

Appendix A

**A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Positive Behaviour Support,
Applied Behaviour Analysis-based Assessment Practices, Applied Behaviour
Analysis-based Antecedent Practices, Applied Behaviour Analysis-based
Consequence Practices, Applied Behaviour Analysis-based ‘Mixed’ Intervention
and “Other” Practices**

Table 1

A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Positive Behaviour Support (PBS)

Studies
Allen & Tynan (2000)
Bradshaw, Mitchell & Leaf (2010)
Bradshaw, Reinke, Brown, Bevans & Leaf (2008)
Crates & Spicer (2012)
Gore & Umizawa (2011)
Grey & McClean (2007)
LaVigna, Christian & Willis (2005)
Lowe, Jones, Allen, Davies, James, Doyle, Andrew, Kaye, Jones, Brophy & Moore (2007)
McClean, Dench, Grey, Shanahan, Fitzsimons, Hendler & Corrigan (2005)
McClean & Grey (2012)
McGill, Bradshaw & Hughes (2007)
Reid, Rotholz, Parsons, Morris, Braswell, Green & Schell (2003)
Rose, Gallivan, Wright & Blake (2014)
Salmento & Bambara (2000)
Singh, Lancioni, Karazsia, Myers, Winton, Latham & Nugent (2015)
Tierney, Quinlan & Hastings (2007)

Table 2.

A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Applied Behaviour Analysis-Based Assessment Practices

Studies
Bishop & Kenzer (2012)
Borgmeier, Loman, Hara & Rodriguez (2015)
Deliperi, Vladescu, Reeve, Reeve & DeBar (2015)
Erbas, Tekin-Iftar & Yucesoy (2006)
Graff & Karsten (2012)
Lambert, Bloom, Kunnavatana, Collins & Clay (2013)
Lavie & Sturmey (2002)
Lipschultz, Vladescu, Reeve, Reeve & Dipsey (2015)
Loman & Horner (2014)
Moore & Fisher (2007)
Moore, Edwards, Sterling-Turner, Riley, DuBard & McGeorge (2002)
Pence, St Peter & Tetreault (2012)
Rosales, Gongola & Homlitas (2015)
Roscoe & Fisher (2008)
Roscoe, Fisher, Glover & Volkert (2006)
Wallace, Doney, Mintz-Resudek & Tarbox (2004)
Weldy, Rapp & Capocasa (2014)

Table 3

A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Applied Behaviour Analysis-Based Antecedent Practices

Studies
Brock & Carter (2015)
Browder, Trela & Jimenez (2007)
Brown, Stephenson & Carter (2014)
Collins, Higbee & Salzberg (2009)
Duchaine, Jolivete & Fredrick (2011)
Giannakakos, Vladescu, Kisamore & Reeve (2015)
Quilty (2007)
Schmidt, Urban, Luiselli, White & Harrington (2013)

Table 4.

A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Applied Behaviour Analysis-Based Consequence Practices

Studies
Maggin, Fallon, Sanetti & Ruberto (2012)
Petscher & Bailey (2006)

Table 5

*A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in Applied Behaviour Analysis-Based
“Mixed” Practices*

Studies
Barnes, Dunning & Rehfeldt (2011)
Belfiore, Fritts & Herman (2008)
Bingham, Spooner & Browder (2007)
Bolton & Mayer (2008)
Bryson & Ostmeier (2014)
Catania, Almeida, Liu-Constant & Reed (2009)
Da Fonte & Capizzi (2015)
Dib & Sturmey (2007)
Douglas, Light & McNaughton (2013)
Douglas, McNaughton & Light (2013)
Dowey, Toogood, Hastings & Nash (2007)
Ducharme, Williams, Cummings, Murray & Spencer (2001)
Feldman & Matos (2013)
Gentry, Icceton & Milne (2001)
Gilligan, Luiselli & Pace (2007)
Granpeesheh, Tarbox, Dixon, Peters, Thompson & Kenzer (2010)
Grey, McClean & Barnes-Holmes (2002)
Haberlin, Beauchamp, Agnew & O'Brien (2012)
Hall, Grundon, Pope & Romero (2010)
Homlitas, Rosales & Candel (2014)
Horrocks & Morgan (2011)
Leblanc, Ricciardi & Luiselli (2005)
Lerman, Tetreault, Hovanetz, Strobel & Garro (2008)
Lerman, Vorndran, Addison & Kuhn (2004)
Luiselli & St. Amand (2005)
Luiselli, Bass & Whitcomb (2010)
Luiselli, St. Amand, MaGee & Sperry (2007)
Macurik, O'Kane, Malanga & Reid (2008)
McBride & Schwartz (2003)
McCulloch & Noonan (2013)
McKenzie, Sharp, Paxton & Murray (2002)
Nigro-Bruzzi & Sturmey (2010)
Nosik & Williams (2011)
Nosik, Williams, Garrido & Lee (2013)
Parsons, Rollyson & Reid (2004)
Parsons, Rollyson & Reid (2012)
Robinson (2011)
Ryan & Ilemmes (2005)
Sarokoff & Sturmey (2004)

Sarokoff & Sturmev (2008)
Schepis, Ownbey, Parsons & Reid (2000)
Schepis, Reid, Ownbey & Clary (2003)
Schepis, Reid, Ownbey & Parsons (2001)
Suhrheinrich (2011)
Suhrheinrich (2015)
van Vonderen, de Swart & Didden (2010)
van Vonderen, Duker & Didden (2010)
Vladescu, Carroll, Paden & Kodak (2012)
Wood, Luiselli & Harchik (2007)
Zoder-Martell, Dufrene, Tingstrom, Olmi, Jordan, Biskie & Sherman (2014)

Table 6

A Summary of the Studies Providing Training in “Other” Practices

Studies
Brookman-Fraze, Drahota & Stadnick (2012)
Campbell & Hogg (2008)
Chou, Harman, Lin, Lee, Chang & Lin (2011)
Felce, Bowley, Baxter, Jones, Lowe & Emerson (2000)
Jones, Felce, Lowe, Bowley, Pagler, Strong, Gallagher, Roper & Kurowska (2001)
Marks, Sisirak & Chang (2013)
Perkins & Leadbetter (2002)
Smidt, Balandin, Reed & Sigafos (2007)
Smith, Felce, Jones & Lowe (2002)
Stimpson, Kroese, MacMahon, Rose, Townson, Felce, Hood, Jahoda, Rose & Willner (2013)
Toogood (2008)
Totsika, Toogood, Hastings & McCarthy (2010)
Totsika, Toogood, Hastings & Nash (2008)
Willner, Rose, Jahoda, Kroese, Felce, MacMahon, Stimpson, Rose, Gillespie, Shead, Lammie, Woodgate, Townson, Nuttall & Hood (2013)

Appendix B

Outline of Criteria for each Rating on the Scientific Merit Rating Scale (SMRS)

SMRS Rating 5

Research Design		Measurement of Dependent Variable	Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)		
Group	Single-subject						
	<p>All designs except alternating treatments design</p> <p>Alternating Treatments Design</p>	<p>Test, scale, checklist, etc.</p> <p>Direct behavioural observation</p>					
<p>Number of groups: two or more</p> <p>Design: Random assignment and/or no significant differences pre-intervention</p> <p>Participants: n ≥ 10 per group or sufficient</p>	<p>A minimum of three comparisons of control and intervention conditions</p> <p>Number of data points per condition: ≥ five</p> <p>Number of participants: ≥ three</p> <p>Data loss: no data loss</p>	<p>Comparison of baseline and experimental conditions</p> <p>Number of data points per experimental condition: ≥ five</p> <p>Follow-up data collected</p> <p>Carryover effects minimised through counterbalancing</p>	<p>Type of measurement: Observation-based</p> <p>Protocol: Standardised</p> <p>Psychometric properties solid</p> <p>Evaluators: blind and independent</p>	<p>Type of measurement: continuous or discontinuous with calibration data showing low levels of error</p> <p>Reliability: IOA ≥ 90% or kappa ≥ .75</p> <p>Percentage of sessions: Reliability collected in ≥ 25%</p>	<p>Implementation accuracy measured at >80%</p> <p>Implementation accuracy measured in 25% of total sessions</p> <p>IOA for intervention fidelity >80%</p>	<p>Diagnosed by a qualified professional</p> <p>Diagnosis confirmed by independent and blind evaluators for research purposes using at least one psychometrically solid instrument</p> <p>DSM or ICD criteria or commonly accepted criteria during the identified time period reported to be met</p>	<p>Objective data</p> <p>Maintenance data collected</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Generalisation data collected across at least two of the following: setting, stimuli, persons</p>

<p>power for lower number of participants</p> <p>Data loss: no data loss</p>		<p>of key variables (e.g., time of day) and condition discriminability</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq three</p> <p>Data loss: no data loss</p>		<p>Type of conditions in which data were collected: all sessions</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SMRS Rating 4

Research Design		Measurement of Dependent Variable	Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)		
Group	Single-subject						
	All designs except alternating treatments design	Alternating Treatments Design	Test, scale, checklist, etc.	Direct behavioural observation			
<p>Number of groups: two or more</p> <p>Design: Matched groups; No significant differences pre-intervention; or better design</p> <p>Participants: $n \geq 10$ per group or sufficient power for lower</p>	<p>A minimum of three comparisons of control and intervention conditions</p> <p>Number of data points per condition: \geq five</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq three</p> <p>Data loss: some data loss possible</p>	<p>Comparison of baseline and experimental conditions</p> <p>Number of data points per experimental condition: \geq five</p> <p>Carryover effects minimised through counterbalancing of key variables (e.g., time of day) and condition discriminability</p>	<p>Type of measurement: Observation-based</p> <p>Protocol: Standardised</p> <p>Psychometric properties solid</p> <p>Evaluators: blind OR independent</p>	<p>Type of measurement: continuous or discontinuous with no calibration data</p> <p>Reliability: IOA $\geq 90\%$ or kappa $\geq .75$</p> <p>Percentage of sessions: Reliability collected in $\geq 25\%$</p> <p>Type of conditions in which data were collected: all sessions</p>	<p>Implementation accuracy measured at $\geq 80\%$</p> <p>Implementation accuracy measured in 20% of total sessions</p> <p>IOA for intervention fidelity: not reported</p>	<p>Diagnosis provided/confirmed by independent and blind evaluators for research purposes using at least one psychometrically solid instrument</p>	<p>Objective data</p> <p>Maintenance data collected</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Generalisation data collected across at least one of the following: setting, stimuli, persons</p>

number of participants		Number of participants: \geq three					
Data loss: some data loss possible		Data loss: some data loss possible					

SMRS Rating 3

Research Design			Measurement of Dependent Variable		Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)
Group	Single-subject		Test, scale, checklist, etc.	Direct behavioural observation			
	All designs except alternating treatments design	Alternating Treatments Design					
<p>Number of groups: two or more</p> <p>Design: Pre-intervention differences are controlled statistically or better design</p> <p>Data loss: some data loss possible</p>	<p>A minimum of two comparisons of control and intervention conditions</p> <p>Number of data points per condition: \geq three</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq two</p> <p>Data loss: some data loss possible</p>	<p>Number of data points per experimental condition: \geq five</p> <p>Carryover effects minimised through counterbalancing of key variables (e.g., time of day) and condition discriminability</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq two</p> <p>Data loss: some data loss possible</p>	<p>Type of measurement: Observation-based</p> <p>Protocol: Non-standardised on standardised</p> <p>Psychometric properties adequate</p> <p>Evaluators: neither blind nor independent required</p>	<p>Type of measurement: continuous or discontinuous with no calibration data</p> <p>Reliability: IOA \geq 80% or kappa \geq .4</p> <p>Percentage of sessions: Reliability collected in \geq 20%</p> <p>Type of conditions in which data were collected: all or experimental sessions only</p>	<p>Implementation accuracy measured at \geq 80%</p> <p>Implementation accuracy measured in 20% of partial sessions</p> <p>IOA for intervention fidelity: not reported</p>	<p>Diagnosis provided/confirmed by independent</p> <p>OR</p> <p>blind evaluators for research purposes using at least one psychometrically adequate instrument</p> <p>OR</p> <p>DSM or ICD criteria conformed by a qualified diagnostician and/or blind evaluator</p>	<p>Objective data</p> <p>Maintenance data collected</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Generalisation data collected across at least one of the following: setting, stimuli, persons</p>

SMRS Rating 2

Research Design		Measurement of Dependent Variable		Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)	
Group	Single-subject	Test, scale, checklist, etc.	Direct behavioural observation				
	All designs except alternating treatments design			Alternating Treatments Design			
Number of groups and Design: If two or more groups, pre-intervention difference not controlled or better design OR A one group repeated measures pre-test/post-test design	A minimum of two comparisons of control and intervention conditions Number of data points per condition: \geq three Number of participants: \geq two Data loss: significant data loss possible	Number of data points per experimental condition: \geq five Number of participants: \geq two Data loss: significant data loss possible	Type of measurement: Observation-based or subjective Protocol: Non-standardised on standardised Psychometric properties modest Evaluators: neither blind nor independent required	Type of measurement: continuous or discontinuous with no calibration data Reliability: IOA \geq 80% or kappa \geq .4 Percentage of sessions: not reported Type of conditions in which data were collected: not necessarily reported	Control condition is operationally defined at an inadequate level or better Experimental (intervention) procedures are operationally defined at a rudimentary level or better Implementation accuracy: not reported IOA for intervention fidelity: not reported	Diagnosis with at least one psychometrically modest instrument OR Diagnosis provided by a qualified diagnostician or independent and/or blind evaluator with no reference to psychometric properties of instrument	Subjective data Maintenance data collected AND Generalisation data collected across at least one of the following: setting, stimuli, persons

Data loss: significant data loss possible				Operational definitions are extensive or rudimentary			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

SMRS Rating 1

Research Design		Measurement of Dependent Variable		Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)	
Group	Single-subject	Test, scale, checklist, etc.	Direct behavioural observation				
	All designs except alternating treatments design			Alternating Treatments Design			
<p>Number of groups and Design: two group post-test only or better research design</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Retrospective comparison of one or more matched groups</p> <p>Data loss: significant</p>	<p>A minimum of two comparisons of control and intervention conditions</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq one</p> <p>Data loss: significant data loss possible</p>	<p>Number of data points per experimental condition: \geq five</p> <p>Number of participants: \geq one</p> <p>Data loss: significant data loss possible</p>	<p>Type of measurement: Observation-based or subjective</p> <p>Protocol: Non-standardised on standardised</p> <p>Psychometric properties weak</p> <p>Evaluators: neither blind nor independent required</p>	<p>Type of measurement: continuous or discontinuous with no calibration data</p> <p>Type of conditions in which data were collected: not necessarily reported</p> <p>Operational definitions are extensive or rudimentary</p>	<p>Control condition is operationally defined at an inadequate level or better</p> <p>Experimental (intervention) procedures are operationally defined at a rudimentary level or better</p> <p>IOA and intervention fidelity are not reported</p>	<p>Diagnosis by review of records</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Instrument with weak psychometric support</p>	<p>Subjective data</p> <p>Maintenance data collected</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Generalisation data collected across at least one of the following: setting, stimuli, persons</p>

data loss possible							
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SMRS Rating 0

Research Design		Measurement of Dependent Variable		Measurement of Independent Variable	Participant Ascertainment	Generalisation and Maintenance of Intervention Effect(s)
Group	Single-subject	Test, scale, checklist, etc.	Direct behavioural observation			
	All designs except alternating treatments design	Alternating Treatments Design				
Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1	Does not meet criterion for a score of 1

Appendix C

**Summary of the Studies Focusing on Systematic Prompting, Task Analysis, and
Functional Communication Training**

Table 20

A Summary of the Studies Focusing on Systematic Prompting

Studies
Ahlgrim-Delzell, Browder & Wood (2014)
Ahlgrim-Delzell, Browder, Wood, Stanger, Preston & Kemp-Inman (2016)
Akcin (2013)
Akmanoglu & Batu (2004)
Akmanoglu & Tekin-Iftar (2011)
Akmanoglu, Yanardag & Batu (2014)
Akmanoglu-Uludag & Batu (2005)
Alberto, Cihak & Gama (2005)
Alberto, Waugh & Fredrick (2010)
Alcantara (1994)
Allen, Burke, Howard, Wallace & Bowen (2012)
Anderson, Sherman, Sheldon & McAdam (1997)
Aoki & Yamamoto (1996)
Ault, Gast & Wolery (1988)
Bannerman, Sheldon & Sherman (1991)
Barbetta, Heward & Bradley (1993)
Batu (2008)
Batu (2014)
Batu, Ergenekon, Erbas & Akmanoglu (2004)
Baumgart & Van Wallegem (1987)
Bell, Young, Salzberg & West (1991)
Bennett, Gast, Wolery & Schuster (1986)
Bennett, Reichow & Wolery (2011)
Bevill, Gast, Maguire & Vail (2001)
Biederman, Fairhall, Raven & Davey (1998)
Biederman, Fairhall, Raven & Davey (1998)
Bingham, Spooner & Browder (2007)
Birkan (2005)
Bizarra & Ribeiro (2009)
Bosner & Belfiore (2001)
Browder & D'Huyvetters (1988)
Browder, Shapiro & Ambrogio (1986)
Browder, Hudson & Wood (2013)
Bruder (1986)
Burke, Andersen, Bowen, Howard & Allen (2010)
Cavallaro & Poulson (1985)
Cavkaytar (2012)

Celik & Vuran (2014)
 Certo, Mezzullo & Hunter (1985)
 Chan, Lambdin, Graham, Fragale & Davis (2014)
 Chandler, Schuster & Stevens (1993)
 Choi, O'Reilly, Sigafos & Lancioni (2010)
 Christensen, Lignugaris-Kraft & Fiechtl (1996)
 Cihak, Alberto, Taber-Doughty & Gama (2006)
 Cipani (1985)
 Coe, Matson, Craigie & Gossen (1991)
 Coleman, Cherry, Moore, Yujeong & Cihak (2015)
 Coleman, Hurley & Cihak (2012)
 Collins, Branson, Hall & Rankin (2001)
 Collins, Gast, Wolery, Holcombe & Leatherby (1991)
 Collins, Hall & Branson (1997)
 Colozzi, Ward & Crotty (2008)
 Coyler & Collins (1996)
 Conyer, Martin, Yu & Vause (2000)
 Cooper & Browder (1997)
 Copeland & Hughes (2000)
 Creech-Galloway, Collins, Knight & Bausch (2013)
 Davies, Stock & Wehmeyer (2003)
 Day (1987)
 Denny, Marchand-Martella, Martella, Reilly, Reilly & Cleanthous (2000)
 Devine, Malley, Sheldon, Dattilo & Gast (1997)
 DiCarlo, Reid & Stricklin (2003)
 Dollar, Fredrick, Alberto & Luke (2012)
 Dorminy, Luscre & Gast (2009)
 Downing (1987)
 Doyle, Wolery, Gast, Ault & Wiley (1990)
 Doyle, Gast, Wolery, Ault & Farmer (1990)
 Doyle, Gast, Wolery, Ault & Meyer (1992)
 Duker, Dortmans & Lodder (1993)
 Duker & Jutten (1997)
 Duker & Moonen (1985)
 Dunne & Sanders (1986)
 Duran (1985)
 Emmick, Cihon & Eshleman (2010)
 Ergenekon, Tekin-Iftar, Kapan & Akmanoglu (2014)
 Fetko, Schuster, Harley & Collins (1999)
 Fiscus, Schuster, Morse & Collins (2002)
 Fox, Shores, Lindeman & Strain (1986)
 Gast, Doyle, Wolery, Ault & Farmer (1991)
 Gaule, Nietupski & Certo (1985)

-
- Gee, Graham, Goetz, Oshima & Yoshioka (1991)
Gibson & Schuster (1992)
Gilson & Carter (2016)
Godby, Gast & Wolery (1987)
Gruber & Poulson (2016)
Gursel, Tekin-Iftar & Bozkurt (2006)
Halasz-Dees & Cuvo (1986)
Hartzell, Liaupsin, Gann & Clem (2015)
Heap & Emerson (1989)
Heinrich, Collins, Knight & Spriggs (2016)
Hibbert, Kostinas & Luiselli (2002)
Hinderscheit & Reicle (1987)
Hoogeveen, Kouwenhoven & Smeets (1989)
Hoogeveen, Smeets & Van der Houven (1987)
Hourcade (1988)
Husdon & Browder (2014)
Hudson, Browder & Jimenez (2014)
Ivanic & Schepis (1995)
James & Egel (1986)
Kagohara, Sigafos, Achmadi, van der Meer, O'Reilly & Lancioni (2011)
Kapadia & Fantuzzo (1988)
Karen, Astin-Smith & Creasy (1985)
Karl, Collins, Hager & Ault (2013)
Kee, Casey, Cea, Bicard & Bicard (2012)
Keogh, Whitman, Beeman, Halligan & Starzynski (1987)
Kistner, Robbins & Haskett (1988)
Knudson, Miltenberger, Bosch, Gross, Brower-Breitwieser & Tarasenko (2009)
Kouri (2005)
Kroeger & Nelson (2006)
Krstovska-Guerrero & Jones (2016)
Kryzak & Jones (2015)
Lalli, Mace, Browder & Brown (1989)
Lancioni, O'Reilly, Oliva, Bianchi & Pirani (2000)
Lane (1996)
Le Grice & Blampied (1997)
Leaf, Leaf, Taubman, McEachin & Delmolino (2014)
Leaf, Oppenheim-Leaf, Dotson, Johnson, Courtemanche, Sheldon & Sherman (2011)
Light, Binger, Ramsay & Agate (1999)
Lorah, Crouser, Gilroy, Tincani & Hantula (2014)
Lorah, Karnes & Speight (2015)
Luciano, Barnes-Holmes & Barnes-Holmes (2002)
Luciano (1986)
-

Luiselli (1985)
Luiselli (1988)
Luiselli (1996)
MacArthur, Ballard & Artinian (1986)
MacDuff, Krantz & McClannahan (1993)
Maciag, Schuster, Collins & Cooper (2000)
Maeser & Thyer (1990)
Manley, Collins, Stenhoff & Kleinert (2008)
Massey & Wheeler (2000)
Matson, Bamberg, Smalls & Smiroldo (1997)
Matson, Manikam, Coe, Raymond, Taras & Long (1988)
Matson, Smalls, Hampff, Smiroldo & Anderson (1998)
Matson, Taras, Sevin, Love & Fridley (1990)
McAdam & Cuvo (1994)
McCathren (2000)
McDonald & Hemmes (2003)
McDonnell (1987)
McDonnell & Ferguson (1989)
McKay, Weiss, Dickson & Ahern (2014)
McKelvey, Sisson, van Hessel & Hersen (1992)
McLaughlin & Walsh (1996)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Stephens (2009)
Miller & Test (1989)
Minarovic & Bambara (2007)
Mitchell, Schuster, Collins & Gassaway (2000)
Morro, Mackay & Carlin (2014)
Murdock & Hobbs (2011)
Newman & Eyck (2005)
O'Handley, Dadakhodjaeva, Radley & Dart (2016)
Odluyurt & Batu (2010)
Ostry & Wolfe (2011)
Ozen (2008)
Palmer, Collins & Schuster (1999)
Parker & Schuster (2002)
Parrott, Schuster, Collins & Gassaway (2000)
Pattison & Robertson (2016)
Pennington, Delano & Scott (2014)
Pennington, Collins, Stenhoff, Turner & Gunselman (2014)
Pennington, Stenhoff, Gibson & Ballou (2012)
Philips and Vollmer (2012)
Piazza, Anderson & Fisher (1993)

Rae & Roll (1985)
Rao & Kane (2009)
Rao & Mallow (2009)
Reichle, McComas, Dahl, Solberg, Pierce & Smith (2005)
Repp, Karsh & Lenz (1990)
Riley (1990)
Riley (1996)
Robinson & Smith (2010)
Romski, Sevcik & Pate (1988)
Ronning & Nabuzoka (1993)
Roy-Wsiaki, Marion, Martin & Yu (2010)
Sabiely & Cannella-Malone (2014)
Schoen & Ogden (1995)
Schoen & Sivil (1989)
Schuebel & Lalli (1992)
Schuster & Griffen (1993)
Schuster, Griffen & Wolery (1992)
Seward, Schuster, Ault, Collins & Hall (2014)
Sewell, Collins, Hemmeter & Schuster (1998)
Shimizu & McDonough (2006)
Shimizu, Yoon & McDonough (2010)
Sigafos, Couzens, Roberts, Philips & Goodison (1996)
Sigafos, O'Reilly, Seely-York & Edrisinha (2004)
Simacek, Reichle & McComas (2016)
Simmons & Flexer (1992)
Singh, Oswald, Ellis & Singh (1995)
Singleton, Schuster, Morse & Collins (1999)
Singleton, Schuster & Ault (1995)
Sisson, Kilwein & Van Hasselt (1988)
Skibo, Mims & Spooner (2011)
Smeets (1992)
Smeets, Striefel & Hoogreveen (1990)
Smeets, Lancioni & Striefel (1987)
Smith, Schuster, Collins & Kleinert (2011)
Smith, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (1999)
Snell, Lewis & Houghton (1989)
Sowers, Verdi, Bourbeau & Sheehan (1985)
Spriggs, Gast & Ayres (2007)
Steed & Lutzker (1997)
Stokes, Cameron, Dorsey & Fleming (2004)
Stonecipher, Schuster, Collins & Grisham-Brown (1999)
Strand & Morris (1986)
Strand & Morris (1988)

Strasberger & Ferreri (2014)
Summers, Rincover & Feldman (1993)
Swain, Lane & Gast (2015)
Swenson-Pierce, Kohl & Egel (1987)
Tam, Philips & Mudford (2011)
Taras, Matson & Felps (1993)
Tarbox, Madrid, Aquilar, Jacobo & Schiff (2009)
Tarnowski & Drabman (1987)
Taylor, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (2002)
Taylor (1987)
Tekin & Kircaali-Iftar (2002)
Tekin-Iftar, Kurt & Cetin (2011)
Tekin-Iftar (2003)
Tekin-Iftar (2008)
Tekin-Iftar, Acar & Kurt (2003)
Tekin-Iftar, Kurt & Acar (2008)
Thierman & Martin (1989)
Thompson, Cotnoir-Bichelma, McKerchar, Tate & Dancho (2007)
Trask-Tyler, Grossi & Heward (1994)
Valentino, Shillingsburg & Call (2012)
van der Meer, Achmadi, Cooymans, Didden, Lancioni, O'Reilly, Roche, Stevens,
Carnett, Hodis, Green, Sutherland, Lang, Rispoli, Marschik & Sigafos (2015)
van der Meer, Kagohara, Achmadi, Green, Herrington, Sigafos, O'Reilly, Lancioni,
Lang & Rispoli (2011)
van der Meer, Kagohara, Roche, Sutherland, Balandin, Green, O'Reilly, Lancioni,
Marschik & Sigafos (2013)
Waugh, Fredrick & Alberto (2009)
Welch, Nietupski & Hamre-Nietupski (1985)
Wheeler, Bates, Marshall & Miller (1988)
Wilson, Reid & Green (2006)
Winterling, Gast, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Wolery, Ault, Gast, Doyle & Griffen (1991)
Wood, Browder & Flynn (2015)
Yilmaz, Konukman, Birkan & Yanardag (2010)
Zhang, Cote, Chen & Liu (2004)
Zhang, Gast, Horvat & Dattilo (1995)
Zhang, Horvat & Gast (1994)

Table 24

A Summary of the Studies Focusing on Task Analysis

Studies
Aykut, Dageseven Emecen, Dayi & Karasu (2014)
Ayres, Maguire & McClimon (2009)
Batu (2014)
Browder, Lim, Lin & Belfiore (1993)
Browder, Snell & Wildonger (1988)
Cannella-Malone, Sigafos, O'Reilly, de la Cruz, Edrisinha & Lancioni (2006)
Cannella-Malone, Fleming, Chung, Wheeler, Basbagill & Singh (2011)
Cavkaytar (2012)
Certo, Mezzullo & Hunter (1985)
Chandler, Schuster & Stevens (1993)
Choi, Wong & Chung (2012)
Collins, Gast, Wolery, Holcombe & Leatherby (1991)
Cromartie, Flood & Luiselli (2014)
Demore, Cataldo, Tierney & Slifer (2009)
Dollar, Fredrick, Alberto & Luke (2012)
Drysdale, Lee, Anderson & Moore (2015)
Duran (1985)
Epps, Stern & Horner (1990)
Ergenekon, Tekin-Iftar, Kapan & Akmanoglu (2014)
Falkenstine, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (2009)
Faloon & Rehfeldt (2008)
Faw, Davis & Peck (1996)
Fetko, Schuster, Harley & Collins (1999)
Garff & Storey (1998)
Gast, Winterling, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Godsey, Schuster, Lingo, Collins & Kleinert (2008)
Goh & Bambara (2013)
Goodson, Sigafos, O'Reilly, Cannella & Lancioni (2007)
Griffin, Wolery & Schuster (1992)
Gruber & Poulson (2016)
Hagopian, Farrell & Amari (1996)
Halasz-Dees & Cuvo (1986)
Hall, Schuster, Wolery, Gast & Doyle (1992)
Heinrich, Collins, Knight & Spriggs (2016)
Hogan (1988)
Horn, Miltenberger, Weil, Mowery, Conn & Sams (2008)
Inglesfield & Crisp (1985)
Kagohara, Sigafos, Achmadi, van der Meer, O'Reilly & Lancioni (2011)
Keogh, Whitman, Beeman, Halligan & Starzynski (1987)
Knight, Spooner, Browder, Smith & Wood (2013)

Kourassanis, Jones & Fienup (2015)
Lambert, Copeland, Karp, Finley, Houchins-Juarez & Ledford (2016)
Lancioni, Singh, O'Reilly, Sigafos, Oliva, Smaldone, La Martire, Alberti & Scigliuzzo (2011)
Le Grice & Blampied (1994)
Lee, Anderson & Moore (2014)
Lifschitz (1999)
MacArthur, Ballard & Artinian (1986)
Maciag, Schuster, Collins & Cooper (2000)
Maeser & Thyer (1990)
Matson, Bamburg, Smalls & Smiroldo (1997)
McAdam & Cuvo (1994)
McConville, Hantula & Axelrod (1998)
McDonnell & Laughlin (1989)
McDonnell & McFarland (1988)
McLaughlin & Walsh (1996)
McWilliams, Nietupski & Hamre-Nietupski (1990)
Mechling, Ayres, Byrant & Foster (2014)
Mechling, Ayres, Byrant & Foster (2014)
Mechling, Bryant, Spencer & Ayres (2015)
Mechling & Collins (2012)
Mechling & Gast (1997)
Mechling, Gast & Fields (2008)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Stephens (2009)
Moore, Anderson, Treccase, Deppeler, Furlonger & Didden (2013)
O'Handley, Dadakhodjaeva, Radley & Dart (2016)
Parker & Kamps (2011)
Parrott, Schuster, Collins & Gassaway (2000)
Parsons, Reid, Green, Browning & Hensley (2002)
Ramirez, Cengher & Fienup (2014)
Rao & Kane (2009)
Richman, Ponticas, Page & Epps (1986)
Sabiely & Cannella-Malone (2014)
Schepis, Reid & Fitzgerald (1987)
Schuster, Gast, Wolery & Gultinan (1988)
Schuster & Griffin (1993)
Scott, Collins, Knight & Kleinert (2013)
Shimizu, Yoon & McDonough (2010)
Sigafos, O'Reilly, Cannella, Edrisinha, de la Cruz, Upadhyaya, Lancioni, Hundley, Andrews, Garver & Young (2007)

Sigafoos, O'Reilly, Cannella, Upadyyaya, Edrisinha, Lancioni, Hundley, Andrews, Garver & Young (2005)
Sisson, Kilwein & Van Hasselt (1988)
Stokes, Cameron, Dorsey & Fleming (2004)
Stonecipher, Schuster, Collins & Grisham-Brown (1999)
Tarnowski & Drabman (1987)
Taylor & O'Reilly (2000)
Veazey, Valentino, Low, McElroy & LeBlanc (2016)
Wacker, Berg, Visser & Egan (1986)
Werts, Caldwell & Wolery (1996)
Winterling, Gast, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Wolery, Ault, Gast, Doyle & Griffen (1991)
Xin & Holmdal (2003)
Yilmaz, Birkan, Konukman & Erkan (2005)
Young, West, Howard & Whitney (1986)
Zisimopoulos, Sigafoos & Koutromanos (2011)

Table 30

A Summary of the Studies Focusing on Functional Communication Training

Studies
Austin & Tiger (2015)
Berg, Ringdahl, Ryan, Ing, Lustig, Romani, Wacker, Andersen & Durako (2015)
Berg, Wacker, Harding, Ganzer & Barretto (2007)
Braithwaite & Richdale (2000)
Brown, Wacker, Derby, Peck, Richman, Sasso, Knutson & Harding (2000)
Byiers, Dimian & Symons (2014)
Carr & Carlson (1993)
Carr & Durand (1985)
Carr, Levin, McConnachie, Carlson, Kemp, Smith & McLaughlin (1999)
Casey & Mercial (2006)
Chezan, Drasgow & Martin (2014)
Conklin & Mayer (2011)
Dalmau, Wacker, Harding, Berg, Schieltz, Lee, Breznican & Kramer (2011)
Davis, Fredrick, Alberto & Gama (2012)
Derby, Wacker, Berg, DeRaad, Ulrich, Asmus, Harding, Prouty, Laffey, Stoner (1997)
Dixon, Benedict & Larson (2001)
Doyle, DeRosa & Roane (2013)
Drasgow, Halle, Ostrosky & Harbers (1996)
Durand (1999)
Durand & Carr (1991)
Durand & Carr (1992)
Falcomata, Wacker, Ringdahl, Vinquist & Dutt (2013)
Falcomata, White, Muething & Fragale (2012)
Fisher, Piazza, Cataldo, Harrell, Jefferson & Conner (1993)
Fisher, Adelinis, Thompson, Worsdell & Zarccone (1998)
Fisher, Greer, Querim & DeRosa (2014)
Fisher, Kuhn & Thompson (1998)
Franco, Lang, O'Reilly, Chan, Sigafos & Rispoli (2009)
Hagopian, Fisher, Sullivan, LeBlanc & Acquisto (1998)
Hanley, Iwata & Thompson (2001)
Hanley, Piazza, Fisher & Maglieri (2005)
Harding, Wacker, Berg, Winborn-Kemmerer & Lee (2009)
Hetzroni & Roth (2003)
Kahng, Iwata, DeLeon & Worsdell (1997)
Kahng, Hendrickson & Vu (2000)
Kelley, Lerman & Van Camp (2002)
Kemp & Carr (1995)
Kern, Mauk, Marder & Mace (1995)

Koegel, Stiebel & Koegel (1998)
Kuhn, Chirighin & Zelenka (2010)
Kuhn, Hardesty & Sweeney (2009)
Lalli, Casey & Kates (1995)
Lambert, Bloom & Irvin (2012)
Langdon, Carr & Owen-DeSchryver (2008)
Leon, Hausman, Kahng & Becraft (2010)
Lerman, Kelley, Vorndran, Kuhn & LaRue (2002)
Mace & Lalli (1991)
Manning & Katz (1991)
Najdowski, Wallace, Ellsworth, MacAleese & Cleveland (2008)
O'Neill & Sweetland-Baker (2001)
O'Reilly, Fragale, Gainey, Kang, Koch, Shubert, Zein, Longino, Chung, Xu, White, Lang, Davis, Rispoli, Lancioni, Didden, Healy, Kagohara, van der Meer & Sigafos (2012)
Radstaake, Didden, Lang, O'Reilly, Sigafos, Lancioni, Appels & Curfs (2013)
Reeve & Carr (2000)
Rehfeldt & Chambers (2003)
Rispoli, Camargo, Machalicek, Lang & Sigafos (2014)
Robinson & Owens (1995)
Scalzo, Henry, Davis, Amos, Zoch, Turchan & Wagner (2015)
Schieltz, Wacker, Harding, Berg, Lee, Dalmau, Mews & Ibrahimovic (2011)
Schindler & Horner (2005)
Schmidt, Drasgow, Halle, Martin & Bliss (2014)
Shirley, Iwata, Kahng, Mazaleski & Lerman (1997)
Shukla & Albin (1996)
Symons, Fox & Thompson (1998)
Tait, Sigafos, Woodyatt, O'Reilly & Lancioni (2004)
Thompson, Fisher, Piazza & Kuhn (1998)
Umbreit (1996)
Volkert, Lerman, Call & Trosclair-Lasserre (2009)
Vollmer & Vorndran (1998)
Wacker, Steege, Northup, Sasso, Berg, Reimers, Cooper, Cigrand & Donn (1990)
Winborn-Kemmerer, Ringdahl, Wacker & Kitsukawa (2009)
Worsdell, Iwata, Hanley, Thompson & Kahng (2000)

Appendix D

**Studies (SMRS ≥ 3) from the Prompting, Task Analysis and Functional
Communication Training Reviews that Used Reinforcement**

Table 36

Studies from the Systematic Prompting Review (SMRS ≥ 3) that Used Reinforcement as Part of the Intervention

<u>Study</u>
Ahlgren-Delzell, Browder & Wood (2014)
Akcin (2013)
Akmanoglu & Batu (2004)
Akmanoglu & Tekin-Iftar (2011)
Akmanoglu, Yanardag & Batu (2014)
Akmanoglu-Uludag & Batu (2005)
Alberto, Cihak & Gama (2004)
Alcantara (1994)
Allen, Burke, Howard, Wallace & Bowen (2012)
Ault, Gast & Wolery (1988)
Bannerman, Sheldon & Sherman (1991)
Barbetta, Heward & Bradley (1993)
Batu (2008)
Batu, Ergenekon, Erbas & Akmanoglu (2004)
Bell, Young, Salzberg & West (1991)
Bennett, Gast, Wolery & Schuster (1986)
Bennett, Reichow & Wolery (2011)
Bevill, Gast, Maguire & Vail (2001)
Birkan (2005)
Browder, Hudson & Wood (2013)
Cavallaro & Poulson (1985)
Cavkaytar (2012)
Celik & Vuran (2014)
Chan, Lambdin, Graham, Fragale & Davis (2014)
Chandler, Schuster & Stevens (1993)
Choi, O'Reilly, Sigafos & Lancioni (2010)
Cihak, Alberto, Taber-Doughty & Gama (2006)
Cipani (1985)
Coe, Matson, Craigie & Gossen (1991)
Coleman, Cherry, Moore, Yujeong & Cihak (2015)
Coleman, Hurley & Cihak (2012)
Collins, Gast, Wolery, Holcombe & Leatherby (1991)
Collins, Hall & Branson (1997)
Coyler & Collins (1996)
Cooper & Browder (1997)
Copeland & Hughes (2000)
Creech-Galloway, Collins, Knight & Bausch (2013)
Day (1987)
Devine, Malley, Sheldon, Dattilo & Gast (1997)
DiCarlo, Reid & Stricklin (2003)
Dollar, Fredrick, Alberto & Luke (2012)
Dorminy, Luscre & Gast (2009)

Downing (1987)
Duker, Dortmans & Lodder (1993)
Duker & Jutten (1997)
Emmick, Cihon & Eshleman (2010)
Ergenekon, Tekin-Iftar, Kapan & Akmanoglu (2014)
Fetko, Schuster, Harley & Collins (1999)
Fox, Shores, Lindeman & Strain (1986)
Gast, Doyle, Wolery, Ault & Farmer (1991)
Gee, Graham, Goetz, Oshima & Yoshioka (1991)
Gibson & Schuster (1992)
Gilson & Carter (2016)
Godby, Gast & Wolery (1987)
Gruber & Poulson (2016)
Gursel, Tekin-Iftar & Bozkurt (2006)
Halasz-Dees & Cuvo (1986)
Hartzell, Liaupsin, Gann & Clem (2015)
Heinrich, Collins, Knight & Spriggs (2016)
Hoogeveen, Kouwenhoven & Smeets (1989)
Husdon & Browder (2014)
Hudson, Browder & Jimenez (2014)
Ivanic & Schepis (1995)
James & Egel (1986)
Kagohara, Sigafos, Achmadi, van der Meer, O'Reilly & Lancioni (2011)
Karl, Collins, Hager & Ault (2013)
Keogh, Whitman, Beeman, Halligan & Starzynski (1987)
Kistner, Robbins & Haskett (1988)
Knudson, Miltenberger, Bosch, Gross, Brower-Breitwieser & Tarasenko (2009)
Kouri (2005)
Krstovska-Guerrero & Jones (2016)
Kryzak & Jones (2015)
Lalli, Mace, Browder & Brown (1989)
Leaf, Leaf, Taubman, McEachin & Delmolino (2014)
Leaf, Oppenheim-Leaf, Dotson, Johnson, Courtemanche, Sheldon & Sherman (2011)
Lorah, Karnes & Speight (2015)
Luciano, Barnes-Holmes & Barnes-Holmes (2002)
MacDuff, Krantz & McClannahan (1993)
Maeser & Thyer (1990)
Manley, Collins, Stenhoff & Kleinert (2008)
McAdam & Cuvo (1994)
McDonnell (1987)
McDonnell & Ferguson (1989)
McKay, Weiss, Dickson & Ahern (2014)
McLaughlin & Walsh (1996)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Stephens (2009)
Miller & Test (1989)
Minarovic & Bambara (2007)
Newman & Eyck (2005)

-
- O'Handley, Dadakhodjaeva, Radley & Dart (2016)
Ozen (2008)
Palmer, Collins & Schuster (1999)
Parker & Schuster (2002)
Pennington, Delano & Scott (2014)
Pennington, Collins, Stenhoff, Turner & Gunselman (2014)
Pennington, Stenhoff, Gibson & Ballou (2012)
Philips and Vollmer (2012)
Rao & Kane (2009)
Rao & Mallow (2009)
Roy-Wsiaki, Marion, Martin & Yu (2010)
Schuster & Griffen (1993)
Seward, Schuster, Ault, Collins & Hall (2014)
Sewell, Collins, Hemmeter & Schuster (1998)
Shimizu & McDonough (2006)
Shimizu, Yoon & McDonough (2010)
Sigafos, Couzens, Roberts, Philips & Goodison (1996)
Singleton, Schuster, Morse & Collins (1999)
Sisson, Kilwein & Van Hasselt (1988)
Smeets (1992)
Smeets, Lancioni & Striefel (1987)
Smith, Schuster, Collins & Kleinert (2011)
Smith, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (1999)
Sowers, Verdi, Bourbeau & Sheehan (1985)
Spriggs, Gast & Ayres (2007)
Stokes, Cameron, Dorsey & Fleming (2004)
Stonecipher, Schuster, Collins & Grisham-Brown (1999)
Strand & Morris (1986)
Strand & Morris (1988)
Strasberger & Ferreri (2014)
Swain, Lane & Gast (2015)
Swenson-Pierce, Kohl & Egel (1987)
Tam, Philips & Mudford (2011)
Taras, Matson & Felps (1993)
Tarnowski & Drabman (1987)
Taylor, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (2002)
Tekin-Iftar (2003)
Tekin-Iftar (2008)
Tekin-Iftar, Acar & Kurt (2003)
Tekin-Iftar, Kurt & Acar (2008)
Thompson, Cotnoir-Bichelman, McKerchar, Tate & Dancho (2007)
van der Meer, Achmadi, Cooijmans, Didden, Lancioni, O'Reilly, Roche, Stevens, Carnett, Hodis, Green, Sutherland, Lang, Rispoli, Marschik & Sigafos (2015)
van der Meer, Kagohara, Achmadi, Green, Herrington, Sigafos, O'Reilly, Lancioni, Lang & Rispoli (2011)
van der Meer, Kagohara, Roche, Sutherland, Balandin, Green, O'Reilly, Lancioni, Marschik & Sigafos (2013)
Waugh, Fredrick & Alberto (2009)
Welch, Nietupski & Hamre-Nietupski (1985)
Wilson, Reid & Green (2006)
-

Winterling, Gast, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Wolery, Ault, Gast, Doyle & Griffen (1991)
Wood, Browder & Flynn (2015)
Yilmaz, Konukman, Birkan & Yanardag (2010)
Zhang, Gast, Horvat & Dattilo (1995)

Table 37

Studies from the Task Analysis Review (SMRS ≥ 3) that Used Reinforcement as Part of the Intervention

<u>Study</u>
Ayres, Maguire & McClimon (2009)
Browder, Lim, Lin & Belfiore (1993)
Browder, Snell & Wildonger (1988)
Cavkaytar (2012)
Chandler, Schuster & Stevens (1993)
Choi, Wong & Chung (2012)
Dollar, Fredrick, Alberto & Luke (2012)
Drysdale, Lee, Anderson & Moore (2015)
Epps, Stern & Horner (1990)
Ergenekon, Tekin-Iftar, Kapan & Akmanoglu (2014)
Falkenstine, Collins, Schuster & Kleinert (2009)
Faloon & Rehfeldt (2008)
Fetko, Schuster, Harley & Collins (1999)
Gast, Winterling, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Godsey, Schuster, Lingo, Collins & Kleinert (2008)
Goh & Bambara (2013)
Goodson, Sigafos, O'Reilly, Cannella & Liancioni (2007)
Griffin, Wolery & Schuster (1992)
Gruber & Poulson (2016)
Halasz-Dees & Cuvo (1986)
Hall, Schuster, Wolery, Gast & Doyle (1992)
Heinrich, Collins, Knight & Spriggs (2016)
Kagohara, Sigafos, Achmadi, van der Meer, O'Reilly & Liancioni (2011)
Keogh, Whitman, Beeman, Halligan & Starzynski (1987)
Knight, Spooner, Browder, Smith & Wood (2013)
Kourassanis, Jones & Fienup (2015)
Le Grice & Blampied (1994)
Lifschitz (1999)
Maeser & Thyer (1990)
McAdam & Cuvo (1994)
McConville, Hantula & Axelrod (1998)
McDonnell & McFarland (1988)
McLaughlin & Walsh (1996)
McWilliams, Nietupski & Hamre-Nietupski (1990)
Mechling, Ayres, Byrant & Foster (2014)
Mechling, Ayres, Byrant & Foster (2014)
Mechling & Collins (2012)
Mechling & Gast (1997)
Mechling, Gast & Fields (2008)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Gustafon (2009)
Mechling & Stephens (2009)
O'Handley, Dadakhodjaeva, Radley & Dart (2016)
Parker & Kamps (2011)
Parsons, Reid, Green, Browning & Hensley (2002)

Ramirez, Cengher & Fienup (2014)
Rao & Kane (2009)
Richman, Ponticas, Page & Epps (1986)
Schepis, Reid & Fitzgerald (1987)
Schuster, Gast, Wolery & Gultinan (1988)
Scott, Collins, Knight & Kleinert (2013)
Shimizu, Yoon & McDonough (2010)
Sisson, Kilwein & Van Hasselt (1988)
Stokes, Cameron, Dorsey & Fleming (2004)
Stonecipher, Schuster, Collins & Grisham-Brown (1999)
Tarnowski & Drabman (1987)
Taylor & O'Reilly (2000)
Werts, Caldwell & Wolery (1996)
Winterling, Gast, Wolery & Farmer (1992)
Wolery, Ault, Gast, Doyle & Griffen (1991)
Yilmaz, Birkan, Konukman & Erkan (2005)
Young, West, Howard & Whitney (1986)
Zisimopoulos, Sigafos & Koutromanos (2011)

Table 38

Studies from the FCT Review (SMRS ≥ 3) that Used Reinforcement as Part of the Intervention

<u>Study</u>
Berg, Wacker, Harding, Ganzer & Barretto (2007)
Brown, Wacker, Derby, Peck, Richman, Sasso, Knutson & Harding (2000)
Byiers, Dimian & Symons (2014)
Carr & Carlson (1993)
Carr, Levin, McConnachie, Carlson, Kemp, Smith & McLaughlin (1999)
Chezan, Drasgow & Martin (2014)
Conklin & Mayer (2011)
Dalmau, Wacker, Harding, Berg, Schieltz, Lee, Breznican & Kramer (2011)
Doyle, DeRosa & Roane (2013)
Drasgow, Halle, Ostrosky & Harbers (1996)
Durand & Carr (1991)
Durand & Carr (1992)
Falcomata, Wacker, Ringdahl, Vinqvist & Dutt (2013)
Hetzroni & Roth (2003)
Kahng, Iwata, DeLeon & Worsdell (1997)
Kelley, Lerman & Van Camp (2002)
Kemp & Carr (1995)
Koegel, Stiebel & Koegel (1998)
Kuhn, Chirighin & Zelenka (2010)
Lalli, Casey & Kates (1995)
Lambert, Bloom & Irvin (2012)
Langdon, Carr & Owen-DeSchryver (2008)
Lerman, Kelley, Vorndran, Kuhn & LaRue (2002)
O'Neill & Sweetland-Baker (2001)
O'Reilly, Fragale, Gainey, Kang, Koch, Shubert, Zein, Longino, Chung, Xu, White, Lang, Davis, Rispoli, Lancioni, Didden, Healy, Kagohara, van der Meer & Sigafos (2012)
Radstaake, Didden, Lang, O'Reilly, Sigafos, Lancioni, Appels & Curfs (2013)
Rispoli, Camargo, Machalicek, Lang, Sigafos (2014)
Schmidt, Drasgow, Halle, Martin & Bliss (2014)
Shirley, Iwata, Kahng, Mazaleski & Lerman (1997)
Tait, Sigafos, Woodyatt, O'Reilly & Lancioni (2004)
Volkert, Lerman, Call & Trosclair-Lasserre (2009)

Appendix E

Results from the Mann Whitney Tests

Reinforcement Knowledge Assessment

Baseline (Time 1) scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 50$) did not differ significantly from the baseline scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 60$), $U = 24.00$, $z = -1.21$, $p = .227$.

Post-intervention (Time 2) scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 65$) did not differ significantly from the post-intervention scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 70$), $U = 29.50$, $z = -.66$, $p = .512$.

The difference scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 30$) did not differ significantly from the difference scores on the reinforcement knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 20$), $U = 29.00$, $z = -.69$, $p = .492$.

Systematic Prompting Knowledge Assessment

Baseline scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 25$) did not differ significantly from the baseline scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 40$), $U = 26.50$, $z = -.93$, $p = .354$.

Post-intervention scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 70$) did not differ significantly from the post-intervention scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 60$), $U = 16.50$, $z = -.194$, $p = .052$.

The difference scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 45$) did not differ significantly from the difference scores on the systematic prompting knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 20$), $U = 17.00$, $z = -1.85$, $p = .064$.

Functional Communication Training Knowledge Assessment

Baseline scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 25$) did not differ significantly from the baseline scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 40$), $U = 27.00$, $z = -.89$, $p = .375$.

Post-intervention scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 80$) did not differ significantly from the post-intervention scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 80$), $U = 34.50$, $z = -.15$, $p = .878$.

The difference scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 55$) did not differ significantly from the difference scores on the functional communication training knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 40$), $U = 25.50$, $z = -1.03$, $p = .303$.

Task Analysis Knowledge Assessment

Baseline scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 55$) did not differ significantly from the baseline scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 80$), $U = 33.00$, $z = -.29$, $p = .769$.

Post-intervention scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 80$) did not differ significantly from the post-intervention scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 80$), $U = 29.50$, $z = -.66$, $p = .512$.

The difference scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 30$) did not differ significantly from the difference scores on the task analysis knowledge assessment for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 30$), $U = 35.50$, $z = -.05$, $p = .961$.

Test of Knowledge (Denne, Thomas, Hastings, & Hughes, 2015)

Baseline scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 12.5$) did not differ significantly from the baseline scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 15$), $U = 30.30$, $z = -.54$, $p = .587$.

Post-intervention scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 27.5$) did not differ significantly from the post-intervention scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 25$), $U = 26.00$, $z = -.97$, $p = .330$.

The difference scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the first service site ($Mdn = 15$) did not differ significantly from the difference scores on the Test of Knowledge for participants from the second service site ($Mdn = 10$), $U = 21.50$, $z = -1.42$, $p = .155$.

References

- Denne, L. D., Thomas, E., Hastings, R. P., & Hughes, J. C. (2015). Assessing competencies in applied behavior analysis for tutors working with children with autism in a school-based setting. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 20*, 67-77.

Appendix F

Staff Evaluations of the Evidence-Based Practice Modules During the Pilot Study

Table 47

Summary of the Percentage of Participants Selecting a Specific Response on Each Item of the Training Acceptability Questionnaire:

Upper Panel - Reinforcement Module Data (N=17); Upper-Middle Panel – Systematic Prompting Module Data (N=17); Lower-Middle Panel – Functional Communication Training Module Data (N=17); Lower Panel – Task Analysis Data (N=17)

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	5.9%	41.2%	52.9%
The session was well planned	0%	5.9%	41.2%	52.9%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	5.9%	41.2%	52.9%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	0%	47.1%	52.9%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	0%	35.3%	64.7%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	17.6%	82.4%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	0%	23.5%	76.5%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	5.9%	29.4%	64.7%
The session was well planned	0%	5.9%	35.3%	58.8%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	11.8%	35.3%	52.9%

Appendix F

I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	5.9%	35.3%	58.8%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	11.8%	17.6%	70.6%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	23.5%	76.5%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	0%	23.5%	76.5%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	0%	29.4%	70.6%
The session was well planned	0%	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	5.9%	5.9%	23.5%	64.7%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	5.9%	29.4%	64.7%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	5.9%	17.6%	76.5%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	11.8%	88.2%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	0%	5.9%	94.1%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	0%	41.2%	58.8%
The session was well planned	0%	0%	35.3%	64.7%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	0%	35.3%	64.7%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	0%	41.2%	58.8%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	5.9%	29.4%	64.7%

Appendix F

I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	5.9%	29.4%	64.7%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	11.8%	88.2%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	0%	11.8%	88.2%

Appendix G

**Results from the Attitudes to Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire During the
Pilot Study**

Table 49

Percentage of Participants Selecting a Specific Response on Each Item of the Attitudes to Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire (N=17)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel confident in my ability to evaluate the quality of research papers	Time 1	5.9%	5.9%	41.2%	35.3%	11.8%
	Time 2	5.9%	17.6%	52.9%	23.5%	0%
I believe that putting research into practice is to some extent dependent on how much it is going to cost	Time 1	0%	5.9%	29.4%	52.9%	11.8%
	Time 2	0%	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%	0%
Much of the available research is not relevant to my work	Time 1	0%	52.9%	41.2%	5.9%	0%
	Time 2	5.9%	47.1%	47.1%	0%	0%
I find it difficult to access the internet on a regular basis (to access information on evidence-based practice)	Time 1	29.4%	64.7%	0%	0%	5.9%
	Time 2	17.6%	52.9%	11.8%	17.6%	0%
I find that management are supportive in the use of Evidence-Based Practice	Time 1	0%	0%	5.9%	94.1%	0%
	Time 2	0%	5.9%	17.6%	70.6%	5.9%
I find that the research specific to my work area is of poor quality	Time 1	0%	35.3%	58.8%	5.9%	0%
	Time 2	0%	35.3%	58.8%	5.9%	0%
I find that research articles are not well understood	Time 1	0%	0%	76.5%	23.5%	0%
	Time 2	0%	23.5%	52.9%	17.6%	5.9%
I feel there are benefits to changing my practice, based on research	Time 1	0%	0%	17.6%	58.8%	23.5%
	Time 2	0%	0%	23.5%	58.8%	17.6%
There are no incentives for changing my practice based on research	Time 1	11.8%	47.1%	29.4%	11.8%	0%
	Time 2	5.9%	47.1%	35.3%	11.8%	0%
I feel isolated from knowledgeable colleagues with whom I could discuss research findings	Time 1	5.9%	41.2%	35.3%	17.6%	0%
	Time 2	0%	58.8%	17.6%	23.5%	0%

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I find service user compliance is a major factor in the use of evidence	Time 1	0%	5.9%	47.1%	41.2%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	17.6%	17.6%	52.9%	11.8%
I am confident using computers to search for evidence-based information	Time 1	0%	5.9%	5.9%	64.7%	23.5%
	Time 2	0%	0%	11.8%	76.5%	11.8%
I find the amount of research literature overwhelming	Time 1	0%	11.8%	17.6%	64.7%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	5.9%	47.1%	41.2%	5.9%
I find it difficult to keep up with all the changes in my work environment at present	Time 1	17.6%	47.1%	5.9%	23.5%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	41.2%	23.5%	23.5%	11.8%
I know how to search for evidence-based information	Time 1	0%	5.9%	17.6%	70.6%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	5.9%	35.3%	52.9%	5.9%
My on-site computer facilities are adequate for searching evidence-based literature	Time 1	5.9%	5.9%	11.8%	64.7%	11.8%
	Time 2	5.9%	11.8%	17.6%	58.8%	5.9%
I find it hard to bring change to the general practices at work	Time 1	0%	23.5%	29.4%	41.2%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	47.1%	29.4%	17.6%	5.9%
I have found that the research literature can have conflicting results	Time 1	0%	5.9%	64.7%	29.4%	0%
	Time 2	0%	5.9%	70.6%	17.6%	5.9%
I believe that I should do a course to help me use research effectively	Time 1	5.9%	11.8%	17.6%	35.3%	29.4%
	Time 2	0%	23.5%	23.5%	35.3%	17.6%
There is not enough money to fund intellectual disability research	Time 1	0%	0%	82.4%	11.8%	5.9%
	Time 2	0%	11.8%	70.6%	11.8%	5.9%
I find that time limitations prevent evidence-based practice being used effectively in my practice	Time 1	5.9%	17.6%	11.8%	47.1%	17.6%
	Time 2	0%	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	11.8%
I believe the results of the research I have read.	Time 1	0%	5.9%	58.8%	29.4%	5.9%
	Time 2	5.9%	0%	29.4%	64.7%	0%
I would feel more confident if there was an individual experienced in research to supply me with relevant information	Time 1	0%	0%	17.6%	70.6%	11.8%
	Time 2	0%	0%	17.6%	58.5%	23.5%

Appendix G

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
My colleagues support the concept of putting sound research into practice.	Time 1	0%	0%	35.3%	64.7%	0%
	Time 2	0%	0%	23.5%	52.9%	23.5%
Research findings are often not easily transferrable into my practice	Time 1	0%	23.5%	41.2%	35.3%	0%
	Time 2	0%	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%	0%
Implementing evidence-based practice will be of benefit to my professional development	Time 1	0%	0%	0%	82.4%	17.6%
	Time 2	0%	0%	17.6%	52.9%	29.4%

Appendix H

**Results from the Attitudes to Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire During the
Randomised Control Trial Study**

Table 56

Percentage of Participants in the Intervention Condition Selecting a Specific Response on Each Item of the Attitudes to Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire (N=54)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel confident in my ability to evaluate the quality of research papers	Time 1	0%	5.6%	42.6%	40.7%	11.1%
	Time 2	0%	1.9%	27.8%	53.7%	9.3%
	Time 3	0%	7.4%	22.2%	48.1%	5.6%
I believe that putting research into practice is to some extent dependent on how much it is going to cost	Time 1	3.7%	29.6%	22.2%	40.7%	3.7%
	Time 2	3.7%	14.8%	20.4%	50%	3.7%
	Time 3	5.6%	22.2%	20.4%	35.2%	1.9%
Much of the available research is not relevant to my work	Time 1	7.4%	51.9%	35.2%	5.6%	0%
	Time 2	9.3%	46.3%	27.8%	7.4%	0%
	Time 3	5.6%	38.9%	31.5%	9.3%	0%
I find it difficult to access the internet on a regular basis (to access information on evidence-based practice)	Time 1	29.6%	35.2%	7.4%	25.9%	1.9%
	Time 2	9.3%	42.6%	13%	27.8%	0%
	Time 3	9.3%	48.1%	11.1%	13%	3.7%
I find that management are supportive in the use of Evidence-Based Practice	Time 1	0%	5.6%	24.1%	59.3%	11.1%
	Time 2	0%	3.7%	9.3%	55.6%	22.2%
	Time 3	0%	3.7%	16.7%	53.7%	11.1%
I find that the research specific to my work area is of poor quality	Time 1	7.4%	25.9%	40.7%	22.2%	1.9%
	Time 2	3.7%	53.7%	25.9%	5.6%	1.9%
	Time 3	3.7%	27.8%	42.6%	15.6%	3.7%
I find that research articles are not well understood	Time 1	2%	20%	44%	20%	0%
	Time 2	1.9%	33.3%	35.2%	22.2%	0%
	Time 3	1.9%	18.5%	46.3%	13%	5.6%
I feel there are benefits to changing my practice, based on research	Time 1	0%	3.7%	13%	53.7%	29.6%
	Time 2	1.9%	0%	3.7%	53.7%	33.3%
	Time 3	0%	0%	7.4%	63%	14.8%
There are no incentives for changing my practice based on research	Time 1	20.4%	44.4%	24.1%	9.3%	0%
	Time 2	29.6%	48.1%	11.1%	1.9%	1.9%
	Time 3	7.4%	51.9%	18.5%	7.4%	0%
I feel isolated from knowledgeable colleagues with whom I could discuss research findings	Time 1	13%	38.9%	27.8%	14.8%	5.6%
	Time 2	14.8%	50%	16.7%	9.3%	1.9%
	Time 3	7.4%	38.9%	24.1%	5.6%	7.4%

Appendix H

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I find service user compliance is a major factor in the use of evidence	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	3.7% 3.7% 1.9%	22.2% 22.2% 20.4%	25.9% 33.3% 29.6%	38.9% 33.3% 27.8%	9.3% 0% 5.6%
I am confident using computers to search for evidence-based information	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	1.9% 0% 0%	1.9% 0% 1.9%	5.6% 3.7% 9.3%	57.4% 64.8% 55.6%	33.3% 24.1% 18.5%
I find the amount of research literature overwhelming	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	7.4% 3.7% 1.9%	31.5% 40.7% 35.2%	33.3% 27.8% 29.6%	25.9% 20.4% 16.7%	1.9% 0% 1.9%
I find it difficult to keep up with all the changes in my work environment at present	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	7.4% 3.7% 0%	59.3% 50% 57.4%	7.4% 18.5% 14.8%	18.5% 16.7% 9.3%	7.4% 3.7% 3.7%
I know how to search for evidence-based information	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	0% 0% 0%	5.6% 13% 7.4%	24.1% 7.4% 14.8%	50% 53.7% 57.4%	20.4% 16.7% 5.6%
My on-site computer facilities are adequate for searching evidence-based literature	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	9.3% 7.4% 3.7%	16.7% 14.8% 22.2%	24.1% 11.1% 5.6%	38.9% 50% 50%	11.1% 9.3% 3.7%
I find it hard to bring change to the general practices at work	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	3.7% 7.4% 3.7%	33.3% 42.6% 40.7%	16.7% 24.1% 16.7%	38.9% 16.7% 20.4%	7.4% 1.9% 3.7%
I have found that the research literature can have conflicting results	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	0% 1.9% 0%	5.6% 9.3% 1.9%	48.1% 46.3% 42.6%	42.6% 33.3% 38.9%	3.7% 1.9% 1.9%
I believe that I should do a course to help me use research effectively	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	1.9% 3.7% 0%	11.1% 24.1% 22.2%	5.6% 9.3% 13%	61.1% 50% 40.7%	20.4% 3.7% 7.4%
There is not enough money to fund intellectual disability research	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	1.9% 0% 1.9%	5.6% 9.3% 1.9%	55.6% 46.3% 40.7%	20.4% 31.5% 33.3%	16.7% 3.7% 7.4%
I find that time limitations prevent evidence-based practice being used effectively in my practice	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	1.9% 0% 0%	22.2% 18.5% 16.7%	25.9% 20.4% 20.4%	37% 46.3% 37%	13% 5.6% 9.3%
I believe the results of the research I have read.	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	0% 0% 0%	14.8% 9.3% 3.7%	53.7% 31.5% 35.2%	29.6% 42.6% 38.9%	1.9% 8.2% 7.4%
I would feel more confident if there was an individual experienced in research to supply me with relevant information	Time 1 Time 2 Time 3	1.9% 0% 0%	5.6% 7.4% 9.3%	20.4% 11.1% 20.4%	50% 64.8% 48.1%	20.4% 7.4% 7.4%

Appendix H

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
My colleagues support the concept of putting sound research into practice.	Time 1	1.9%	11.1%	38.9%	40.7%	5.6%
	Time 2	0%	3.7%	27.8%	48.1%	11.1%
	Time 3	0%	13%	18.5%	46.3%	7.4%
Research findings are often not easily transferrable into my practice	Time 1	0%	13%	44.4%	33.3%	9.3%
	Time 2	1.9%	31.5%	38.9%	18.5%	0%
	Time 3	1.9%	14.8%	42.6%	22.2%	3.7%
Implementing evidence-based practice will be of benefit to my professional development	Time 1	1.9%	0%	5.6%	38.9%	51.9%
	Time 2	0%	1.9%	0%	44.4%	42.6%
	Time 3	0%	1.9%	5.6%	53.7%	24.1%

Table 57

Percentage of Participants in the Control Condition Selecting a Specific Response on Each Item of the Attitudes to Evidence-Based Practice Questionnaire (N=50)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel confident in my ability to evaluate the quality of research papers	Time 1	0%	2%	26%	52%	8%
	Time 3	4%	4%	40%	38%	6%
I believe that putting research into practice is to some extent dependent on how much it is going to cost	Time 1	0%	8%	28%	44%	8%
	Time 3	4%	2%	34%	42%	8%
Much of the available research is not relevant to my work	Time 1	0%	42%	40%	8%	0%
	Time 3	2%	20%	40%	22%	8%
I find it difficult to access the internet on a regular basis (to access information on evidence-based practice)	Time 1	20%	36%	14%	18%	0%
	Time 3	4%	42%	12%	24%	10%
I find that management are supportive in the use of Evidence-Based Practice	Time 1	0%	4%	24%	46%	16%
	Time 3	0%	0%	38%	34%	20%
I find that the research specific to my work area is of poor quality	Time 1	4%	40%	34%	10%	0%
	Time 3	4%	28%	48%	10%	2%
I find that research articles are not well understood	Time 1	2%	20%	44%	20%	0%
	Time 3	4%	14%	48%	20%	4%
I feel there are benefits to changing my practice, based on research	Time 1	2%	4%	32%	44%	8%
	Time 3	2%	0%	38%	38%	12%
There are no incentives for changing my practice based on research	Time 1	8%	32%	38%	10%	2%
	Time 3	8%	10%	56%	12%	4%
I feel isolated from knowledgeable colleagues with whom I could discuss research findings	Time 1	10%	54%	12%	12%	2%
	Time 3	8%	42%	32%	6%	2%
I find service user compliance is a major factor in the use of evidence	Time 1	4%	10%	42%	28%	4%
	Time 3	0%	4%	42%	32%	12%

Appendix H

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am confident using computers to search for evidence-based information	Time 1	0%	6%	10%	50%	24%
	Time 3	2%	8%	10%	56%	14%
I find the amount of research literature overwhelming	Time 1	0%	22%	30%	30%	8%
	Time 3	0%	10%	40%	22%	18%
I find it difficult to keep up with all the changes in my work environment at present	Time 1	4%	48%	14%	16%	6%
	Time 3	4%	50%	12%	18%	6%
I know how to search for evidence-based information	Time 1	0%	8%	20%	54%	6%
	Time 3	0%	4%	24%	52%	10%
My on-site computer facilities are adequate for searching evidence-based literature	Time 1	2%	22%	22%	36%	8%
	Time 3	6%	16%	26%	36%	6%
I find it hard to bring change to the general practices at work	Time 1	8%	28%	30%	18%	4%
	Time 3	6%	38%	20%	22%	4%
I have found that the research literature can have conflicting results	Time 1	0%	6%	42%	32%	8%
	Time 3	0%	4%	48%	26%	12%
I believe that I should do a course to help me use research effectively	Time 1	4%	16%	22%	40%	4%
	Time 3	6%	16%	22%	30%	14%
There is not enough money to fund intellectual disability research	Time 1	0%	2%	52%	24%	8%
	Time 3	0%	6%	40%	20%	26%
I find that time limitations prevent evidence-based practice being used effectively in my practice	Time 1	0%	10%	36%	34%	8%
	Time 3	0%	10%	30%	36%	16%
I believe the results of the research I have read.	Time 1	0%	2%	52%	32%	0%
	Time 3	0%	12%	50%	20%	8%
I would feel more confident if there was an individual experienced in research to supply me with relevant information	Time 1	2%	6%	24%	44%	12%
	Time 3	0%	8%	28%	40%	16%
My colleagues support the concept of putting sound research into practice.	Time 1	0%	0%	44%	32%	10%
	Time 3	2%	2%	34%	44%	8%

Appendix H

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
Research findings are often not easily transferrable into my practice	Time 1	2%	10%	36%	34%	6%
	Time 3	0%	4%	48%	28%	10%
Implementing evidence-based practice will be of benefit to my professional development	Time 1	0%	0%	32%	44%	12%
	Time 3	0%	2%	28%	44%	16%

Appendix I

**Staff Evaluations of the Evidence-Based Practice Modules During the
Randomised Control Trial Study**

Table 62

Percentage of Participants Selecting a Specific Response on Each Item of the Training Acceptability Questionnaire: Upper Panel - Reinforcement Module (N=54); Upper Middle Panel – Systematic Prompting Module (N=54); Lower Middle Panel – Functional Communication Training Module (N=51); Lower Panel – Task Analysis Module (N=50)

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	7.4%	38.9%	53.7%
The session was well planned	0%	3.7%	44.4%	51.9%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	5.6%	48.1%	46.3%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	9.3%	14.8%	40.7%	35.2%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	3.7%	50%	46.3%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	1.9%	9.3%	33.3%	55.6%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	33.3%	66.7%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	1.9%	25.9%	72.2%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	3.7%	51.9%	44.4%
The session was well planned	0%	0%	46.3%	53.7%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	7.4%	46.3%	46.3%

Appendix I

I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	18.5%	38.9%	42.6%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	3.7%	42.6%	53.7%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	11.1%	27.8%	61.1%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	1.9%	27.8%	70.4%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	1.9%	24.1%	74.1%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	9.3%	35.2%	50%
The session was well planned	0%	1.9%	29.6%	63%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	9.3%	33.3%	51.9%
I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	0%	9.3%	35.2%	50%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	0%	37%	57.4%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	13%	24.1%	57.4%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	18.5%	75.9%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	0%	20.4%	74.1%

	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
I found that the training was very relevant to my work	0%	1.9%	31.5%	59.3%
The session was well planned	0%	0%	37%	55.6%
The training resources were appropriate and related well to my work	0%	1.9%	31.5%	59.3%

Appendix I

I discovered my own areas of weakness with regard to the training topic	1.9%	5.6%	37%	48.1%
I am encouraged to learn more about this topic	0%	1.9%	37%	53.7%
I can apply this training to my current work immediately	0%	7.4%	27.8%	57.4%
I had an opportunity to actively participate in the training session	0%	0%	22.2%	70.4%
I had the opportunity to ask questions during training	0%	1.9%	24.1%	66.7%