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Purpose and Goals

• As the first dedicated Centre for Autism research, education and training in Ireland, ICAN provides a pivotal presence in the domain of **research, training and policy evaluation** in the expanding field of autism and neurodevelopmental research.

  Research on representative samples

  Intervention

  Policy Change

  Rapid injection of expertise within services
Centres
- Centre for Disability, Law and Policy
- Child and Family Research Centre
- Irish Centre for Social Gerontology
- Centre for Research on Occupational and Life Stress

Schools
- Psychology
- Medicine
- Sociology
- Education
- Economics
- Nursing
- Speech and Language Therapy
- Occupational Therapy
- Health Promotion

Research Institutions
- Lifecourse Institute
- Institute of Regenerative Medicine (REMEDI)
- Digital Enterprise Research Institute (DERI)
- Clinical Research Facility Galway (CRFG)

Research

Graduate Education

Professional Training

University Resources
1. Irish Autism Database and Repository (IADR)
2. Genetic and Stem Cell Research
3. Environmental Risk Factors
4. Neuroimaging Research
5. Behavioural Research
6. Autism Research across the Lifespan
7. Policy Change
First Prevalence Study in Ireland Launched
April 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2013

Population of 4.7 million ---
Over 200,000 diagnosed with Autism

Many argue that parents are denied access to an effective science for dealing with the condition.

Autism Speaks has recognised the urgent need at the national level to create a national register and database for all individuals on the spectrum. The Irish Autism Database and Repository (IADR) will be transformative in accelerating the pace of ASD research, by providing large datasets which will be shared among researches.
In collaboration with Autism Speaks ICAN will establish the Irish Autism Database and Repository Launch in June 2103

Two principle components:

• (1) An interactive electronic research database that will link researchers with individuals affected by ASD all over Ireland and

• (2) a bio-repository which will facilitate Irish researchers to conduct genetic and stem cell research
ABA Schools for Autism 1998-2012
• “My Department supports a multi-skills approach in regard to the education of children with ASD where a range of teaching methods are available e.g., Treatment and Education of Autistic and Related Communication Handicapped Children (TEACCH), Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA), Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS) etc.” (Minister Hanafin, Department of Education, Government of Ireland, 2006).

• "The Department of Education and Science's refusal to recognise the merit of the ABA method has more to do with institutional rigidities and conservatism within the civil service than a real honest and open evaluation of the effectiveness of the ABA method...We urge the Minister for Education [Mary Hanafin] to recognise the error of her ways and to take courage in her personal judgement and not be bullied by teachers' interests and civil service conservatism (Oppositional Minister, 2010)."
Story from the Republic of Ireland by Pat McCormack, parent of a child with autism and qualified teacher living in Dublin

From The Current Repertoire, Fall 2012, Newsletter of the Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies

“Why have they abandoned children with autism and denied them the right to ABA? Why has Ireland, when it stood on the cusp of making a great advance, turned back the clock? Why, almost twenty years after we had a Minister for Education stressing the need for "up to date data" is the current government following the example of its predecessor and pointedly ignoring the "data", the depth of international research that supports the effectiveness of ABA as an intervention for children with ASD as reflected in reports such as Maine and the National Standards Project”?
Thematic Areas of Research within ICAN

- Educational Risk and Prevention
- Review Articles
- Core symptoms and co-morbidity
- Communication
- Behavioural Interventions

Graduate Programmes

Examining Repertoires
Impact of Research from ICAN

Policy Change - Health Service Executive, Department of Education

Screening,
Behaviour Support,
Awareness and Training in EBP
Training in ABA technologies
Sustaining ABA in special education
Examination of Repertoires, Skills and Deficits in Autism
Patterns of Reading Ability in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder
Nally & Healy, 2012

- We investigated the heterogeneous nature of reading skills in children with ASD (N=95).
- Four components of reading skill were assessed:
  - word recognition,
  - Non-word decoding,
  - text reading accuracy and
  - text comprehension.

What are the levels of component reading skills?
- accuracy and comprehension
- ability to decode novel words
- discrepancy between chron. age and reading age
- do component reading skills have a tendency to develop out of step with each other?
Measures

**Reading Accuracy:**
- **Decoding:** *The Graded Nonword Reading Test*
- **Word Recognition:** *The British Ability Scales*
- **Connected Text:** *Neale Analysis of Reading Ability-II (NARA-II)*

**Reading Comprehension:**
- **NARA-II:** Some of the questions tapped literal understanding of the passage, whereas others required an inference to be made.

**Oral Language:**
- **Receptive vocabulary:** *British Picture Vocabulary Scale-II*
- **Comprehension:** subtest of WISC-IV
- **Nonverbal Ability:** Block Design subtest from the WISC-IV
Patterns of Reading Performance were determined by:

- ability to read aloud single words
- presented out of context, the ability to decode non-words,
- the ability to read connected text accurately and the ability
- to comprehend text.
Table 1 shows the correlation between the four components of reading skill. Although the tests inter-correlated at a statistically significant level, the correlations were modest in size and were smaller than those observed in samples of typically-developing children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word Reading</th>
<th>Nonword Reading</th>
<th>Text Reading</th>
<th>Comp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Reading</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39** (.83**)</td>
<td>.69** (.92**)</td>
<td>.275** (.75**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonword Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.310* (.79**)</td>
<td>.202* (.60**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.368** (.87**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05; ** P < .01
Word recognition (word reading) and phonological decoding (non-word reading) are not well linked in this group.

18.9% (N=18) Word Reading levels in normal range
2% Reading Comp. in normal range

**Decoding:**
15% 1SD below population norm
58% 2SD below norm

**Reading Comprehension:**
12% 1SD below population norm
68% 2SD below norm
Current Research, NUIG Millennium Grant
Funded: Nally & Healy based on statistics from previous sample:

A multisite cluster randomized design is underway examining the impact of behavioural reading curricula- Edmark Reading Programme (Manual & CAI) and MimioSprout (CAI) compared to usual reading intervention in Special Ed. schools.
The presence of co-occurring problems, such as conduct or behaviour disorders, can greatly impact the complexity of the core symptoms of the condition. It has been demonstrated that behavioural problems in autism are prevalent with a large number of studies identifying at least half of participants with autism engaging in one or more challenging behaviours.

The mean age of the sample was 8.5 years (S.D. = 2.17) with the age ranging from 3 to 14.2 years.
Murphy, Healy & Leader, (2009)

82% of participants (n = 144) displayed challenging behaviour

**Table 1**
Full sample characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No challenging behavior</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB, aggressive behavior and stereotyped behavior</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB/aggressive behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB and stereotyped behavior</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression and stereotyped behavior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyped behavior only</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Self-biting** was the most common form of SIB reported.
• **Hitting others/kicking others/grabbing/pulling others** were the most frequent aggressive behaviours reported.
• **Waving/Shaking arms/Having repetitive hand movements/rocking back and forth** were the most common repetitive behaviours.
• 174 participants with a diagnosis of autism
• The mean age of the sample was 8 years (SD = 2.38) ranging from 3 to 14 years.
• The mean age at diagnosis was 3 years (SD = 0.91) and ranged from 1 to 5 years.
### Table 1
Full sample characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenging behavior</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least one behavior</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three behaviors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyped behaviors</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive behaviors</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB and aggression</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIB and stereotyped behaviors</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression and stereotyped behaviors</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No challenging behaviors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Of the total sample (n=174) 148 *did not emit* challenging behaviour at diagnosis.

• Parents reported that these problem behaviours emerged subsequently and worsened when the children began school. 

    **Surprising??**
• We analysed challenging behaviours among participants with regard to **type of intervention received at diagnosis**.

• Results showed that those who received "eclectic" interventions at diagnosis scored **significantly higher** on the frequency and severity of self-injurious and stereotyped behaviours.

• We also analysed challenging behaviours among participants with regard to **change in intervention** received (intervention at diagnosis and current intervention).

• Results showed **significant differences in frequency and severity** of self-injurious, aggressive and stereotyped behaviours with those who had moved from "eclectic" interventions at diagnosis to ABA interventions currently having the highest rank score for all. Those who had moved from ABA to "eclectic" interventions scored the lowest.
The oral health status of children with Autism in Ireland (n=537) was examined and showed the current level of oral and dental care available to these children to be inadequate resulting in serious health consequences in terms of oral diseases.

- Almost 50% of 12- and 15-year olds with special needs required assistance with daily tooth brushing;
- Approximately 15% required urgent professional attention to their oral hygiene to avoid irreversible damage to the tissues;
- the levels of untreated dental trauma and treatment needed for dental trauma were higher among children with Autism than in the general population;
- 22% of the children required sedation and/or general anaesthesia (GA) to receive dental treatment.

Children and adolescents with special needs had greater need for oral hygiene support than their peers;
As a result of these data…

Current Research

(1) the effect of parent training in Behavioural Guideline Techniques (BGT) in increasing child participation in routine oral, dental care and problem prevention;

(2) the evaluation of BGT to improve child independence with daily oral hygiene in the home,

(3) the evaluation of BGT manuals and training protocols for dental professionals to improve knowledge of autism and compliance with dental examination and treatment in clinics.
These data were useful in convincing policy makers of the need for Applied Behaviour Analysis

- There is extensive evidence that behavioural approaches can bring about short and medium-term reductions with long-term effects also documented.

- Empirically validated ABA procedures have been demonstrated to be highly effective in managing such challenging behaviour.

- 42 of our graduates now work as BCBA specialists within the Health Service Executive assessing and treating challenging behaviour.

- These Behaviour Specialists are now being employed to improve curriculum content and teaching skills within Special Ed. schools.
• **Screening instruments for Autism** have been adopted for the first time in the West of Ireland. GPs and Public Health Nurses are administering the BISCUIT and POEMS in order to identify early signs.

• Children are referred to ICAN for further assessment, intervention and parent training.
Behavioural Interventions for Problem Behaviour in Autism
Determining Treatment Efficacy for Stereotypy/Repetitive Behaviour

Boyd, McDonough and Bodfish (2011) suggest that these behaviours can be categorized as follows:

- **stereotyped motor movements** such as body rocking or hand flapping, repetitive object manipulation, repetitive vocal or vocal stereotypy,
- **high-level repetitive behaviour** such as ordering, lining up,
- **repetitive self-injurious behaviour, dyskinesia and akathisia and obsessions and compulsions.**

- The authors also suggest that interventions and treatment of these behaviours can be determined by topography rather than function.
We conducted a review to determine treatment efficacy for stereotyped, repetitive, ritualistic, obsessive and compulsive behaviours in Autism along with an evaluation of function-based and non function-based treatment approaches to reduce these target behaviours.

Nineteen studies were identified for inclusion and were categorized as either function-based (n=10) or non function-based (n=9).
Function-based interventions:  Non-Function Based Interventions:

- RIRD
- NCR
- DR
- FCT
- Environmental Enrichment
- Functional Play

- RIRD
- Weighted Vests
- SIT
- Antecedent exercise
- Choice of activity and non-contingent attention
- Discrimination training and self management
Treatment Outcomes.

• Studies which used function-based treatments showed a mean reduction in stereotypy and repetitive behaviour of 58.64% (range: -25.75%-100%).

• 80% percent of the studies which used function-based treatments demonstrated at least a 50% reduction in behaviour.

• The mean reduction in stereotypy and repetitive behaviour in studies which did not base their intervention on outcomes from a functional analysis was 27.79%.

• A further 63.64% (n=7) were identified as using treatments which were less than 50% effective.

• An increase in target behaviour was reported in 36.6% (n=4) studies.
### Treatment Efficacy
Mean Percentage reduction of the target behavior from baseline to treatment phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRO using high preference, high competition items as reinforcers for the absence of stereotypy</td>
<td>95.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to toys combined with prompts and response blocking</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential reinforcement combined with discrimination training and self monitoring</td>
<td>84.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response interruption and redirection</td>
<td>82.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA with extinction</td>
<td>81.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of activity plus social attention</td>
<td>78.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase functional play skills</td>
<td>78.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional communication training</td>
<td>78.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental enrichment</td>
<td>65.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to matched stimulation</td>
<td>62.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to toys</td>
<td>18.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antecedent jogging</td>
<td>36.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antecedent walking (-1%)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to high competition items</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to high preference items</td>
<td>-25.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contingent access to music played at high volume</td>
<td>30.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted vests</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted vest with no weight</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite such findings it is still very common to see recommendations in practice that do not adhere to a functional assessment/analysis!! ??
Green et al. (2006) surveyed 552 parents of children with Autism and reported that 38.2% of parents said their child currently was in receipt of SIT and an additional 33.2% reported that their child had received SIT at some point in the past.

Speculation continues in relation to how effective SIT is with children with ASD.
We aimed to provide an analysis of the use of SIT by a sample of families of children with ASD within Ireland. Specifically, the aim was to determine the prevalence of specific SI techniques, their popularity and perceived efficacy. Additionally, the reasons parents seek Sensory Integration Therapy as an intervention for their children was examined along with child factors including age and frequency of challenging behaviour.

124 families participated
• The most commonly used techniques currently in use were: Trampoline; Gross Motor Activities; Oro-Motor Exercises; and Deep Pressure.

• The treatments which were no longer in use but which were reported to be used in the past included: Weighted Vest; Wilbarger Brushing Programme; Tactile Stimulation; and Joint Compressions.

• From the informants 91% were currently using SI techniques. The mean number of techniques “currently in use” was 5, ranging from 1 to 14.

• Sensory Integration was predominantly reported by informants to be a treatment sought in the early years of the child’s life. Participants began receiving SIT from two years of age with the average at five years of age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Currently using</th>
<th>Used in the past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trampoline</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gross Motor Activities</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oro-Motor Exercises</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deep Pressure</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rocking</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Swing/Hammock</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tactile Stimulation</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joint Compressions</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vibratory stimulation</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chewy Tube</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bean Bag Compressions</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spinning in a chair</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wilbarger brushing</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Balancing on a Beam</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hot Dog Wrap</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Weighted Vest</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sit N' Move cushion</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hitting a swinging ball</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hug Machine</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Scooter Board</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Theraband</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ankle Weights</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Weighted Blanket</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sensory Integration Techniques and Behavioural Targets

- Our findings show that addressing problem behaviour issues, specifically stereotyped behaviours, was the main reason that families of children with ASD sought SIT.

- It is often assumed that stereotyped behaviour serves a function of automatic reinforcement for the individual and therefore practitioners often presume that SIT is the most appropriate treatment to address this problem behaviour.

- Indeed, the terms stereotypy and “self-stimulatory” behaviour (or “stimming”) are often used synonymously (Rapp & Vollmer, 2005).
• Similarly, it was also found in the current study that practitioners (both OT’s and psychologists) recommended SIT for problem behaviours (aggression/SIB/Stereotypy).

• These findings are in accordance with Smith and Antolovich (2000) who reported that parents typically learned about Sensory Integration from service providers for their child (i.e., speech therapists and educators).
An Example of Functional and Arbitrary Reinforcement.

- A small number of comparative studies (Mason & Iwata, 1990; Devlin et al., 2009; 2011) have employed robust experimental designs to compare SIT and behavioural intervention (BI) as treatment approaches to challenging behaviour. In each of these studies the researchers subjected both interventions to the same measures of empirical data collection.
• Four Participants with Autism all presenting with aggressive behaviours, self-injury, tantrums and non-compliance.
• Alternating treatments design with initial baseline and final best treatment phase across 10 daily sessions.
• SIT and the Behavioural Interventions were alternated across daily sessions. The sequence of treatments was randomized for each of the participants.
• The theoretical underpinnings of SIT believe that problem behaviour results from an inability to process complex sensory information effectively due to a lack of organisation of the senses (Ayres, 1972; Ayres & Tickle, 1980; Schaaf & Miller, 2005).

• **SIT often does not account for the variables maintaining the challenging behaviour**, and typically entails the delivery of SI techniques either contingent on challenging behaviour or non-contingently during a 30-minutes session (Reisman, 1993).
Behavioural Interventions:

Designed from *prior functional analysis* for each participant. Problem behaviour was maintained by *negative reinforcement* as a result of escaping or avoiding demand situation and by positive reinforcement in the form of accessing preferred tangible items.

- DR + Extinction
- FCT Mand Training
- Interspersal of learned operants
- Errorless learning
- Positive practice
Target Behaviours: Hitting self, hitting others, kicking, stomping, screaming

Function: Negative Reinforcement - Escape
Positive Reinforcement - access to tangibles
Target Behaviours: Crying, stomping, body tensing, squeezing
Function: Negative Reinforcement- Escape, Highest frequency during transition
Target Behaviours: hand mouthing, scratching, hand biting, hair pulling
Function: Negative Reinforcement - Escape
Positive Reinforcement - access to tangibles
Target Behaviours: Finger biting
Function: Negative Reinforcement - Escape
Fig. 1 Mean rate of occurrence of SIB and challenging behavior observed in baseline, alternating treatments and best treatment phases
Findings...

zero levels during a behavioral intervention phase. Together these studies demonstrate the importance of providing function-based treatment for challenging behavior. In each of these studies the behavioral intervention was designed based on a functional analysis or a thorough functional assessment of the problem behavior presented. The behavioral intervention was successful in reducing and eliminating the target behavior. However, during sensory-integration therapy, techniques were applied without an analysis of the function of the behavior under investigation. As a result the behavior may have been reinforced through positive social reinforcement.
“One recent small study (Devlin et al., 2011) cautions health care practitioners about the possible negative behavioral effects of sensory integration therapy in certain populations”, (Pediatrics, 2012)

“Results from this study clearly demonstrated that the behavioral intervention was more effective in reducing challenging behavior and self-injurious behavior than was the sensory integration therapy. Finally, in the best treatment phase, only the behavioral intervention was implemented, and further reduction was observed in the frequency of challenging behavior and self-injurious behavior”. 
RECOMMENDATIONS:

- At this time, pediatricians should not use sensory processing disorder as a diagnosis.

- Pediatricians should recognize and communicate with families about the limited data on the use of sensory-based therapies for childhood developmental and behavioral problems.

- The family, pediatrician, and other clinicians should work together to prioritize treatment on the basis of the effects the sensory problems have on a child’s ability to perform daily functions of childhood.
However... in Devlin et al., 2011

the nature of sensory integration therapy, it is often proposed as a necessary treatment option for stereotypy or behaviors maintained by automatic reinforcement. In the current study, the functional assessments did not identify an automatic function for the behaviors displayed by any of the participants. Future research should examine the efficacy of SIT for behaviors that potentially have a sensory function as opposed to those maintained by environmental events.
The Alternating Treatments Design drew some attention…
Some practitioners and researchers believed that there may be a latency involved with respect to observing the benefits of SIT.

Kay and Vyse (2005) specified that “the effect of brushing and joint compressions would be most noticeable in the two hours after treatment” (p.270).
In Further Studies we Decided to Address these Issues…
Lydon and Healy, 2012

- The current research aimed to evaluate the effects of SIT on **various topographies** of aberrant behaviours, as well as self-injury/aggression in persons with autism diagnoses.

- Furthermore, such challenging behaviours presented with **differential functions** across participants and allowed for the analysis of SIT in relation to such functions.

- An **AB cross-over design** was selected to control for a sequence effect from the order of treatment delivery.

- This enabled the evaluation of a more extended application of both SIT and BI across a **block of time** with two groups of participants receiving both interventions.

- A **10 day period** was selected as the duration for each treatment based on Schreck and Miller’s (2010) recommendation that a two week period was an appropriate duration to assess the effectiveness of behaviour change from an alternative treatment.
A-B Crossover

- Participants 1-5 received Sequence 1, which involved delivery of SIT for 10 days followed by BI for 10 days.

- Participants 6-10 received Sequence 2, which involved delivery of BI for 10 days followed by SIT for 10 days.
SIT -> BI Sequence
BI-> SIT Sequence

Participant 6 Total Challenging Behaviours

Participant 7 Total Challenging Behaviours
The importance of function...

During SIT, contingent on the occurrence of challenging behaviour, participants accessed a sensory technique, which also, concurrently, provided social positive reinforcement or escape from demands, which were the maintaining variables for their target behaviours e.g.,

Participant 1: Escape from demand and Attention;
Participant 3: Attention;
Participant 9: Escape from demand;
Automatically reinforcing behaviour? A function of competing stimulation, rather than actual therapeutic benefits? (Mason & Iwata, 1990)
We decided to investigate this…
Lydon & Healy, 2012

- We employed a multiple baseline design, across participants, to evaluate the application of Sensory Integration Therapy to behaviours maintained by automatic reinforcement and to compare the effects of functional versus arbitrary reinforcement typically employed in SIT.

- All three participants demonstrated repetitive behaviour/stereotypy maintained by a single function of automatic reinforcement.
Figure 5.10 Multiple Baseline of Challenging Behaviour across Participants
An Examination of Inhibitory Stimulus Control on Echolalia.
Healy, Brady & Holloway, 2013

• Stimulus control is an emerging popular area of research that is reflecting promising results in the treatment of stereotypy.

• Control of behaviour by antecedent stimuli is ubiquitous in the natural setting. Therefore, it is necessary and crucial that future research in behavioural interventions for automatically reinforced stereotypy continues to harness the power of stimulus control in designing and evaluating interventions for stereotypy based on the principle of stimulus control.
• An ABAB design with an embedded changing criterion design was used to demonstrate functional control of an inhibitory stimulus on vocal stereotypy (shown to be maintained by automatic reinforcement during functional analysis) in three participants with autism.
Communication Repertoires and Interventions in Autism
We examined spontaneous and elicited communication in children with ASD in comparison to age matched typically developing children. N=18 (nine children diagnosed with Autism and nine typically developing children).

Each participant was video recorded for 2 h 15 min periods across two conditions (academic activity and free-time).
Table 2
Mean number of communication operants for spontaneity of communication emitted to a communicative partner and diagnosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Communicative partner</th>
<th>Spontaneity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Elicited</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Elicited</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically developing</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically developing</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Elicited</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically developing</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically developing</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Elicited</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of communication</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Mean ASD</td>
<td>Mean typically developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mands for information</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mands for attention</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate an activity</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>19.528</td>
<td>20.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>6.361</td>
<td>17.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4.917</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoclitics</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>5.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>5.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>1.972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• There was a **significant difference for communication partner** whereby the main communication partner for children with ASD was an adult in contrast to typically developing children who communicated more frequently with their peers.

• Typically developing children had **more spontaneous communication** overall than children with ASD and this was mostly directed to their peers.

• Typically developing children **specified far more** using autoclitics, mands for information, mands for attention and emitted more tacts across particular conditions than children with ASD.
An Analysis of Spontaneous and Elicited Communication Functions across Topographical Communication Systems in ASD  (Dwyer & Healy, 2012)

• 30 children with ASD with no vocal language (i.e., not exceeding vocalisations).

• 9 observation sessions (30 min each) across a lunch time setting, a teacher-led setting and a free time setting.

• Spontaneous and elicited communication were further analysed in terms of verbal behaviour functions
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• All participants had a minimum of 30 acquired symbols/gestures within their communication system used without physical prompts.

• Mean age 9.3, Range 4-11 years
A significant interaction was seen between verbal operant function and group ($F_{3.636, 49.084} = 4.547, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .252$).

Signers were more likely to mand for information, mand for attention, emitted more greetings and negotiation operants and descriptive autoclitics, emit intraverbals and show rejection.

Mean values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Operant</th>
<th>PECS</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>VOCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request (Mands)</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand information</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand attention</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational autoclitics</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive autoclitics</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacts</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraverbals</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant interaction effect was found for verbal operant and setting ($F_{714.313, 63.610} = 11.230, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .294$).

**Mean values below**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Operant</th>
<th>Teacher-led</th>
<th>Free-time</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mand information</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand attention</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tact</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraverbals</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interaction between communication partner and group was statistically significant \((F_{2,27} = 4.078, p < .05, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .232)\).
Results from this study illustrate a significant difference in frequency of communication in nonverbal children with Autism according to the type of alternative and augmentative communication used.

Children using sign language emitted the most instances of communication over the course of the study, followed by PECS users and finally VOCA users.
Interventions for Increasing Behavioural Variability in ASD

- In recent years, research has been growing in the area of autism spectrum disorder and operant variability.
- Many individuals with autism spectrum disorder behave in a characteristically rigid manner.
- It has been argued that this may reflect the absence of effective reinforcement contingencies (Baron-Cohen, 1992). For this reason, increasing variability is often a goal within this population.
## Lag Schedules of Reinforcement

| Lag reinforcement schedules (n=5) | Esch et al., 2009; Lag1 phoneme speech production | Heldt & Schlinger, 2012; Lag3 novel tacts | Lee & Sturmey, 2006; Lag1 intraverbals | Napolitano et al., 2010; Lag1 variant block form and colour | Susa & Schlinger, 2012; Lag3 intraverbals |
• All of the studies examined led to an overall increase in variability of the target behaviour in question.
• **Experimental control** was evident in the reported magnitude and rate of change in variability in three of the studies (Heldt & Schlinger, 2012; Napolitano et al., 2010; Susa & Schlinger, 2012).
• Two studies showed issues with **reinforcer effectiveness** (Lee & Sturmey, 2006; Esch et al., 2009).
While communication deficits form part of the diagnostic criteria for ASD, repetitive and fixed verbal behaviour is noted as prevalent amongst this population (Susa & Schlinger, 2012).

Growing focus on the use of lag schedules of reinforcement to increase vocal variability in children with a diagnosis of ASD (Esch, Esch and Love, 2009).
Intervention

Following Baseline:

Tact-Mand Contingency:
- Preference Assessments
- Training Phase- Prompt Fading
- FR1 Access to Preferred Items
- Environmental Enrichment

Lag Schedules of Reinforcement:
- Lag 0
- Lag 1
- Lag 3
- Lag 5
Participant 1

Sessions - 1 Hour

Baseline | Lag 0 | Lag 1 | Lag 3 | Lag 5
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---

Frequency

Spontaneous Tacts
Variability

Sessions - 1 Hour

NUI Galway
OÉ Gaillimh
Participant 2

Sessions - 1 Hour

Baseline | Lag 0 | Lag 1 | Lag 3 | Lag 5

Frequency

Sessions - 1 Hour

Spontaneous Tacts

Variability

NUI Galway
OÉ Gaillimh
Participant 3

Sessions - 1 Hour

Baseline | Lag 0 | Lag 1 | Lag 3 | Lag 3 + Self-Monitoring

Frequency

0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50

Sessions - 1 Hour

Spontaneous Tacts

Variability

NUI Galway
OÉ Gaillimh
The End...
Thank You !!