Dolezal and Kurtz (2010). Evaluation of combined-antecedent variables on functional analysis results and treatment of problem behaviour in a school setting. *J Appl Behav Anal,* 43(2): 309-314.	RoBiNT score - 11/30
Method / Results	Rehabilitation Program

Method / Results

Design
- **Study Type:** SCD. Concurrent multiple baseline across the different antecedent demand conditions.
- **Population:** n=1. Kyle: male, age 13, with a TBI and moderate intellectual disability. He attended a special education classroom, and was provided one-on-one supervision by a classroom aide.
- **Setting:** Kyle's classroom during ongoing instruction using school staff as therapists.

Target behaviour measure/s:
- Frequency of problem behaviour (per minute) – aggression (scratching, hitting, biting, kicking, spitting at others, pulling hair), destruction and disruption (throwing and breaking objects, tipping over furniture, pounding fists on objects, and spitting).
- Frequency of communicative requests (verbal requests or card exchange) during treatment.

Primary outcome measure/s:
- No other standardised measure.

Results: During treatment in the demand condition, problem behaviour decreased to zero, mean rate of break requests was 0.29 per minute, and mean rate of work requests was 0.41 per minute. During functional communication training (FCT) treatment in the demand and diverted-attention condition, rate of problem behaviour decreased to a mean of 0.05 per minute and was not observed during the last two treatment sessions. Mean rate of requests for attention was 0.93 per minute, and mean rate of requests for breaks was 0.13 per minute.

Rehabilitation Program

Aim: To reduce problem behaviour in a classroom setting.

Materials: Not specified in report.

Treatment Plan:
- **Duration:** Not specified.
- **Procedure:** 7 sessions of structured descriptive assessment, 32 sessions of functional analysis (8-15) + treatment (FCT + Choice + Extinction).
- **Content:**
1. Structured descriptive assessment (SDA): Demand and toy-play conditions. Prior to each session, antecedent condition was explained and school staff were instructed to respond to problem behaviour as they typically would. Data collected on problem behaviour and staff consequences were used to calculate event-based probabilities.
2. Functional analysis: Based on SDA results, single-antecedent conditions (attention and escape) were compared to a combined-antecedent condition and a control condition (toy-play) using a multi-element design.
3. Treatment evaluation: A treatment package including functional communication training (FCT) in the form of verbal requests or touching cards, choice, extinction for both positive and negative reinforcement (i.e., attention and escape), and response cost for problem behaviour. Concurrent multiple baseline design across the two different antecedent demand conditions from the functional analysis.
4. Demand (single-antecedent) condition: The antecedent conditions identical to the demand (single-antecedent) functional analysis condition.
5. Demand and diverted-attention (combined-antecedent) condition: The antecedent conditions were identical to the demand and diverted-attention (combined-antecedent) functional analysis condition.

Note that these rehabilitation summaries reflect the current literature and the treatments are not necessarily endorsed by members of the NRED Team.