

The Association for Behavior Analysis International Position Statement on Restraint and Seclusion

Timothy R. Vollmer
University of Florida

Louis P. Hagopian
Kennedy Krieger Institute and Johns Hopkins School
of Medicine

Jon S. Bailey
Florida State University and Behavior Management Consultants

Michael F. Dorsey
Endicott College and Vinfen Corp.

Gregory P. Hanley
Western New England College

David Lennox
QBS Inc. and Simmons College

Mary M. Riordan
Behavior Management Consultants

Scott Spreat
Woods Services

A task force authorized by the Executive Council of the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) generated the statement below concerning the techniques called *restraint* and *seclusion*. Members of the task force independently reviewed the scientific literature concerning restraint and seclusion and agreed unanimously to the content of the statement. The Executive Council accepted the statement, and it was subsequently approved by a two-thirds majority vote of the general membership. It now constitutes official ABAI policy. The position statement is posted on the ABAI Web site (www.abainternational.org/ABA/statements/RestraintSeclusion.asp). The purpose of the position statement is to provide guidance to behavior analysts and other professionals interested in the position of ABAI on these controversial topics. In extreme cases, abuses of procedures erroneously used in the name of behavior analysis are not defensible. On the other hand, behavior analysts acting ethically and in good faith are provided with guidelines for sound and acceptably safe practice. To the extent that behavior-analytic positions influence public policy and law, this statement can be presented to officials and lawmakers to guide informed decision making. At the conclusion of the document, a bibliography is provided of articles and presentations considered by one or more task force members in developing the position statement.

Key words: seclusion, restraint, position statement, ethics

The Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) and its members strongly oppose the

inappropriate or unnecessary use of seclusion, restraint, or other intrusive interventions. Although many persons with severe behavior problems can be effectively treated without the use of any restrictive interventions, restraint may be necessary on some rare occasions with meticulous clini-

Address correspondence to Timothy R. Vollmer, Psychology Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida (e-mail: vollmera@ufl.edu).

cal oversight and controls. In addition, a carefully planned and monitored use of time-out from reinforcement can be acceptable under restricted circumstances. Seclusion is sometimes necessary or needed, but behavior analysts would support only the most highly monitored and ethical practices associated with such use, to be detailed below.

This Position Statement on Restraint and Seclusion summarizes critical guiding principles. With a strong adherence to professional judgment and best practice, it also describes the conditions under which seclusion and restraint may be necessary and outlines proper strategy to implement these procedures appropriately and safely. This statement is consistent with ABAA's 1989 Position Statement on the Right to Effective Behavioral Treatment, which asserts numerous rights, including access to the most effective treatments available, while emphasizing extensive procedural safeguards.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Welfare of the Individual Served is the Highest Priority

Clinical decisions should be made based on the professional judgment of a duly formed treatment team that demonstrates knowledge of the broad research base and best practice. Included in this process are the individuals being served and their legal guardians. The team should be informed by the research literature, and should determine that any procedure used is in that person's best interests. These interests must take precedence over the broader agendas of institutions or organizations that would prohibit certain procedures regardless of the individual's needs. A core value of ABAA with regard to behavioral treatment is that welfare of the individual being served is the absolute highest priority.

Individuals (and Parents or Guardians) Have a Right to Choose

ABAA supports the U.S. Supreme Court ruling that individuals have a right to treatment in certain contexts, and that many state and federal regulations and laws create such rights. Organizations and institutions should not limit the professional judgment or rights of those who are legally responsible for an individual to choose interventions that are necessary, safe, and effective. A regulation that prohibits treatment that includes the necessary use of restraint violates individuals' rights to effective treatment. The irresponsible use of certain procedures by unqualified or incompetent people should not result in policies that limit the rights of those duly qualified and responsible for an individual through the process of making informed choices.

The Principle of Least Restrictiveness

ABAA supports the position that treatment selection should be guided by the principle of the least restrictiveness. The least restrictive treatment is defined as that treatment that affords the most favorable risk-to-benefit ratio, with specific consideration of probability of treatment success, anticipated duration of treatment, distress caused by procedures, and distress caused by the behavior itself. One may conclude from this premise that a nonintrusive intervention that permits dangerous behavior to continue while limiting participation in learning activities and community life, or results in a more restrictive placement, may be considered more restrictive than a more intensive intervention that is effective and enhances quality of life.

APPLICATION

General Definitions

Restraint involves physically holding or securing the individual, either

(a) for a brief period of time to interrupt and intervene with severe problem behavior or (b) for an extended period of time using mechanical devices to prevent otherwise uncontrollable problem behavior (e.g., self-injurious behavior) that has the potential to produce serious injury. When used in the context of a behavior intervention plan, restraint in some cases serves both a protective and a therapeutic function. These procedures can reduce risks of injury and can facilitate learning opportunities that support appropriate behavior.

Seclusion involves isolating an individual from others to interrupt and intervene with problem behavior that places the individual or others at risk of harm. When used in the context of a behavior intervention plan, seclusion in some cases serves both a protective and a therapeutic function. These procedures can reduce risks of injury and can facilitate learning opportunities that support appropriate behavior. ABAI is opposed to the use of seclusion when it is operationally defined as placing someone in a locked room, often combined with the use of mechanical restraint or sedation, and not part of a formal behavior intervention plan to which the individual served or his or her guardian has consented. We support the use of a planned time-out treatment or safety intervention that conforms to evidence-based research, is part of a comprehensive treatment or safety plan that meets the standards of informed consent by the individual served or his or her legal guardian, and is evaluated on an ongoing basis via the use of contemporaneously collected objective data.

Time-out from reinforcement is an evidence-based treatment intervention that involves reducing or limiting the amount of reinforcement that is available to an individual for a brief period of time. It can entail removing an individual from his or her environment, or it may entail changes to

the existing environment itself. When time-out involves removing an individual from the environment, it should only be used as part of an approved behavior intervention plan. Time-out from reinforcement is not seclusion, but it may involve seclusion if it is not safe to have others in the room. In addition, some innocuous versions of time-out from reinforcement, such as having a child take a seat away from a play area, are not deemed to be intrusive. Such procedures are commonly used and are generally safe.

Use of Restraint as Part of a Behavior Intervention Plan

The use of restraint in a behavior intervention plan is done as part of an integrated effort to reduce the future probability of a specified target behavior or to reduce the episodic severity of that behavior. A behavior intervention plan that incorporates contingent restraint must (a) incorporate reinforcement-based procedures, (b) be based on a functional behavior assessment, (c) be evaluated by objective outcome data, and (d) be consistent with the scientific literature and current best practices. Procedures describing the use and monitoring of this type of procedure should be designed by a Board Certified Behavior Analyst, or a similarly trained and licensed professional who is trained and experienced in the treatment of problem behavior.

Use of Time-Out (or in Rare Cases, Seclusion) as Part of a Behavior Intervention Plan

Time-out may be used as part of an integrated behavior intervention plan designed to decrease the future probability of a prespecified target behavior or to reduce the episodic severity of that behavior. The behavior intervention plan that incorporates the use of time-out must (a) be derived from a behavioral assessment, (b)

incorporate reinforcement strategies for appropriate behavior, (c) be of brief duration, (d) be evaluated by objective outcome data, and (e) be consistent with the scientific literature and current best practices.

The Necessity for the Use of Emergency Restraint and Seclusion

Emergency restraint involves physically holding or securing a person to protect that person or others from behavior that poses imminent risk of harm. These procedures should be considered only for dangerous or harmful behaviors that occur at unpredictable times, that make the behavior not amenable to less restrictive behavioral treatment interventions, and that place the individual or others at risk for injury, or that will result in significant loss of quality of life. The procedures should be considered only when less intrusive interventions have been attempted and failed or are otherwise determined to be insufficient given adequate empirical documentation to prove this point.

When applied for crisis management, restraint or seclusion should be implemented according to well-defined, predetermined criteria; include the use of deescalation techniques designed to reduce the target behavior without the need for physical intervention; be applied only at the minimum level of physical restrictiveness necessary to safely contain the crisis behavior and prevent injury; and be withdrawn according to precise and mandatory release criteria.

Emergency restraint procedures should be limited to those included within a standardized program. Medical professionals should review restraint procedures to ensure their safety.

Consideration of emergency restraint should involve weighing the relative benefits and limitations of using these procedures against the risks associated with not using them.

Associated risks of failure to use appropriate restraint when necessary include increased risk of injury; excessive use of medication; expulsion from school; placement in more restrictive, less normalized settings; and increased involvement of law enforcement.

Crisis management procedures are not a replacement for behavioral treatment and should not be used routinely in the absence of an individualized behavior intervention plan. The best way to eliminate restraint use is to eliminate behavior that invites its use via systematic behavioral treatment procedures. If crisis intervention procedures are used on a repeated basis, a formal written behavior plan should be developed, reviewed by both a peer review committee and human rights committee (when available), and consented to by the individuals served and their parents or legal guardians.

Informed Consent

As members of the treatment team, the individual and parents or guardians must be allowed the opportunity to participate in the development of any behavior plan.

Interventions that involve restraint or seclusion should be used only with the full consent of those who are responsible for decision making. Such consent should meet the standards of "information," "capacity," and "voluntary." The individual and his or her guardian must be informed of the methods, risks, and effects of possible intervention procedures, which include the options to both use and not use restraint.

Oversights and Monitoring

Restraint or seclusion (not including brief time-out) for both treatment and emergency situations should be made available for professional review consistent with prevailing practices.

The behavior analyst is responsible for ensuring that any plan involving

restraint or seclusion conforms to the highest standards of effective and humane treatment, and the behavior analyst is responsible for continued oversight and quality assurance.

These procedures should be implemented only by staff who are fully trained in their use, receive regular in-service training, demonstrate competency using objective measures of performance, and are closely supervised by a Board Certified Behavior Analyst or a similarly trained professional. The use of restraint or seclusion should be monitored on a continuous basis using reliable and valid data collection that permits objective evaluation of its effects.

Procedures that involve restraint or seclusion should be continued only if they are demonstrated to be safe and effective; their use should be reduced and eliminated when possible. *Efficacy* with respect to treatment programs refers to a reduction in the rate of the specified target behavior or reduction in the episodic severity of that behavior. With respect to emergency treatments, *efficacy* refers only to the time and risk associated with achieving calm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barton, E. S., Guess, D., Garcia, E., & Baer, D. M. (1970). Improvement of retardates' mealtime behaviors by timeout procedures using multiple baseline techniques. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 3, 77-84.
- Barton, L., Repp, A., & Brulle, A. (1985). Reduction of stereotypic behaviours using differential reinforcement procedures and momentary restraint. *Journal of Mental Deficiency Research*, 29, 71-79.
- Binik, Y. (1985). Psychosocial predictors of sudden death: A review and critique. *Social Science and Medicine*, 20, 667-680.
- Bisconer, S., Zhang, X., & Sine, L. (1995). Impact of a psychotropic medication and physical restraint review process on adults with mental retardation, psychiatric diagnoses, and challenging behaviors. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 7, 123-135.
- Borrero, J. C., Vollmer, T. R., Wright, C. S., Lerman, D. C., & Kelley, M. E. (2002). Further evaluation of the role of protective equipment in the functional analysis of self-injurious behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 35, 69-72.
- Burke, J. (1997). Physical and mechanical restraint as treatment of severe behavior disorders. *Self-Injury Abstracts and Reviews*, 6(1), 1-3.
- Campbell, J. M. (2003). Efficacy of behavioral interventions for reducing problem behavior in persons with autism: A quantitative synthesis of single-subject research. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 24, 120-138.
- Clark, H., Rowbury, T., Baer, A., & Baer, D. (1973). Timeout as a punishing stimulus in continuous and intermittent schedules. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 6, 443-455.
- Cote, C. (1994). Sedation for the pediatric patient. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 41, 31-50.
- Davidson, N., Hemingway, M., & Wysocki, T. (1984). Reducing the use of restrictive procedures in a residential facility. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 35, 164-167.
- Didden, R., Duker, P. C., & Korzilius, H. (1997). Meta-analytic study on treatment effectiveness for problem behaviors with individuals who have mental retardation. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 101, 387-399.
- Dorsey, M. F., Iwata, B. A., Reid, D. H., & Davis, P. A. (1982). Protective equipment: Continuous and contingent application in the treatment of self-injurious behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 15, 217-230.
- Drabman, R., & Spitalnik, R. (1973). Social isolation as a punishment procedure: A controlled study. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 16, 236-249.
- Duker, P., & Seys, M. (1997). An inventory method for assessing the degree of restraint imposed by others. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 28, 113-121.
- Emson, H. (1994). Death in a restraint jacket from mechanical asphyxia. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 151, 985-987.
- Falcomata, T. S., Roane, H. S., Hovanetz, A. N., Kettering, T. L., & Keeney, K. M. (2004). An evaluation of response cost in the treatment of inappropriate vocalizations maintained by automatic reinforcement. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 37, 83-87.
- Favell, J. E., McGimsey, J. F., & Jones, M. L. (1978). The use of physical restraint in the treatment of self-injury and as positive reinforcement. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 11, 225-241.
- Favell, J. E., McGimsey, J. F., Jones, M. L., & Cannon, P. R. (1981). Physical restraint as positive reinforcement. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 85, 425-432.
- Fidone, G. (1988). Risks in physical restraint. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 39, 203.

- Fisher, W. (1994). Restraint and seclusion: A review of the literature. *Journal of Psychiatry, 151*, 1584–1591.
- Fisher, W. W., Piazza, C. C., Bowman, L. G., Hanley, G. P., & Adelinis, J. D. (1997). Direct and collateral effects of restraints and restraint fading. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 30*, 105–119.
- Fox, R. M. (1998). A comprehensive treatment program for inpatient adolescents. *Behavioral Interventions, 13*, 67–77.
- Fox, R. M., & Dufresne, D. (1984). "Harry": The use of physical restraint as a reinforcer, timeout from restraint, and fading restraint in treating a self-injurious man. *Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities, 4*, 1–13.
- Friman, P. C. (1990). Nonaversive treatment of high-rate disruption: Child and provider effects. *Exceptional Children, 57*, 64–69.
- Gast, D. L., & Nelson, C. M. (1977). Legal and ethical considerations for the use of timeout in special education settings. *Journal of Special Education, 11*, 457–467.
- Grey, I. M., & Hastings, R. P. (2005). Evidence-based practices in intellectual disability and behaviour disorders. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 18*, 469–475.
- Griffin, J., Ricketts, R., & Williams, D. (1986). Reaction to Richmond et al.: Propriety of mechanical restraint and protective devices as tertiary techniques. In K. D. Gadow (Ed.), *Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities* (Vol. 5, pp. 109–116). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Griffith, R., & Spreat, S. (1989). Aversive behavior modification procedures and the use of professional judgment. *The Behavior Therapist, 12*, 143–146.
- Gurguis, E. (1978). Management of disturbed patients: An alternative to the use of mechanical restraint. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 39*, 295–299.
- Hamilton, J., Stevens, L., & Allen, P. (1967). Controlling aggressive and destructive behavior in severely retarded institutionalized residents. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 71*, 852–856.
- Hanley, G. P., Piazza, C. C., Fisher, W. W., & Maglieri, K. A. (2005). On the effectiveness of and preference for punishment and extinction components of function-based interventions. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 38*, 51–65.
- Hill, J., & Spreat, S. (1987). Staff injury rates associated with the implementation of contingent restraint. *Mental Retardation, 25*, 141–145.
- Jacobson, J. (1992). Who is treated using restrictive behavioral procedures. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 4*, 99–113.
- Kahng, S., Iwata, B. A., & Lewin, A. (2002). Behavioral treatment of self-injury, 1964 to 2000. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 107*, 212–221.
- Keeney, K. M., Fisher, W. W., Adelinis, J. D., & Wilder, D. A. (2000). The effects of response cost in the treatment of aberrant behavior maintained by negative reinforcement. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 33*, 255–258.
- Killebrew, J., Harris, C., & Kruckeberg, K. (1982). A conceptual model for determining the least restrictive treatment-training modality. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 33*, 367–370.
- Konarski, E., & Johnson, M. (1989). The use of brief restraint plus reinforcement to treat self injurious behavior. *Behavioral Residential Treatment, 4*, 45–52.
- Kuhn, D. E., DeLeon, I. G., Fisher, W. W., & Wilke, A. E. (1999). Clarifying an ambiguous functional analysis with matched and mismatched extinction procedures. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 32*, 99–102.
- Kumar, A. (1997). Sudden unexplained death in a psychiatric patient—A case report: The role of phenothiazines and physical restraint. *Medicine, Science, and the Law, 37*, 170–175.
- Leestma, J., & Koenig, K. (1968). Sudden death and phenothiazines: A current controversy. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 18*, 137–147.
- Lerman, D. C., & Iwata, B. A. (1996). A methodology for distinguishing between extinction and punishment effects associated with response blocking. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 29*, 231–234.
- Lerman, D. C., Iwata, B. A., Shore, B. A., & DeLeon, I. G. (1997). Effects of intermittent punishment on self-injurious behavior: An evaluation of schedule thinning. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 30*, 187–201.
- Lerman, D. C., Iwata, B. A., Smith, R. G., & Vollmer, T. R. (1994). Restraint fading and the development of alternative behaviour in the treatment of self-restraint and self injury. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 38*, 135–148.
- Lerman, D. C., Kelley, M. E., Vorndran, C. M., & Van Camp, C. M. (2003). Collateral effects of response blocking during the treatment of stereotypic behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 36*, 119–123.
- Lovaas, O. I., & Simmons, J. (1969). Manipulation of self-destruction in three retarded children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 2*, 143–157.
- Lown, B., Verrier, R., & Corbalan, R. (1973). Psychologic stress and threshold for repetitive ventricular response. *Science, 182*, 834–836.
- Luiselli, J. (1992). Protective equipment. In J. K. Luiselli, J. L. Matson, & N. N. Singh (Eds.), *Self-injurious behavior: Analysis, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 201–233). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Magee, S., & Ellis, J. (2001). The detrimental effects of physical restraint as a consequence

- for inappropriate classroom behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 34, 501–504.
- Marholin, D., & Townsend, N. (1978). An experimental analysis of side effects and response maintenance of a modified over-correction procedure. *Behavior Therapy*, 9, 383–390.
- Matson, J., & Keyes, J. (1988). Contingent reinforcement and contingent restraint to treat severe aggression and self-injury in mentally retarded and autistic adults. *Journal of the Multihandicapped Person*, 1, 141–153.
- Matson, J., & Keyes, J. (1990). A comparison of DRO to movement suppression time out and DRO with two self-injurious and aggressive mentally retarded adults. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 11, 111–120.
- McCord, B. E., Grosser, J. W., Iwata, B. A., & Powers, L. A. (2005). An analysis of response-blocking parameters in the prevention of pica. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 38, 391–394.
- Miles, S. (1996). A case of death by physical restraint: New lessons from a photograph. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 44, 291–292.
- Mirchandani, J., Rorke, L., Sekula-Perlman, A., & Hood, I. (1994). Cocaine induced agitated delirium, forceful struggle, and minor head injury: A further definition of sudden death during restraint. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*, 15, 95–99.
- Moldawsky, R. (1985). Sudden death. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 36, 81.
- Moore, J. W., Fisher, W. W., & Pennington, A. (2004). Systematic application and removal of protective equipment in the assessment of multiple topographies of self-injury. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 37, 73–77.
- Mulick, J. A., & Schroeder, S. R. (1980). Research relating to management of antisocial behavior in mentally retarded persons. *The Psychological Record*, 30, 397–417.
- National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. (2003). *Position on seclusion and restraint*. Retrieved from <http://www.nami.org/update/unitedrestraint.html>
- Nord, G., Wieseler, N., & Hanson, R. (1991). Aversive procedures: The Minnesota experience. *Behavioral Residential Treatment*, 6, 197–205.
- Obi, C. (1997). Restraint fading and alternative management strategies to treat a man with Lesch-Nyhan syndrome over a 2 year period. *Behavioral Interventions*, 12, 195–202.
- O'Brien, F., Azrin, N., & Bugle, C. (1972). Training profoundly retarded children to stop crawling. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 5, 131–137.
- Oliver, C., Hall, S., Hales, J., Murphy, G., & Watts, D. (1998). The treatment of severe self-injurious behavior by the systematic fading of restraints: Effects on self-injury, self-restraint, adaptive behavior, and behavioral correlates of affect. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 19, 143–165.
- Paniagua, F., Braverman, C., & Capriotti, R. (1986). Use of a treatment package in the management of a profoundly mentally retarded girl's pica and self-stimulation. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 90, 550–557.
- Pendergrass, V. (1972). Timeout from positive reinforcement following persistent, high-rate behavior in retardates. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 5, 85–91.
- Perry, A. C., & Fisher, W. W. (2001). Behavioral economic influences on treatments designed to decrease destructive behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 34, 211–215.
- Persel, C., Persel, C., Ashley, M., & Krych, K. (1997). The use of noncontingent reinforcement and contingent restraint to reduce physical aggression and self-injurious behavior in a traumatically brain injured adult. *Brain Injury*, 11, 751–760.
- Powers, K. V., Roane, H. S., & Kelley, M. E. (2007). Treatment of self-restraint associated with the application of protective equipment. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 40, 577–581.
- Rapoff, M., Altman, K., & Christophersen, E. (1980). Elimination of a blind child's self-hitting by response contingent brief restraint. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 3, 231–236.
- Reid, D. H., Parsons, M. B., Phillips, J. F., & Green, C. W. (1993). Reduction of self-injurious hand mouthing using response blocking. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 26, 139–140.
- Rincover, A., Cook, R., Peoples, A., & Packard, D. (1979). Sensory extinction and sensory reinforcement principles for programming multiple adaptive behavior change. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 12, 221–233.
- Rolider, A., & Van Houten, R. (1985). Movement suppression time-out for undesirable behavior in psychotic and severely developmentally delayed children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 18, 275–288.
- Rolider, A., Williams, L., Cummings, A., & Van Houten, R. (1991). The use of a brief movement restriction procedure to eliminate severe inappropriate behavior. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 22, 23–30.
- Rubin, B., Dube, A., & Mitchell, E. (1993). Asphyxial deaths due to physical restraint: A case series. *Archives of Family Medicine*, 2, 405–408.
- Rush, A. J., & Frances, A. (Eds.). (2000). Expert consensus guideline series: Treat-

- ment of psychiatric and behavioral problems in mental retardation [Special Issue]. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, *105*, 159–228.
- Saloviita, T. (1988). Elimination of self-injurious behaviour by brief physical restraint and DRA. *Scandinavian Journal of Behaviour Therapy*, *17*, 55–63.
- Shapiro, E., Barrett, R., & Ollendick, T. (1980). A comparison of physical restraint and positive practice overcorrection in treating stereotypic behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, *11*, 227–233.
- Sheridan, N., Herrior, R., Robinson, L., & Baxter, V. (1990). Precipitants of violence in psychiatric inpatient setting. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, *41*, 776–780.
- Singh, N., & Bakker, L. (1984). Suppression of pica by overcorrection and physical restraint: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *14*, 331–341.
- Singh, N., Dawson, M., & Manning, P. (1981). The effects of physical restraint on self-injurious behavior. *Journal of Mental Deficiency Research*, *25*, 207–216.
- Singh, N., Winton, A., & Ball, P. (1984). Effects of physical restraint on the behavior of hyperactive mentally retarded persons. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, *89*, 16–22.
- Smith, R. G., Russo, L., & Le, D. D. (1999). Distinguishing between extinction and punishment effects of response blocking: A replication. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *32*, 367–370.
- Spreat, S., & Baker-Potts, J. (1983). Patterns of injury in institutionalized residents. *Mental Retardation*, *21*, 23–29.
- Spreat, S., Lipinski, D., Dickerson, R., Nass, R., & Dorsey, M. (1989). A paramorphic representation of the acceptability of behavioral programming. *Behavioral Residential Treatment*, *4*, 1–13.
- Spreat, S., Lipinski, D., Hill, J., & Halpin, M. (1986). Safety indices associated with the use of contingent restraint procedures. *Applied Research in Mental Retardation*, *7*, 475–481.
- Spreat, S., & Stepanyk, D. (1986). The effectiveness of contingent restraint of aggression, self-injury, and property destruction of institutionalized mentally retarded persons. *Behavioral Residential Treatment*, *1*, 57–71.
- Spreat, S., & Walsh, D. (1994). Impact of treatment efficacy and professional affiliation on ratings of treatment acceptability. *Mental Retardation*, *32*, 227–233.
- Stratton, S., Rogers, C., & Green, K. (1995). Sudden death in individuals in hobble restraints during paramedic transport. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, *25*, 710–712.
- Sweerissen, H., & Carruthers, J. (1987). The use of a physical restraint procedure to reduce a severely intellectually disabled child's tantrums. *Behaviour Change*, *4*, 34–38.
- Swett, C., Michaels, A., & Cole, J. (1989). Effects of a state law on rates of restraint on a child and adolescent unit. *Bulletin of American Psychiatry Law*, *17*, 165–169.
- Tilli, D., & Spreat, S. (2009). Restraint safety in a residential setting for persons with intellectual disabilities. *Behavioral Interventions*, *24*, 127–136.
- Tomporowski, P. (1983). Training an autistic client: The effect of brief restraint on disruptive behavior. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, *14*, 169–173.
- Vorndran, C. M., & Lerman, D. C. (2006). Establishing and maintaining treatment effects with less intrusive consequences via a pairing procedure. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *39*, 35–48.
- Wacker, D. P., Steege, M. W., Northup, J., Sasso, G., Berg, W., Reimers, T., et al. (1990). A component analysis of functional communication training across three topographies of severe behavior problems. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *23*, 417–429.
- Wallace, M. D., Iwata, B. A., Zhou, L., & Goff, G. A. (1999). Rapid assessment of the effects of restraint on self-injury and adaptive behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *32*, 525–528.
- White, G. D., Nielsen, G., & Johnson, S. M. (1972). Timeout duration and the suppression of deviant behavior in children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *5*, 111–120.
- Yell, M. L. (1994). Timeout and students with behavior disorders: A legal analysis. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *17*, 293–301.