



<p>Feeney and Ylvisaker (1995). Choice and routine: Antecedent behavioural interventions for adolescents with severe traumatic brain injury. <i>J Head Trauma Rehabil</i>, 10(3): 67-86.</p>	<p><b>RoBiNT score</b> - 11/30</p>
<p>Method / Results</p>	<p>Rehabilitation Program</p>
<p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Study Type:</b> SCD. ABCA design. (A – baseline, B – intervention 1, C – intervention 2).</li> <li>• <b>Population:</b> n=3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mike: male, missing further information.</li> <li>○ Jim: male, age 18, widespread diffuse damage, including bilateral frontal lobe injury (automotive-bicycle accident).</li> <li>○ Joe: male, age 18, probable widespread diffuse damage, left frontal and left temporal focal signs (hit by a car).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Setting:</b> School.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target behaviour measure/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency of occurrence of specific challenging behaviours (e.g. physical or verbal aggression).</li> <li>• Percentage of assigned work completed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary outcome measure/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections of the Abberant Behaviour Checklist (ABCL).</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b> Visual inspection of graphed data showed the combination of behavioural and cognitive antecedent intervention procedures produced a sufficient reduction in aggressive behaviour to enable the participants to succeed in their educational and subsequent vocational programs. No statistical analysis was performed.</p>	<p><b>Aim:</b> To reduce the frequency and intensity of challenging behaviours that earlier resulted in educational and prevocational failure.</p> <p><b>Materials:</b> Photograph and written cues.</p> <p><b>Treatment Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Duration:</b> 4-5 weeks.</li> <li>• <b>Procedure:</b> 2-3 weeks in B condition, and 2 weeks in C condition. Sessions occurred during school day; Mike and Jim completed 22 sessions, Joe completed 20. Length and frequency of sessions not specified.</li> <li>• <b>Content:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>B: Picture routine</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participant’s daily routine was task analysed collaboratively by instructional staff, the consultant, and the participant. Decisions about amount of work to be completed negotiated between participant and staff (so participant was engaged in planning and decision-making).</li> <li>• Participants provided with photograph cues (participants engaged in their routines, identifying the parts of each activity as the indicators of specific behaviours that needed to complete an activity).</li> <li>• Verbal rehearsal at the beginning of every element of the routine and a review of performance after completion of every element (i.e. a plan-do-review routine).</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <u>C – Verbal routine</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differed from the B condition only in that written cues were substituted for photograph cues. They included an organized presentation of the tasks that needed to be completed and clear criteria for success.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>