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The Clinical Problem

- 2.0 to 7 year old children
- Parent Concerns Include:
  - Disobedience
  - Temper Tantrums
  - Physical Aggression
  - Rude Talk
- “Not Improving!!!”
Clinical Child Psychology
A Very Brief History

- The 1960s Shift from Individual Psychotherapy to:
  - Observational Methodologies
    - Home
    - Clinic Analogs
  - Parent Training
  - Social Learning Theory
- Primary Clinical Child Contributors
  - Gerald Patterson – University of Oregon
  - Robert Wahler – University of Tennessee
  - Constance Hanf – University of Oregon Medical Center
The Contribution of Socialization Research in Developmental Psychology

- Diane Baumrind’s Authoritative Parenting Style
  - Warmth, Responsiveness, & Engagement
  - Firm Control
  - Support for Autonomy
- Correlated with Best Outcomes
  - Successful Socialization
  - Peer Acceptance
  - Positive Self Esteem
  - Academic Achievement
The Contribution of Coercion Theory

- Gerald Patterson
- Oregon Social Learning Center
  - Aversive Child Behavior
    - Cessation Negatively Reinforcers Parent
  - Parenting Reactions
    - Unintended Positive Reinforcers
      - Attention/Touch
      - Grant Child Demands
    - Unintended Negative Reinforcers
      - Withdraw Instructions
      - Cease Discipline Efforts
  - Endless Reinforcement Traps
  - Stability by middle childhood
Hanf’s Two-stage Intervention

- Stage I: Enhance Parent Responsiveness to Developmentally Appropriate child signals/play
- Stage II: Parenting Steps to Promote Compliance to Instructions
  - Instruction Giving Skills
  - Social Reinforcement for Compliance Efforts
  - Warnings for Noncompliance (5 second rule)
  - Chair Timeout (TO) for Noncompliance
  - Re-cycle to original Instruction post TO
Finding 1: Stage I is Not Associated with Improved Child Compliance
Finding 2: Instruction Giving Skills and Timeout Both Contribute to Stage II Improvements

![Chart showing the effect of parental instruction-giving on percentage compliance to total commands before (PRE) and after (POST) intervention.](chart.png)

Fig. 1. Percentage compliance to total commands at PRE and POST for each of three groups.
Finding 3: The Social Reinforcement Component Is Not Contributing to Improved Compliance during Stage II
Finding #4: Social Reinforcement Not Contributing to Compliance Maintenance

Fig. 1. Mean compliance ratios across Trial Blocks for children in the Attention (ATT) and Ignore (IG) conditions of Project 2.
Finding #5: Warnings Reduce the Number of Timeouts Needed for Child to Reach Compliance Criterion
Finding #6: Warnings Do Not Attenuate the Timeout Effect
Finding #7: Enforcing Chair Timeouts Aversive to Child, Parents, and Therapists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Escape Mean</td>
<td>3.4 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=30)</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration Mean</td>
<td>5'38&quot; (4'31&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2'00&quot;-21'39&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subset 1</td>
<td>Escape Mean</td>
<td>3.8 (3.4)</td>
<td>1.0 (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0 - 11</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration Mean</td>
<td>4'04&quot; (2'45&quot;)</td>
<td>3'03&quot; (1'23&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2'00&quot;-12'45&quot;</td>
<td>2'00&quot;- 5'55&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subset 2</td>
<td>Escape Mean</td>
<td>2.6 (2.7)</td>
<td>0.9 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.1 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration Mean</td>
<td>2'51&quot; (0'41&quot;)</td>
<td>2'52&quot; (1'08&quot;)</td>
<td>3'15&quot; (1'14&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2'00&quot;- 4'15&quot;</td>
<td>2'00&quot;- 5'37&quot;</td>
<td>2'00&quot;- 5'35&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations are given in parentheses. Two subjects met the compliance criterion without being timed-out and are omitted from these analyses.
Finding #8: If you do not enforce chair timeouts, defiant children leave TO virtually immediately
Finding #9: Child Release Attenuates TO effect
Finding #10: Barrier and Spanking Enforcement Strategies Appear Comparably Effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Spank</th>
<th>Hold</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Child Release</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Attaining Criterion Performance</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>H &lt; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects with Excessive TO's</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>B&lt;CR; S&lt;CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape Efforts/TO(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects with Excessive Escape Efforts/TO(^c)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Spank = S, Hold = H, Barrier = B, Child Release = CR.

\(^b\)Subjects with no TO's (3 in Barrier) were excluded; subjects with excessive escape efforts were assigned 7 escape efforts/TO.

\(^c\)Subjects with no TO's were again excluded.
Finding #11: Both Enforcement Procedures Eliminate Need for Subsequent Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Mean Weekly Escape/TO Ratios in Home Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Current Status

*Given overtly defiant 2.0 to 7.0 year children*

- Effective Intervention Appears to Require Discipline
  - Empirical Findings in Literature (above)
  - Consistent with Coercion Theory
- Initial Use of Discipline with Disruptive 2-7 year olds is Difficult
  - Requires professional support for parent
  - Requires professional judgment to tailor TO protocol to child and parent
- Effective Discipline Renders Milder Forms of Parent Control Effective
  - Warnings
  - Instructions
Modern Versions of Hanf’s Program

- Forehand & McMahon – *Helping the Noncompliant Child*
- Eyberg – *Parent Child Interaction Therapy*
- Barkley – *Defiant Children*
- Webster-Stratton – *Incredible Years*
- Cunningham – *Community Parent Education Program*

Does the Clinical Child Literature have implications for Normally Developing Children?

- Successful Hanf-based interventions yield children who look like untreated, well socialized children:
  - Well Behaved
  - Responsive Parents
  - Rarely Disciplined

- Symposium Presentations & Discussion to Follow

Reference List for all data displayed available upon request following the symposium