INTRODUCTION
Previous research has been conducted with DRO (Differential Reinforcement of Other Behavior) and DNRO (Differential Negative Reinforcement of Other Behavior) schedules of reinforcement, Roberts, Mace, & Daggett (1995) demonstrated that DNRA (Differential Negative Reinforcement of Alternative Behavior) and DNRO reduced the rate of escape-maintained SIB in a 4 year old female with severe mental retardation. Kodak, Mittenberger, & Romanuk (2003) showed that DNRO and NCE (Noncontingent Escape) reduced the disruptive behavior and increased the compliance of two 4 year olds with autism. Kodak, Lerman, Volkert, & Trosclair (2007) conducted research with 5 male and female children ranging in age from 4-8 who were diagnosed with autism. All participants exhibited escape-maintained problem behavior. Where they could choose between a break and a food in a choice procedure, all participants chose the food. Kodak, Mittenberger, & Romanuk (2003) used NCR (Noncontingent Reinforcement) and DRO procedures for a 7 year old general education student whose problem behaviors were maintained by escape and attention. NCR was somewhat more effective in reducing problem behavior, and NCR and DRO were similar in increasing compliance. Piazza et al. (1997) used a DRO procedure that resulted in near zero levels of elopement for an 11 year old male with autism, severe mental retardation, bipolar disorder, and ADHD. Elopement was attention-maintained. The participant chose between 20 s of attention or 5 s of access to chips in a choice procedure. The previous research suggests that a DRO procedure was effective at reducing several topographies of problem behavior. The research also supports using a DRO plus choice procedure for reducing elopement.

METHOD
Participants and Setting
• 5 year old Caucasian male: “Gary”
• Referred to the Center for Autism Spectrum Disorders (CASD)
• Primary referral behavior was elopement, or running away from adults without consent

Materials
• A preference assessment was conducted with Gary to determine which toys would be most and least preferred by him for use in functional analysis sessions.
• Results revealed that a blue texture ball, a puzzle, and a goodnight moon book were highly preferred. The ball and puzzle were used in the functional analysis.

Dependent Variables
• Elopement: Touching the door handle of the session room
• Flopping: Voluntarily dropping to the ground
• IOA: IOA data were collected for Gary for 25% of treatment sessions. The mean agreement for elopement was 99% (range 95-100). The mean agreement for flopping was 97.6% (range 90-100).

RESULTS
Functional Analysis
• The results of the functional analysis revealed that attention and escape were the most likely maintaining variables of Gary’s elopement.

Elopement
• By the end of Gary’s treatment at the CASD, elopement decreased to zero levels, even when the DRO interval was increased to 20 minutes.

Flopping
• Flopping remained variable when the treatment was in place. When the DRO interval was increased, flopping decreased to zero levels.

DISCUSSION
• The investigation demonstrated that a DRO plus choice procedure was effective at eliminating the elopement behavior of a 5 year old male with a pervasive developmental delay.
• This research investigation was interesting in that a novel behavior emerged in the presence of a behavior that was targeted for treatment.
• Although the NCR plus toy treatment for flopping produced variable rates in flopping, this procedure was eventually effective at eliminating flopping.
• By the end of his treatment, both of Gary’s targeted behaviors decreased to zero levels.
• This research investigation added to the paucity of research that is currently available on elopement and flopping as targeted behaviors for change.
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