evaluation without prior verbalization. Since at times the target child (Child Y) tried to verbalize before self-evaluating in the third phase, it suggests that prior verbalization might have played some role. However, this role was not very clear and further investigation is necessary. Sainato et al. (1992) also suggested that a component analysis of self-evaluation should be done to determine the need of verbalization by children before performing a behavior.

In the present study, two strategies were used to increase the feedback from the natural environment, namely trainer reinforcing, and a child with visual impairment prompting the peers for feedback. Although partial generalization of feedback from the peers was observed, it might be more effective if the peers also self-evaluated their behavior. Training the environment to self-evaluate the giving of feedback and information might lead to more widespread generalization and maintenance.

It was observed that compared to Child R (Study 5), Child S (Study 6) who self-recruited feedback self-evaluated more accurately. Further, Child S modified his behavior much more than Child R could. It is possible that recruiting feedback might have made Child S feel more in control than Child R to whom feedback might have seemed to be imposed. It is necessary to investigate this in a multiple baseline design across subjects.

In Studies 5 and 6, it was seen that although neither group of peers provided any information about the social environment at the beginning of the study, Child S's peers started giving such information to a greater extent by the end of the study. It is possible that it was due to the fact that the situation was more natural as there was no prompt toward the peers from the trainer. Further, it might mean that peer-mediation is more effective than adult-mediation. It might be interesting to investigate this, especially because the information about the social environment might be important for the development of social skills.

Further, it is necessary to investigate the role of information about the social environment in the development of social skills. There were indications in the present study that it may play an important role in increasing social skills. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate these effects clearly by using a design in which increasing information about the social environment is the only strategy used. That is, an intervention for the environment with no intervention for the child with visual impairment.

In Studies 5 and 6, non trained peers were observed to model the trained peers in giving feedback. Although it is possible that modeling took place because the model was a peer, the possibility of children modeling the teacher cannot be ignored. Therefore, it is

imperative to investigate the role that a teacher can play in increasing feedback and information about the social environment from the peers.

In Study 6, intervention was first started for direction of gaze and then conversation. It was observed that the recruitment of feedback generalized to the setting and peers during the sessions of training for conversation. It might be interesting to see what happens if the child is first prompted to recruit feedback for conversation or some other similar behavior. Would it then generalize to direction of gaze? Or will the child consider it to be superfluous during the skills related to conversation and not learn it and generalize it to other skills?

Usually there is natural feedback available in the environment, like not answering when somebody's rude, ignoring a senseless statement, laughing when somebody makes a joke, etc. However, among these only a few might be meaningful and appropriate for a child with visual impairment. It might be useful to analyze this natural feedback present in the environment (meaningful to a child with visual impairment). It is necessary to increase this natural feedback, and also to analyze the natural contingencies of feedback. Also it is critical to analyze as to how this visual feedback can be converted into non visual feedback naturally.

References

- Cartledge G, Milburn JF. 1986. Teaching social skills to children: Innovative approaches. Second Edition. Pergamon Press: New York.
- Chandler LK, Lubeck RC, Fowler SA. 1992. Generalization and maintenance of preschool children's social skills: A critical review and analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 25(2):415-428.
- Couch RH, Magrega D. 1992. Feedback: A behavioral approach to adjustment services. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin* 25(3):89-92.
- DeMario NC, Crowley EP. 1994. Using applied behavior analysis procedures to change the behavior of students with visual disabilities: A research review. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 88(6):532-543.
- Epstein YM., Borduin, CM. 1984. "The children's feedback game": An approach for modifying disruptive group behaviour. *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 38(1):63-72.
- Jindal D, Kato M. 1994. Generalization and maintenance of social skills of visually impaired children. *Indian Journal of Disability and Rehabilitation* 8(1):1-12.
- Jindal, D. 1997. Generalisation and maintenance of social skills of children with visual impairment: Effectiveness of self-management procedures. Doctoral Thesis, University of Tsukuba, Japan.
<http://dspace.tulips.tsukuba.ac.jp/dspace/handle/2241/3357>

- Jindal-Snape D, Kato M, Maekawa H. 1998. Using self-evaluation procedures to maintain social skills in a child who is blind. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 92(5):362-366.
- Jindal-Snape D. 2003. Generalisation and maintenance of social skills of a girl with visual impairment using self-evaluation procedures. *Journal of Human Ergology* 32: 57-68. Also published in Japanese.
- Jindal-Snape D. 2004. Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills of Children with Visual Impairment: Self-evaluation and Role of Feedback. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 98(8):470-483.
- Jindal-Snape D. 2005a. Use of feedback from sighted peers in promoting social interaction skills. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 99(7): 403-412. Also in Spanish: El uso de la retroalimentación informativa de compañeros videntes para favorecer las habilidades de interacción social. *Entre dos mundos: Revista de traducción sobre discapacidad visual*, 2005, 29:5-14.
- Jindal-Snape D. 2005b. Self-evaluation and recruitment of feedback for enhanced social interaction by a student with visual impairment. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 99(8):486-498.
- Kanfer FH. 1977. The many faces of self-control, or behavior modification changes its focus. In R.B. Stuart, Editor, *Behavioral self-management* New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers. p 1-48).
- Kazdin A. 1982. *Single-Case Research Designs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mank, D.M., and Horner, R.H. (1987). Self-recruited feedback: A cost-effective procedure for maintaining behavior. *Research in Developmental Disabilities* 8(1):91-112.
- McAdam DB, O'Cleirigh CM, Cuvo AJ. 1993. Self-monitoring and verbal feedback to reduce stereotypic body rocking in a congenitally blind adult. *RE:view* 26(4):163-172.
- MacCuspie PA. 1996. Promoting acceptance of children with disabilities: From tolerance to inclusion. Nova Scotia : Atlantic Provinces Special Education Authority.
- McGaha CG, Farran DC. 2001. Interactions in an inclusive classroom: The effects of visual status and setting. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 95:80-94.
- Sainato DM, Goldstein H., Strain PS. 1992. Effects of self-evaluation on preschool children's use of social interaction strategies with their classmates with autism. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 25(1):127-141.

- Spates CR, Kanfer FH. 1977. Self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement in children's learning: A test of a multistage self-regulation model. *Behavior Therapy* 8:9-16.
- Storey K, Gaylord-Ross R. 1987. Increasing positive social interactions by handicapped individuals during a recreational activity using a multicomponent treatment package. *Research in Developmental Disabilities* 8:627-649.