

**PSYCHOLOGY 528<sup>1</sup>: SEMINAR: APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS**  
**• Winter 2009 •**

**Section 01: Monday & Wednesday 6:10-7:50pm • King Hall D3082**

**Section 02: Monday & Wednesday 8:00-9:40pm • King Hall B3019**

**SYLLABUS**

Instructor: Daniel B. Shabani, Ph.D., BCBA  
 Office: KH A3043  
 Office hrs: Monday & Wednesday 2-4pm & by appointment  
 Email: bshaban@calstatela.edu  
 Phone: 323-343-2278

**COURSE GOALS**

The purpose of this course is to teach students the application of basic principles of behavior analysis to clinically and socially relevant problem behaviors in diverse populations. The primary goal of the course is to provide a survey of a variety of areas in which behavioral principles have been applied.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Read, discuss, and review the research literature in the major substantive areas of applied behavior analysis.
- Critique, interpret, and integrate research on a variety of issues and across a variety of domains in the field of applied behavior analysis.
- Formulate and articulate your position on different topics within applied behavior analysis through active participation in seminar discussions and via reaction papers to the assigned readings.
- To write and present a critical review of publishable quality.

**REQUIRED READINGS**

1. Austin, J., & Carr, J. E. (2000). *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*. Reno, NV: Context Press.
2. American Psychological Association (2000). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> edition)*. Washington DC: APA.
3. Galvan, J. L. (2006). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.* Los Angeles, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
4. Articles available on-line
  - [www.shabani-institute.org](http://www.shabani-institute.org)
    - i. click on academic courses; select CSULA

---

<sup>1</sup> Portions of this syllabus were adopted from John Austin, Ph.D. (Western Michigan University)

**COURSE EVALUATION**

Seminar preparation	10%
3 Reaction papers	25%
Outline of review article	5%
Review paper proposal	10%
Review paper	
1st 5 pages	5%
1st 10 pages	10%
Full paper	25%
Presentation of review paper	10%

**COURSE GRADE**

**Your final grade in the course will depend only on the total number of percentage points you accumulate during the semester as follows:**

A	= 92% or higher
A-	= 90-91.4%
B+	= 86-89.4%
B	= 82-85.4%
B-	= 80-81.4%
C+	= 76-79.4%
C	= 72-75.4%
C-	= 70-71.4%
D+	= 66-69.4%
D	= 62-65.4%
F	= below 61.4%

**Seminar preparation will count for 10% of your grade**

Since the quality of any seminar depends largely on its participants and their preparedness, each student will be expected to submit 3 discussion questions for each article or chapter read for that class session (if 3 articles are to be read, then you submit 9 questions total). The questions can be of two general types:

1. A conceptual (hence the term “discussion”) question,
2. A clarification question – was there something in the article that you did not fully understand?

The questions should be typed, will be submitted at the start of each class period, and will often be used by the instructor to guide or begin discussions. Questions do not need to include corresponding answers, but brief answers can be included if the student decides this is a good idea.

If, at any time, it becomes clear that students have not read the material sufficiently to carry out meaningful discussions, the instructor can deliver a “pop” quiz to be counted in lieu of the seminar questions for that day’s class.

Discussion questions not submitted by 6:10pm on Mondays & Wednesdays (for Section 01) and 8:00pm (for Section 02) will be penalized 10% each day they are late, and the first 10% will be subtracted that Monday. Always bring two typed copies of your discussion questions to class – one for me and one for you.

### **3 Reaction papers will count for 25% of your grade**

Each student will write three reaction papers. Each paper should be written in response to some specific article or set of articles representing a topic in ABA.

**You cannot write more than one reaction paper on any one topic.**

Sometimes, there may be two topics covered per week, so this means you could submit up to two reaction papers per week. You must choose for your reaction a topic that is substantive. Reaction papers should not simply be a review of the article – rather, you should choose something on a more conceptual level to which you respond. To see some examples, I recommend reading the “Commentary,” “In Response,” or “Rejoinder” section of any journal (behavioral or not), such as The Behavior Analyst, or American Psychologist. Other journals have reaction papers in sections called by other titles, but the idea is that you speak to some of the concepts or use of terms or ideas expressed by another author.

Reaction papers should be no longer than 5 double-spaced typed pages, not including references or title page. All reaction papers are due on the class day on which (or in the week following when) the articles critiqued are discussed.

**If a student submits a reaction paper from this class to a peer-reviewed journal**, the submitted paper grade will be counted double (meaning that you will only need to complete 2 reaction papers instead of 3). The student must inform the instructor of the intent to submit the manuscript, keep the instructor informed during its preparation, and present the confirmation of receipt from the journal to receive credit. The paper does not need to be accepted for publication in order to count for credit in this course.

### **Outline of review article will count for 5% of your grade**

Each student will read a published review article, to be determined by the instructor, and create an outline of the article. This is designed to help the students understand the structure and content of a review article.

### **Review paper proposal will count for 10% of your grade**

Each student will submit a proposal for the review paper he/she hopes to complete for the course requirement. This proposal should essentially be an outline consisting of the following:

1. A listing of the sections, rationale (why is this important?), and main point of the paper,
2. Topic sentences/main ideas for the paragraphs and sections of the paper,
3. A bibliography of the relevant readings expected to be reviewed for the paper, and
4. A suggested publication outlet for the paper

This information should be provided in sufficient detail to allow me to determine what you hope to accomplish in writing the paper and for me to give you feedback on its organization and goals.

Late proposals will be penalized 10% each day they are late.

### **Review paper**

Each student will write a review paper that will be due near the end of the quarter. The paper should be no longer than 20 (and most likely between 15 and 20) double-spaced pages, not including references and figures/tables. APA guidelines should be followed for the paper – except when the student identifies a publication outlet that has different requirements, and this must be done ahead of time and cleared with the instructor.

#### **1st 5 pages of the review paper will count for 5% of your grade**

The paper will be completed in sections – the first five pages, along with references (references and text in APA format), will be due after the proposal is completed. Late papers will be reduced by 10% per day from the total possible grade, up to a maximum of 40%.

#### **1st 10 pages of the review paper will count for 10% of your grade**

After getting feedback on the first 5 pages, students will revise them and turn in the revisions along with the second part of the paper (in APA format). The total submitted should be approximately the first 10 pages of the final document, not including references. Late papers will be reduced by 10% per day from the total possible grade, up to a maximum of 40%.

#### **Full version of the review paper will count for 25% of your grade**

Each student will submit a completed final version of the review paper on the day indicated in the schedule. Students are required to submit one electronic copy of their paper to the instructor and the instructor will email a pdf copy to every other student in the class, so you will each have a number of timely review papers handy as a result of this class. This paper represents 25% of the student's grade in the course. Late papers will be reduced by 10% per day from the total possible grade, up to a maximum of 40%.

### **Presentation of the review paper will count for 10% of your grade**

Each student will present their review paper to the class for critique, discussion, and feedback. The presentation should require about 15 minutes, and should be designed as you would present a paper at the Association for Behavior Analysis, International. All presenters are required to use PowerPoint® or some other similar computer-electronic means for presenting their papers.

Post-presentation discussion will focus on:

1. Content of the paper
  - a. Was the review thorough?
  - b. Were appropriate literatures reviewed?
  - c. Are the points made logical and valid?
2. The process of the presentation
  - a. Visual presentation
  - b. Audibility of presentation
  - c. Other mechanics of presentation

## Grading Criteria for Papers

### The Quick Version

#### Reaction papers

- **Content/substance** – this is the point of the paper. As papers vary so widely, these criteria are often difficult to clarify ahead of time, however, some common criteria include: the logic of your ideas; the extent to which your arguments are backed by data, citations, or precedent; the relevance of your theme to the assigned readings; and the degree to which the reaction is compelling, thorough, and fair. This article should represent a unique contribution from the student – NOT simply a summary of the readings. In some cases it is appropriate to briefly (1/2 page or so) summarize the article to provide the needed context for your paper, but be sure to spend the vast majority of space in developing your contribution. It is also appropriate to bring in literature from outside the course readings, in order to support your arguments.
- **Writing style** – This represents how clearly and concisely you express yourself in writing. For suggestions and guidelines, see Strunk & White; and APA Publication Manual, v. 5.
- **APA publication style** – this is the extent to which you follow the APA guidelines (APA Manual, v.5) when writing the paper.
- **Development**, coherence, and flow of ideas throughout the paper.
- **Clarity** and defense of the central thesis.
- **Readability** of the paper (does the reader need to re-read sentences multiple times in order to get the point?).

#### Review papers

- **Content/substance** – see above description.
- **Completeness and accuracy of literature review** – the adequacy of a review paper depends largely on the extent to which the literature was adequately selected and represented (this means developing criteria and reviewing thoroughly within those criteria). Was anything blatantly and inappropriately excluded? Was an area overlooked? Were appropriate citations included for the major points in the paper? This grading criterion captures the adequacy and completeness of the review.
- **Writing style** – see above description.
- **APA publication style** – see above description.
- **Development**, coherence, and flow of ideas throughout the paper.
- **Clarity** and defense of the central thesis.
- **Readability** of the paper (does the reader need to re-read sentences multiple times in order to get the point?).

### The More Detailed Version

The following rubric<sup>1</sup> for assigning grades will be used for all written papers:

**A (90-100):** Excellent in all or nearly all respects. The interest of the reader is engaged by the ideas and presentation. This paper represents effective organization and writing. The paper is marked by originality of ideas. Everything in it seems to fit the thesis exactly. It may have a proofreading error or two, or even a misspelled word, but the reader feels that these errors are the consequence of the normal accidents all good writers encounter.

**B+ (86-89):** Clear argument, clear writing, good evidence, appropriate response to the assignment. It is well organized, it presents a worthwhile and interesting idea, and the idea is supported by sound evidence presented in a neat and orderly way. Some of the sentences may not be elegant, but they are clear, and in them, thought follows naturally on thought. The paragraphs may be unwieldy now and then, but they are organized around one main idea. The reader does not have to read a paragraph two or three times to get the thought that the writer is trying to convey.

**B (80-85):** Technically competent, with perhaps a lapse here and there. Use of evidence is sufficient. It has a thesis that is limited and worth arguing. It does not contain unexpected digressions, and it ends by keeping the promise to argue and inform that the writer makes in the beginning.

**C+ (76-79):** A competent piece of work, but not yet good. More or less adequately organized along obvious lines. Thesis may be unclear or overly simplistic. Development is often skimpy. Use of evidence may be inadequate. Monotony of sentence structure is apparent and errors may be sprinkled throughout.

**C (70-75):** The C paper rarely uses evidence well; sometimes it does not use evidence at all. Even if it has a clear and interesting thesis, a paper with insufficient supporting evidence is a C paper. The C paper often has mechanical faults, errors in grammar and spelling, but please note: a paper without such flaws may still be a C paper. A piece of work that demonstrates some efforts on the author's part but that is too marred by technical problems, APA style errors, or flaws in thinking or development of ideas to be considered competent work.

**D or F (below 70):** Failing grade. Essay may not respond to assignment. Essay may be far too short. Grammar and style may be careless. The paper either has no thesis or else it has one that is strikingly vague, broad, or uninteresting. There is little indication that the writer understands the material being presented. The paragraphs do not hold together; ideas do not develop from sentence to sentence. This paper usually repeats the same thoughts again and again, perhaps in slightly different language but often in the same words. The paper is filled with mechanical faults, errors in grammar, and errors in spelling.

---

<sup>1</sup> This rubric was adapted from a online documents published by the Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University and Teaching Matters @ Wesleyan University.

## **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

You are responsible for making yourself aware of and understanding the policies and procedures in the Undergraduate Catalog that pertain to Academic Integrity. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse. If there is reason to believe you have been involved in academic dishonesty, you will be referred to the department chair who will decide if the situation warrants further action.

## **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

ANY PAPER SUBMITTED FOR THIS CLASS MUST BE AN ORIGINAL CREATION, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS CLASS ALONE. YOU MAY NOT SUBMIT WORK FOR THIS CLASS THAT HAS BEEN OR WILL BE SUBMITTED FOR OTHER CLASSES. ANY EXCEPTION REPRESENTS MULTIPLE SUBMISSION AND WILL BE TREATED AS SUCH (SEE BELOW).

Any academic dishonesty will result in the student failing the course and being referred to the appropriate Psychology Department and/or University committee for additional disciplinary action.

The following sections, entitled “Student Conduct: Rights and Responsibilities” (p. 100, 2007-2009 University Catalog) and “Appendix D – Academic Dishonesty” (p. 760, University Catalog) are quoted from the 2007-2009 University Catalog. It can be accessed at:

[http://catalog.calstatela.edu/NXT/gateway.dll?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=calstate:current](http://catalog.calstatela.edu/NXT/gateway.dll?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=calstate:current)

### **Student Conduct: Rights and Responsibilities**

#### **Academic Honesty**

Instructors have the responsibility of planning and supervising all academic work, encouraging honest individual effort, and taking appropriate action if instances of academic dishonesty are discovered. However, honesty is primarily the responsibility of each student. The University considers cheating and plagiarism to be voluntary acts for which there may be reasons, but no acceptable excuse.

The University Academic Honesty Policy (See Appendix D in this Catalog) defines cheating and plagiarism as follows:

Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means.

Plagiarism is the act of using ideas, words, or work of another person or persons as if they were one's own, without giving proper credit to the original sources.

Students who cheat or commit plagiarism may be subject to both academic and administrative sanctions. Faculty have the right to establish the standards by which the academic performance of students will be evaluated, including the consequences of students not meeting some portion or all of the academic

requirements of a course through acts of cheating or plagiarism. The range of academic sanctions is broad and may include repeating an assignment/test, completing additional assignments, receiving a lower grade, zero or "F" on an individual assignment or receiving a lower grade or "F" in the course. Cheating and plagiarism also violate of the Student Conduct Code and are subject to administrative sanctions including, but not limited to disciplinary probation, suspension, or expulsion as stipulated in Section 41302 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations.

Students accused of cheating or plagiarism will be given an opportunity to discuss the allegations with the professor prior to being issued an academic sanction. If a student agrees to the academic sanction suggested by the professor, he or she must acknowledge this agreement by signing an Academic Dishonesty Resolution Form. However, if the student does not agree with the allegations, he or she may request that the professor forward the matter to the Judicial Affairs Officer who will independently investigate the allegations. If the Judicial Affairs Officer determines that there is sufficient evidence that cheating or plagiarism have occurred, the student will be formally charged with a violation of the Student Conduct Code (Section 41301, of Title 5, California Code of Regulations). A record of all disciplinary charges, including cheating and plagiarism, will be maintained in the Judicial Affairs Office for a minimum of five years. Disciplinary files are separate from academic files and subject to disclosure to third parties by prior written consent of the student, or a court ordered subpoena.

Copies of the Academic Honesty Policy are available in SA 108 or at <http://www.calstatela.edu/univ/stuaffrs/jao/>

## **Appendix D – Academic Dishonesty**

### **Preamble**

The University in its quest for truth and knowledge embraces honesty and integrity. These fundamental values must not be compromised. The trust and respect among professors, students and the society need to be vigilantly protected. Cheating and plagiarism can be neither justified nor condoned as this would destroy the ideals and purposes of higher education. Students enter the University to gain the knowledge and tools necessary for participation in society. Academic integrity is one foundation for a society based on trust and honesty. Therefore, the University takes seriously its responsibility for academic honesty.

#### **I. Cheating**

At Cal State L. A., cheating is defined as the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means. The following examples are intended to be representative, but not all-inclusive:

#### **(a) Examinations/Tests Administered by Faculty or the University**

- Copying from another student's paper
- Employing signals to obtain answers from or provide answers to others
- Stealing or arranging for the theft of an examination

- Knowingly reviewing an unauthorized copy of an examination
- Using lecture notes or textbooks during an examination when prohibited
- Possessing crib notes at the location and during the time of the examination
- Having someone else take an examination in your place
- Feigning illness or telling falsehoods to avoid taking an examination at the scheduled time
- Claiming falsely that you took an examination at the scheduled time
- Storing and/or accessing course subject matter in a calculator, computer or recording device, without authorization from the instructor, when such instruments are otherwise permitted to be used during an examination period
- Utilizing calculators and/or other learning aids forbidden by the instructor
- Obtaining assistance in answering questions on a take-home examination, when such action is specifically prohibited
- Attempting to use or using bribery to obtain an undeserved grade
- Changing an answer on a graded test and claiming the student's response to the question was incorrectly marked wrong

#### **(b) Papers/Reports, Laboratory/Homework**

- Copying the work of other persons in whole or in part and claiming authorship
- Submitting a paper obtained from a any source that provides research/term papers
- Using a ghost writer to compose a paper and claiming authorship
- Claiming an assigned share of a team report, toward which insufficient or no contribution was made
- Lying about the reason for not submitting a report on time
- Pretending to have submitted a paper to an instructor
- Stealing another student's report and submitting it as one's own work
- Submitting the same term paper to two or more different instructors for credit in their courses without their prior permission
- Inventing, falsifying, or altering data for a research survey or laboratory experiment
- Misrepresenting the authorship of an experiment or exercise
- Depending upon others to complete laboratory assignments or homework when instructions call for independent work
- Sabotaging someone else's laboratory work or other exercise
- Fabricating bibliographic references

## **II. Plagiarism**

At Cal State L. A., plagiarism is defined as the act of using ideas, words, or work of another person or persons as if they were one's own, without giving proper credit to the original sources.

The following examples of plagiarism are intended to be representative, but not all-inclusive:

- Failing to give credit via proper citations for others' ideas and concepts, data and information, statements and phrases, and/or interpretations and conclusions
- Failing to use quotation marks when quoting directly from another, whether it be a paragraph, a sentence, or a part thereof
- Paraphrasing the expressions of thought by others without appropriate quotation marks or attribution
- Assembling parts from various works and submitting the synthesis or single paper as one's own creation
- Representing another's artistic/scholarly works, such as musical compositions, computer programs, photographs, paintings, drawings, sculptures, or similar works as one's own

### **ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UPS**

You are responsible for anything that occurs during class, including announcements or changes of schedule. This means that if you miss class you should find out from another student what you missed. There are no make-ups for discussion question submissions. Late papers or assignments will be penalized as indicated above.

### **CANCELED CLASSES**

If classes are canceled or for any other reason, the topics missed will be given the day we return even if there has been no lecture over the material and even if there is another scheduled activity for that day.

## **SCHEDULE**

*Note: I reserve the right to alter the schedule at any time.*

### **WEEK 1**

Monday Jan. 5 – No class

Wednesday Jan. 7 - No class

### **WEEK 2**

Monday Jan. 12

Introduction & overview; seminar format & discussion questions

Review & reaction papers

Introduction to Applied Behavior Analysis; Defining Features and Mission

#### **HABA**

Sulzer-Azaroff, B. (2000). Forward. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 6-14). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### **ARTICLES**

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 91-97.

Iwata, B. A. (1991). Applied behavior analysis as technological science. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 421-424.

Hayes, S. C. (1991). The limits of technological talk. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 417-420.

Morris, E. K. (1991). Deconstructing "technological to a fault." *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 411-416.

Redmon, W. K. (1991). Pinpointing the technological fault in applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 441-444.

Reid, D. H. (1991). Technological behavior analysis and societal impact: A human services perspective. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24*, 437-439.

Recommended but not required:

Johnston, J. M. (1996). Distinguishing between applied research and practice. *The Behavior Analyst, 19*, 35-47.

Wednesday Jan. 14 (Week 2 continued)

### Stimulus Preference and Reinforcer Assessment

#### **HABA**

Ivancic, M. (2000). Stimulus preference and reinforcer assessment. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 19-38). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### **ARTICLES**

Hanley, G. P., Iwata, B. A., Roscoe, E. M., Thompson, R. H., & Lindberg, J. S. (2003). Response-restriction analysis: II. Alteration of activity preferences. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 36, 59-76.

Lindauer, S. E., Zarcone, J. R., Richman, D. M., & Schroeder, S. R. (2002). A comparison of multiple reinforcer assessments to identify the function of maladaptive behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 35, 299-303.

Hagopian, L. P., Long, E. S., & Rush, K. S. (2004). *Preference assessment* procedures for individuals with developmental disabilities. *Behavior Modification*, 28, 668-677.

Kuhn, D. E., DeLeon, I. G., Terlonge, C., Goysovich, R. (2006). Comparison of verbal preference assessments in the presence and absence of the actual stimuli. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 27, 645-656.

### **WEEK 3**

Monday Jan. 19 - MLK day (no class)

Wednesday Jan. 21

### **OUTLINE OF REVIEW PAPER DUE**

#### Acquisition

#### **HABA**

Cuvo, A., & Davis, P. (2000). Behavioral acquisition for persons with developmental disabilities. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 39-60). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### Functional Assessment

#### **HABA**

Iwata, B., Kahng, S., Wallace, M., & Lindberg (2000). The functional analysis model of behavioral assessment. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 61-90). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### **ARTICLES**

#### **OUTLINE THIS REVIEW PAPER FOR YOUR ASSIGNMENT**

Hanley, G. P., Iwata, B. A., McCord, B. E. (2003). Functional analysis of problem behavior: A review. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 36, 147-185.

Vollmer, T. R., Borrero, J. C., Wright, C. S., Van Camp, C., & Lalli, J. S. (2001). Identifying possible contingencies during descriptive analyses of severe behavior disorders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 34, 269-287.

#### Recommended but not required:

Sloman, K. M., Vollmer, T., R. Cotnoir, N. M., Borrero, C. S., Borrero, J. S., Samaha, A. L., & St. Peter, C. C. (2005). Descriptive analyses of caregiver reprimands. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 38, 373-383.

## WEEK 4

Monday Jan. 26

### Functional Interventions

#### **HABA**

Carr, J. E., Coriaty, S., Dozier, C. (2000). Current issues in the function-based treatment of aberrant behavior in individuals with developmental disabilities. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 91-112). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### **ARTICLES**

Carr, J. E., & LeBlanc, L. A. (2006). Noncontingent reinforcement as antecedent behavior support. In J. K. Luiselli (Ed.), *Antecedent assessment & intervention: Supporting children & adults with developmental disabilities in community settings* (pp. 147-164). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Lerman, D. C., & Iwata, B. A. (1996). Developing a technology for the use of operant extinction in clinical settings: An examination of basic and applied research. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 29, 345-382.

Wednesday Jan. 28

### PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW PAPER DUE

#### Behavioral Treatment of Autism

#### **HABA**

Frea, W. D., & Vittimberga, G. L. (2000). Behavioral interventions for children with autism. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 247-274). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### **ARTICLES**

Gresham, F. M., & MacMillan, D. L. (1997). Autistic recovery? An analysis and critique of the empirical evidence on the Early Intervention Project. *Behavioral Disorders*, 22, 185-201.

McEachin, J. J., Smith, T., & Lovaas, O. I. (1993). Long-term outcome for children with autism who received early intensive behavioral treatment. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 97, 359-372.

Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Strain, P. S., Todd, A. W., & Reed, H. K. (2002). Problem behavior interventions for young children with autism: A research synthesis. *Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders*, 32, 423-446

Smith, T., McEachin, J. J., Lovaas, O. I. (1993). Comments on replication and evaluation of outcome. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 97, 385-391

Perry, A. Cummings, A., Geier, J. D., Freeman, N. L., Hughes, S., LaRose, L., Managhan, T., Reitzel, J. A., & Williams, J. W. (2008). Effectiveness of intensive behavioral intervention in a large, community-based program. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, in press.

Recommended but not required:

Reeve, S. A., Reeve, K. F., Townsend, D. B., & Poulson, C. L. (2007). Establishing a generalized repertoire of helping behavior in children with autism. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 40, 123-136.

**WEEK 5**Monday Feb. 2

## School Psychology

**HABA**

Ervin, R., & Ehrhardt, K. (2000). Behavioral school psychology. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 113-136). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Meadows, S. F., & Skinner, C. H. (2005). Causing students to choose more language arts work: Enhancing the validity of the additive interspersal procedure. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 14, 227-247.

Twyman, J. S., Layng, T. V. J., Stikeleather, G., Hobbins, K. A. (2005). A nonlinear approach to curriculum design: The role of behavior analysis in building an effective reading program. In W. L. Heward et al. (Eds.), *Focus on behavior analysis in education*, Vol. 3. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Recommended but not required:

Clarfield, J., & Stoner, G. (2005). The effects of computerized reading instruction on the academic performance of students identified with ADHD. *School Psychology Review*, 34, 246-254.

Wednesday Feb. 4

## Assessment and Treatment of Habit Disorders

**HABA**

Miltenberger, R., & Woods, D. (2000). Assessment and treatment of habit disorders. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 137-160). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Carr, J. E., Sidener, T. M., Sidener, D. W., & Cummings, A. R. (2005). Functional analysis and habit reversal of tics. *Behavioral Interventions*, 20, 185-202.

Woods, D. W., Himle M. B., Miltenberger, R. B., Carr, J. E., Osmon, D. C., Karsten, A. M., Jostad, C., & Bosch, A. (2007). Durability, negative impact, and neuropsychological predictors of tic suppression in children with chronic tic disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*.

**WEEK 6**Monday Feb. 9**FIRST 5 PAGES OF REVIEW PAPER DUE**

Behavioral Pediatrics

**HABA**

Blum, N., & Friman, P. (2000). Behavioral pediatrics: The confluence of applied behavior analysis and pediatric medicine. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 161-186). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**HABA**

Friman, P. (2000). Behavioral, family-style residential care for troubled out-of-home adolescents: Recent findings. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 187-210). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Silverman, K., Wong, C. J., Needham, M., Diemer, K. N., Knealing, T., Crone-Todd, D., Fingerhood, M., Nuzzo, P., Kolodner, K. (2007). A randomized trial of employment-based reinforcement of cocaine abstinence in injection drug users. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 40, 387-410.

Wednesday Feb. 11

Brain-injury Rehabilitation

**HABA**

Jacobs, H. (2000). Behavioral contributions to brain-injury rehabilitation. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 211-230). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Mozzoni, M. P., & Bailey, J. S. (1996). Improving training methods in brain injury rehabilitation. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 11, 1-17.

Schlund, M. W., & Pace, G. (1999). Relations between traumatic brain injury and the environment: Feedback reduces maladaptive behaviour by three persons with traumatic brain injury. *Brain Injury*, 13, 889-897.

## WEEK 7

### Monday Feb. 16

#### Behavioral Psychotherapy

##### **HABA**

Hayes, S., & Bissett, R. T. (2000). Behavioral psychotherapy and the rise of clinical behavior analysis. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 231-246). Reno, NV: Context Press.

##### **ARTICLES**

Friman, P. C., Hayes, S.C., & Wilson, K.G. (1998). Why behavior analysts should study emotion: The example of anxiety. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 31, 137-156.

Hayes, S. C. (2004). Acceptance and commitment therapy, relational frame theory, and the third wave of behavioral and cognitive therapies. *Behavior Therapy*, 35, 639-665.

### Wednesday Feb. 18

#### Behavioral Approaches to Occupational Safety

##### **HABA**

Alavosius, M., Adams, A., Ahern, D., & Follick, M. (2000). Behavioral approaches to organizational safety. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 351-374). Reno, NV: Context Press.

##### **ARTICLES**

Alvero, A. M., & Austin, J. (2004). The effects of conducting behavioral observations on the behavior of the observer. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 37, 457-468.

Geller, E. S. (2005). Behavior-based safety and occupational risk management. *Behavior Modification*, 29, 539-561.

Cooper, M. D. (2006). Exploratory analyses of the effects of managerial support and feedback consequences on behavioral safety maintenance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 26, 1-41.

Krause, T. R., Sloat, K. C. M., Seymour, K. J. (1999). Long-term evaluation of a behavior-based method for improving safety performance: A meta-analysis of 73 interrupted time-series replications. *Safety Science*, 32, 1-18.

## WEEK 8

Monday Feb. 23

### FIRST 10 PAGES OF REVIEW PAPER DUE

Performance Diagnostics and OBM

#### HABA

Austin, J. (2000). Performance analysis and performance diagnostics. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 321-350). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### ARTICLES

Rodriguez, M., Wilder, D. A., et al. (2005). Use of the performance diagnostic checklist to select an intervention designed to increase the offering of promotional stamps at two sites of a restaurant franchise. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 25, 17-35.

Haas, J. R., & Hayes, S. C. (2006). When knowing you are doing well hinders performance: Exploring the interaction between rules and feedback. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 26, 91-112.

Kang, K., Oah, S., & Dickinson, A. M. (2003). The relative effects of differing frequencies of feedback on work performance: A simulation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 23, 21-54.

Wednesday Feb. 25

Organizational Behavior Management in Human Service Settings

#### HABA

Reid, D., & Parsons, M. B. (2000). Organizational behavior management in human service settings. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 275-294). Reno, NV: Context Press.

#### ARTICLES

Roscoe, E., M., Fisher, W. W., Glover, A. C., Volkert, V. M. (2006). Evaluating the relative effects of feedback and money for staff training of stimulus preference assessments. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 39, 63-77.

Brackett, L., Reid, D. H., & Green, C. W. (2007). Effects of reactivity to observations on staff performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 40, 191-195.

Sulzer-Azaroff, B., Pollack, M. J., Hamad, C., & Howley, T. (1998). Promoting widespread, durable service quality via interlocking contingencies. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 19, 39-61.

**WEEK 9**Monday March 2

## Behavioral Consultation &amp; Systems Analysis

**HABA**

Williams, W. L. (2000). Behavioral consultation. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 375-398). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Hyatt, S., & Tingstrom, D. (1993). Consultants' use of jargon during intervention presentation: An evaluation of presentation modality and type of intervention. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 8, 99-109.

Rummler, G. A. (2001). Performance logic: The organization performance Rosetta Stone. In L. Hayes, J. Austin, R. Houmanfar, & M. Clayton (Eds.) *Organizational change* (pp. 111-132). Reno, NV: Context Press.

Eubanks, J. L., O'Driscoll, M. P., Hayward, G. B., Daniels, J. A., & Connor, S. H. (1990). Behavioral competency requirements for organization development consultants. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 11, 77-98.

Wednesday March 4

## Behavioral Sport Psychology

**HABA**

Martin, G. L., & Tkachuk, G. A. (2000). Behavioral sport psychology. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 399-421). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**ARTICLES**

Anderson, D. C., Crowell, C. R., Doman, M., & Howard, G. S. (1988). Performance posting, goal setting, and activity-contingent praise as applied to a university hockey team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 87-95.

Smith, S. L., & Ward, P. (2006). Behavioral interventions to improve performance in collegiate football. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 39, 385-391.

## Behavioral Approaches to College Teaching

**HABA**

Austin, J. L. (2000). Behavioral approaches to college teaching. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis*, (pp. 449-472). Reno, NV: Context Press.

**WEEK 10**

Monday March 9

**FINAL DRAFT OF ENTIRE REVIEW PAPER DUE**

Students present review papers (15 min) and discussion/feedback (5 min)

Wednesday March 11

Students present review papers (15 min) and discussion/feedback (5 min)

**FINALS WEEK**

March 16-21

Monday March 16 7:30-10pm (Section 01)

Students present review papers (15 min) and discussion/feedback (5 min)

Friday March 20 7:30-10pm (Section 02)

Students present review papers (15 min) and discussion/feedback (5 min)