

# Problem Behavior in Educational Contexts

Brian A. Iwata, Ph.D. Professor, Psychology & Psychiatry 114 Psychology Building University of Florida Gainesville, Fl 32611 Email: iwata@ufl.edu

### Common Problem Behaviors

\*Severe: ♦ Self-injurious behavior (SIB)  $\diamond$  Aggression (AGG) ♦ Property destruction ♦ Sexual misconduct •Other: ♦ Stereotypy (STPY) ♦ An endless list of others

*Sources of Reinforcement for Problem Behavior* \*Positive Reinforcement

Social (attention, access to tangible materials)
Automatic (sensory stimulation)

Negative Reinforcement
Social (escape from task demands)
Automatic (pain attenuation)

Methods for Conducting Functional Analyses Anecdotal (Indirect) Methods Descriptive (Naturalistic) Analysis Functional (Experimental) Analysis

### Functional Analysis Screening Tool (FAST)

### FAST

#### Functional Analysis Screening Tool

Date:

Client:\_\_\_\_\_

nformant:\_\_\_\_\_

To the Interviewer: The FAST iden tifies factors that may influence problem behaviors. Use it only for screening as part of a comprehensive functional analysis of the behavior. Administer the FAST to several individuals who interact with the client frequently. Then use the results to guide di rect observation in s everal different situations to verify suspected behavioral functions and to identify other factors that may influence the problem behavior.

Interviewer:

To the Inf ormant: Complete the sections below. Then r ead each question carefully and answer it by circling "Yes" or "No." If you are uncertain about an answer, circle "N/A."

#### Informant-Client Relationship

 Indicate your relationship to the person: \_\_\_Parent \_\_\_Instructor

 \_\_Therapist/Residential Staff \_\_\_\_\_\_\_(Other)

 How long have you known the person? \_\_Years \_\_\_Months

 Do you interact with the person daily? \_\_Yes \_\_\_No

 In what situations do you usually interact with the person? \_\_\_\_Academic training \_\_\_\_\_Academic training \_\_\_\_\_\_Self-care \_\_\_\_\_\_(Other)

#### Problem Behavior Information

rodiem Benavior Information					
I. Problem behavior (check and describe):					
Aggression					
Self-Injury					
Stereotypy					
Property destruction					
Other					
2. Frequency:HourlyDailyWeeklyLess often					
<ol><li>Severity:Mild: Disruptive but little risk to property or health</li></ol>					
_ M o d e r ate: Property damage or minor injury					
S e v e re: Significant threat to health or safety					
<ol> <li>Situations in which the problem behavior is <u>most</u> likely to occur:</li> </ol>					
Days/Times					
Settings/Activities					
Persons present					
5. Situations in which the problem behavior is <u>least</u> likely to occur:					
Days/Times					
Settings/Activities					
Persons present					
5. What is usually happening to the person right <u>before</u> the problem					
behavior occurs?					
7. What usually happens to the person right <u>after</u> the problem					
behavior occurs?					
8. Current treatments					

- 1. Does the problem behavior occur when the person is not receiving attention or when caregivers are paying attention to someone else?
- 2. Does the problem behavior occur when the person's requests for preferred items or activities are denied or when these are taken away?
- 3. When the problem behavior occurs, do caregivers usually try to calm the person down or involve the person in preferred activities?
- 4. Is the person usually well behaved when (s)he Yes No N/A is getting lots of attention or when preferred activities are freely available?
- 5. Does the person usually fuss or resist when (s)he is asked to perform a task or to participate in activities?
- 6. Does the problem behavior occur when the Yes No N/A person is asked to perform a task or to participate in activities?
- If the problem behavior occurs while tasks are Yes No N/A being presented, is the person usually given a "break" from tasks?
- 8. Is the person usually well behaved when (s)he is not required to do anything?
   Yes No N/A

   9. Does the problem behavior occur even when no one is nearby or watching?
   Yes No N/A

   10. Does the person engage in the problem behavior even when leisure activities are available?
   Yes No N/A

   11. Does the problem behavior appear to be a form of "self-stimulation?"
   Yes No N/A

   12. Is the problem behavior less likely to occur when sensory stimulating activities are
   Yes No N/A
- presented? 13. Is the problem behavior cyclical, occurring for several days and then stopping? 14. Does the person have recurring painful Yes No N/A
- conditions such as ear infections or allergies?
   If so, list:\_\_\_\_\_\_

  15. Is the problem behavior <u>more</u> likely to occur Yes No N/A
   when the person is ill?
- 16. If the person is experiencing physical problems, Yes No N/A and these are treated, does the problem behavior usually go away?

#### Scoring Summary

Circle the number of each question that was answered "Yes" are enter the number of items that were circled in the "Total" column.							
Items Circled "Yes"			Yes"	Total	Potential Source of Reinforcement		
1	2	3	4		Social (attention/preferred items)		
5	6	7	8		Social (escape from tasks/activities)		
9	10	11	12		Automatic (sensory stimulation)		
13	14	15	16		Automatic (pain attenuation)		
© 2005 The Florida Center on Self-Injury							

### Structured "A-B-C" Analysis

STRUCTURED ABC (Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence) ANALYSIS Date Individual: Time Staff Residence: **Behavior** (list specific problem): 1 HEAD BANGING (SIB) Use this form to identify situational factors related to the occurrence of behavior problem. Each time 3 a target behavior occurs, record the date, time, and Location where behavior occurred: your initials. Use check marks to identify target Residence behavior, location, activity, and what happened immediately before and after the behavior. Worksite School Outside Data on antecedents (As) and consequences (Cs) are summarized in the boxes below. As and Cs are Community outing organized under likely behavioral functions (Note: Other: General activity in progress: some As or Cs may reflect more than one function). Leisure/solitary (TV, music, etc.) In each box, enter the number of times an A or C Leisure/social (with another person) was checked (use the arrows as guides). Enter Meal (preparation, eating, clean up) the overall totals at the botton of each column. х Self-care or household chore Х Academic, work, or training activity Pos. Reinf. Pos. Reinf Neg. Reinf. Auto. Reinf. Alone (sitting, in bed, etc.) (attention) (materials) (escape) (sensory) Other: SHOPPING IN MALL Immediate antecedent (A): Ignored by staff or staff walked away Leisure material or food removed/denied Other request denied Given instruction/prompt to work X X X Provoked by peer None (individual alone/doing nothing) Immediate consequence (C): Attention, response block, told to "stop" x Redirected to another area/activity Leisure material/food given Work requirement terminated Staff walked away Staff did nothing TOTAL: 20 6 22 1

© 1996 The Florida Center on Self-Injury

### Functional (Experimental) Analysis

<u>Condition</u>	Antecedent	<u>Consequence</u>	<u>Contingency</u>
Attention	Th. ignores Cl.	Th. attends to beh. problem	Positive rfmnt (attention)
Demand	Th. presents learning trials	Timeout for beh. problem	<i>Negative rfmnt</i> (escape)
Alone	Th. Absent	N/A	N/A Automatic reinf?
Play	Toys available Noncontingent reinforcement	N/A	Control

#### Functional Analysis Data Sheet

Conduct sessions as described below and in the listed sequence (Session #1=Alone, #2=Attention, etc.). Add a Tangible condition only if it is strongly suspected that problem behavior is maintained by access to tangibles. Each session should last for 10 min. Record either the # or rate of problem behavior (PB) in each session, and summarize as the mean per condition.

Attent Play: Dema Tangi	Alone:       Begin session: Student is alone in a room with no access to attention or leisure items. If PB: No consequences.         Attention:       Begin session: Inform student that you are busy; then ignore. If PB: Deliver a mild reprimand, statement of concern, physical comfort, then ignore again         Play:       Begin session: Deliver frequent attention and allow free access to preferred items. Do not deliver demands If PB: Ignore briefly; then resume play.         Demand:       Begin session: Deliver nonpreferred academic or work tasks. If PB: Remove task and ignore for 30 s; then resume tasks.         Tangible:       Begin session: Allow brief access to preferred item then remove and ignore. If PB: Provide brief access to preferred item; then remove again.         Other:       Begin session: If PB:							
Studer	nt:				St	art date:		
Proble	em behavi	or:			Er	nd date:		
Г	Session	Alone	Attention	Play	Demand	Tangible	Other	
	1			2		Ľ		
Ι Γ	2							
	3							
[	4							
	5							
	6							
	7							
	8							
	9							
	10							
	11							
	12							
	13							
	14							
	15							
	16							
	17							
	18							
	19							
	20							
	Mean P	В						

© 2002 The Florida Center on Self-Injury

### Typical Response Patterns



## Shortcut to Identifying Behavioral Functions

Source of Sr	Likely to Occur	<u>Unlikely to Occur</u>
Social Sr+	<ul> <li>No access to attn/tangibles</li> <li>Peer access to attn/tangibles</li> </ul>	•Access to attn/tangibles
Social Sr-	<ul><li>Work tasks present</li><li>Required social interaction</li></ul>	•No activity requirements
Automatic Sr	•No access to leisure items	•Access to stimulating activity

### Probable Functions of Specific Behavior Disorders

	Positive		Negative	
	Reinforcement		Reinf	orcement
Behavior Disorder	<u>Social</u>	<u>Automatic</u>	<u>Social</u>	<u>Automatic</u>
Aggression	+	Ø	+	Ø
Tantrums	+	Ø	+	Ø
Noncompliance	+	Ø	+	Ø
Property Destruction	+	?	+	Ø
"Stereotypies"	?	+	?	?
SIB	+	+	+	+

S	Summary of Assessment Results							
<u>Function</u>	<u>Iwata et al.</u> SIB (152)	<u>Conners et al.</u> STPY (91)	<u>Shore et al.</u> AGG (16)					
Social Sr+	26.3%	1.1%	31.3%					
Social Sr-	38.1%	0%	62.5%					
Automatic Sr	25.7%	98.9%	0%					
Multiple Sr	9.9%	0%	6.2% (all social)					

S	Summary of Assessment Results							
<u>Function</u>	<u>Iwata et al.</u> SIB (152)	<u>Conners et al.</u> STPY (91)	<u>Shore et al.</u> AGG (16)					
Social Sr+	26.3%	1.1%	31.3%					
Social Sr-	38.1%	0%	62.5%					
Automatic Sr	25.7%	98.9%	0%					
Multiple Sr	9.9%	0%	6.2% (all social)					

Reinforcement-Based Approaches to Behavior Reduction

- *Eliminate the behavior's establishing operation or antecedent event (deprivation or aversive stimulation) Noncontingent reinforcement (NCR)*
- *Eliminate the behavior's maintaining contingency Extinction (EXT)*
- *Replace the behavior with an alternative response Differential reinforcement (DRA)*

Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \**Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands)* Treatment options *♦Noncontingent task removal (NCR) ♦Frequent breaks from work* Advintemance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks *<b><i>AReduced session duration* ♦Reduced rate of task presentation Demand fading (frequency or difficulty) ♦High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence *♦Noncontingent* Sr+

Periodic, Noncontingent Escape (Vollmer, Marcus & Ringdahl, 1995)

◆Participants: N=2, DD, SIB
◆Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
◆Treatment conditions:
◆BL: SIB → 30-s break
◆TR: Continuous escape → 1 (20- or 30-s) break per session



Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \**Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands)* Treatment options *♦Noncontingent task removal (NCR) ♦Frequent breaks from work* ♦Maintenance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks *<b><i>AReduced session duration* ♦Reduced rate of task presentation Demand fading (frequency or difficulty) ♦High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence *♦Noncontingent* Sr+

Establishing Operations for Escape Behavior (Smith, Iwata, Goh, & Shore, 1995) Study 2: Novelty

Participants: N=2, DD, SIB
Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
Treatment conditions:

Exposure to "novel" tasks
Continued exposure to determine whether novelty abated



# Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \*Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands) \*Treatment options \*Noncontingent task removal (NCR) \*Frequent breaks from work

Advise the set of the set of

### Reduced session duration

Reduced rate of task presentation
Demand fading (frequency or difficulty)
High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence
Noncontingent Sr+

Establishing Operations for Escape Behavior (Smith, Iwata, Goh, & Shore, 1995) Study 3: Session Duration

Participants: N=5, DD, SIB
Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
Treatment conditions:
Exposure to 15-min sessions
Data analysis in 30-s bins



# Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \*Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands) \*Treatment options

Noncontingent task removal (NCR)
Frequent breaks from work
Maintenance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks
Reduced session duration
Reduced rate of task presentation
Demand fading (frequency or difficulty)
High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence
Noncontingent Sr+

Establishing Operations for Escape Behavior (Smith, Iwata, Goh, & Shore, 1995) Study 4: Rate of trial presentation

Participants: N=5, DD, SIB
Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
Treatment conditions:

High-rate trial presentation (30 s)
Low-rate trial presentation (90 s)



# Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \*Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands) \*Treatment options

Noncontingent task removal (NCR)
Frequent breaks from work
Maintenance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks
Reduced session duration
Reduced rate of task presentation
Demand fading (frequency or difficulty)
High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence
Noncontingent Sr+

Stimulus (demand) Fading (Pace, Ivancic, & Jefferson, 1994)

◆Participant: N-1, TBI, obscenity
◆Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
◆Treatment conditions:
◆BL: Obscenity → 30-s break
◆DF (No EXT): 3 demand trials → 52 demand trials /session



# Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \*Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands) \*Treatment options

Noncontingent task removal (NCR)
Frequent breaks from work
Maintenance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks
Reduced session duration
Reduced rate of task presentation
Demand fading (frequency or difficulty)
High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence
Noncontingent Sr+

*"Behavioral Momentum" (Mace & Belfiore, 1990)* 

◆Participant: N=1, DD, "STR" (hand/foot contact)
◆Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
◆Treatment conditions:
▲ Low p: 1 low p/min: STR → Th leaves room

◆ Low-p: 1 low-p/min; STR ➤ Th leaves room
◆ High-p: 3 high-p ➤ 1 low-p/min; STR ➤ EXT
◆ Low-p and high-p alternated between 2 TH



# Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Antecedent Interventions \*Establishing operation: Aversive stimulation (demands) \*Treatment options

Noncontingent task removal (NCR)
Frequent breaks from work
Maintenance tasks substituted for acquisition tasks
Reduced session duration
Reduced rate of task presentation
Demand fading (frequency or difficulty)
High probability (Hi-p) instructional sequence
Noncontingent Sr+

Attention and Negative Reinforcement (Gardner, Wacker, & Boelter, 2009)

- Participants: N=2, typically developing, NC, AGG, PD
  Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape
  Attention conditions
  - *HQA: eye contact, close, enthusiastic praise LQA: no eye contact, far, negative or neutral tone No attention*
- Activity conditions

Free play: free access to preferred activities, no demands
 Demand: Demand presentation, no preferred activities
 Attention & Activity pairs presented as concurrent choice


Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Extinction

Maintaining Reinforcer: Escape

Treatment options

*\*EXT (escape); EXT (attention) contraindicated* 

Escape Extinction (Iwata, Pace, Kalsher, Cowdery, & Cataldo, 1990) \*Participants: N=7, DD, SIB \*Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape \*Treatment conditions \*BL: Compliance → Praise, SIB → Escape \*EXT: Compliance → Praise, SIB → Prompting





Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Differential Reinforcement
\* Replacement of escape response
\* Treatment options
\* Reinforce precursor behavior
\* Establish an alternative escape behavior
\* Strengthen compliance via enhanced Sr+
\* Strengthen compliance via enhanced SrFunctional Analysis of Precursor Behavior (Smith & Churchill, 1995)

♦ Participants: N=4, DD, SIB or AGG

\*Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape

Assessment conditions

♦ FA #1: Contingencies on precursors

♦ FA #2: Contingencies on severe PB



Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Differential Reinforcement Replacement of escape response Treatment options ♦Reinforce precursor behavior *♦Establish an alternative escape behavior ♦Strengthen compliance via Sr*+ *Strengthen compliance via enhanced Sr-*



Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Differential Reinforcement Replacement of escape response Treatment options ♦Reinforce precursor behavior *•Establish an alternative escape behavior ♦Strengthen compliance via Sr*+ Strengthen compliance via SrSr+ vs. Sr- for Compliance (DeLeon, Neidert, Anders & Rodriguez-Catter, 2001) \*Participants: N=1, DD, varied PB \*Functional analysis: PB maintained by escape \*Treatmentconditions \*BL: PB → Escape \*RC-edible (Sr+): Compliance → chip \*RC-break (Sr-): Compliance → EXT, 30-s break



Problem Behavior Maintained by Social Sr-Differential Reinforcement \*Replacement of escape response \*Treatment options \*Reinforce precursor behavior \*Establish an alternative escape behavior \*Strengthen compliance via Sr+ \*Strengthen compliance via Sr-



## A WORD OF CAUTION

Almost all studies in which EO or DR interventions have been used incorporated EXT \* Effects of EO and DR interventions w/o EXT have been negative or inconclusive Combine antecedent interventions ♦ Reduced rate, effort, duration  $\diamond DF + Hi$ -p sequence Combine DR interventions  $\diamond Sr + + Sr$ - $\diamond DNRO + DNRA$ 

