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Preface to Volume 1

Many books have been written on assessment, conceptualization, and treatment over the past few decades. However, for the most part, these three issues critical to developing the most effective treatment regimens for clients have not been linked in systematic fashion across the age spectrum. In this two-volume set, we believe that we have filled a gap in the literature. Volume I does so for adults, while Volume II considers the issues in children and adolescents.

In Volume I on adults the chapters are divided into three parts. Part I (General Issues) has six chapters dealing with an Overview of Behavioral Assessment with Adults, Diagnostic Issues, Behavioral Conceptualization, Overview of Behavioral Treatment with Adults, Medical and Pharmacological Issues, and Ethical Issues.

Part II deals with Assessment, Conceptualization, and Treatment of Specific Disorders, while Part III considers Special Issues, such as Marital Distress, Sexual Deviation, Adults with Developmental Disabilities, Older Adults, Insomnia, Health Anxiety, and Compulsive Hoarding.

In Parts II and III, authors were encouraged to include the following topics in their chapters: Description of the Disorder, Diagnosis and Assessment, Conceptualization, Behavioral Treatment, Medical Treatment (if relevant), and a detailed Case Description. Authors were also encouraged to consider the following issues in the section on Conceptualization: learning and modeling, life events, genetic influences, physical affecting behavior, drugs affecting behavior, and cultural and diversity issues.

We believe that the way this volume is structured provides a valuable teaching tool so that students have a more holistic view of psychopathology, its etiology, and its ultimate remediation. The Case Description was included to help concretize the thinking of our experts and to help students understand the more subtle transitions and connections of assessment, conceptualization, and treatment.
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PART I

GENERAL ISSUES
CHAPTER 1

Overview of Behavioral Assessment with Adults

MAUREEN C. KENNY, KRISANN ALVAREZ, BRAD C. DONOHUE, AND CHARLES B. WINICK

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Behavioral assessment stems from early research in classical and operant conditioning that demonstrated how behavioral and emotional responses could be conditioned, or in effect learned (Watson & Rayner, 1920). Treatments based on behavioral principles were then initiated to ameliorate various problem behaviors (Jones, 1924). Despite the increase in the use of behavioral therapy in the late 1950s, behavioral assessment measures were not commonly utilized in a clinical context until the mid-1960s. Early behavioral assessment focused on the observation of behavior patterns. Specifically, assessment focused on quantifying the frequency, rate, and duration of behaviors that were very specifically described to enhance reliability (Ullmann & Krasner, 1965). The publication of Complex Human Behavior (Staats, 1963) and Behavior Analysis (Kanfer & Saslow, 1965) increased interest in the field.

In the 1970s, behavioral assessment expanded in application and focus. The concept that situational variables influenced behavior led researchers to investigate individuals’ behaviors within larger social contexts such as family, school, and business. In addition, assessment expanded to include feelings, sensations, internal imagery, cognitions, interpersonal relations, and psychophysiological functioning (Lazarus, 1973). To adequately assess these content areas, indirect measures, such as self-reports and ratings by significant others were included in behavioral assessments (Cone, 1977, 1978).

Diversification of behavioral assessment continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s with incorporation of other disciplines and traditions. Indeed, in a review of articles published in behavioral assessment journals in the early to mid-1980s, only 15% indicated observation as a mode of assessment (Fernandez-Ballesteros, 1988). Such diversity garnered interest in the topic and resulted in an increase in journal articles related to behavioral assessment. As a result, in the span of 3 years, articles containing the term “behavioral assessment” increased from 50 articles in 1980 to 200 articles in 1983.
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(Fernandez-Ballesteros, 1993). Inclusion of other disciplines was evident in a review of Behavior Therapy and Behavior Research and Therapy from 1988 through 1991 in which 53% of articles detailed the utilization of standardized trait questionnaires (Haynes & Uchigakiuchi, 1993). Moreover, 82% of the articles that included trait measures did so in conjunction with traditional behavioral assessment methodologies. Along a slightly different vein, objective measures of behavior (e.g., urine drug screens to detect drug use) have become customarily administered with subjective measures of behavior (e.g., ratings of satisfaction with drug use) in controlled treatment outcome studies (e.g., Azrin et al., 2001). Thus, behavioral assessment has developed over multiple decades and continues to expand through the incorporation of traditional forms of assessment and application to various fields.

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Contrasts with Traditional Assessment

Despite recent incorporation of traditional assessment strategies in behavioral assessment, differences between behavioral and traditional assessment models lie within contrasting conceptual foundations. Traditional assessment including psychodynamic and personality approaches assume that behavior is the result of stable, internal, psychological processes. The assumption of this methodology is that behavior is the expression of enduring, underlying personality traits. Therefore, emphasis of traditional assessment is on the measurement of internal experiences and underlying traits (O’Brien & Haynes, 2005). The stable nature of these traits does not lend itself to modification through therapy. In addition, traditional assessment requires the acceptance of abstract constructs used to conceptualize underlying traits that are not amenable to empirical investigation. These limitations, among others, led to development of behavioral assessment strategies.

Perhaps the most distinctive trait of behavioral assessment is the emphasis on situational determinants of behavior and exclusion of trait assumptions. Behavioral assessment highlights the importance of environmental contributions and assumes that behavior is situation specific. Assessment in this tradition emphasizes the measurement of environmental factors, situation specific behavior, and recently has incorporated the examination of cognitive processes (O’Brien & Haynes, 2005). Behavior is considered to be initiated and maintained through a dynamic process and thus is assessed across time and environments. This dynamic process is assessed through the investigation of the antecedents and consequences of behavior. These variables include stimuli that precede, co-occur, and follow behaviors of interest.

The emphasis on situational determinants in behavioral assessment lends itself to sensitivity to individual differences. Behavioral assessment accepts that individuals differ in past experiences and present environmental variables and allows for individualized application of assessment strategies (O’Brien & Haynes, 2005). Individualized application can be utilized to better understand the factors initiating and maintaining behavior as similar behavior may be a function of differing contextual variables across individuals. Unlike traditional assessment, such specificity provides for direct therapeutic application. Identification of contributing variables allows for behavior modification through the manipulation of the environment (Nelson & Hayes, 1979).

Behavioral assessment is also distinct from traditional assessment in its emphasis on empirical evaluation. The focus of behavioral assessment on specific actions
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and contextual variables is better suited for empirical testing than conceptual trait characteristics utilized in traditional assessment (Goldfried & Kent, 1972). Application of empirical evaluation in behavioral assessment involves specific definitions of behavior, monitoring of contextual variables, systematic observation, and the use of validated instruments. Several studies evaluating the reliability and validity of diagnoses, behavioral observation, and self-report inventories highlight the importance of empirical validation in behavioral assessment (Follette & Hayes, 1992).

BASIC ISSUES IN BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT

Assessment is a necessary first step in behavioral therapy. In many ways, it is the complementary partner of behavioral treatment. Behavioral assessment ideally occurs prior to commencing treatment to assess requisite goals for treatment, during treatment to assist in measuring therapeutic progress and adequacy of selected treatments, and after treatment to determine final outcomes and appropriateness of treatment termination.

Behavioral assessment is typically organized in three distinct, and increasingly molecular stages. The first stage, or level, of behavioral assessment is focused on the identification of global behaviors (e.g., noncompliance, sleep disturbance) that are most contributory to the presenting problem. These behaviors are particularly distressing, disruptive to daily functioning, socially unacceptable, or dangerous or detrimental to health and well being. The focus of assessment then shifts to determining the syndrome or cluster of symptoms that influence the onset of problem behaviors. Assessment concludes with an assessment of the system. This view holds that the individual is a system, whereby one symptom disturbance affects functioning in another area.

Although behavioral assessment and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition, text revision (DSM-IV-TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) began on much different tracks (the former growing out of behavior therapy and the latter linked to the medical model), they have developed a working relationship and can be used in conjunction with one another. For instance, behavioral assessment is often relied on to assist in diagnosing DSM-IV diagnoses, as these syndromes are often based on quantifiable actions that are quite amenable to behavioral assessment practices. The nosologic scheme of the DSM sets forth a descriptive set of behaviors that are necessary for diagnosis in a particular area. This is analogous to the syndrome level of assessment discussed previously; where by a cluster of symptoms (which delineate a diagnosis) are identified as targets of treatment. Additionally, the DSM list of psychosocial stressors is consistent with behaviorism’s emphasis on environmental factors (Tyron, 1998). The atheoretical nature of the DSM does not preclude explanations of disorders based on behavioral theory. However, the DSM is based on a nomothetic system (classifying groups of similar individuals), while behavioral assessment is idiographic (unique to the individual) (Nelson-Gray & Paulson, 2004). A synthesis of behavioral assessment and DSM, where behavioral assessment is used to create a treatment that may be best for a specific individual, is possible.

Behavioral assessment may include many different instruments and types of assessment strategies. The domains that often need to be attended to when working with a client may best be assessed in different ways including self-report, self-monitoring and recording, surveys, direct behavioral recordings, and physiological assessment (Barlow, 2005). Generally, the start of an assessment identifies what behaviors are
of interest. This usually involves some behavioral excess (e.g., crying all the time) or deficit (e.g., unable to speak in social situations) (Tyron, 1998). Sometimes direct observation of the client is essential, as this method is generally the most validated method of specified behaviors, particularly when motivation is lacking. However, this method is relatively costly as compared with subjective self-report measures (i.e., questionnaires and other retrospective rating by others). Moreover, as compared with direct observation, subjective measures are easier to implement (i.e., direct observation often requires the assessor to travel to naturalistic environments). Assessment in the natural environment is preferred, but not always feasible and so artificial laboratory testing circumstances may be used (Tyron, 1998). Physiological responses (which can impact target behavior) can also be measured directly, requiring relevant equipment and expertise. The various methods of behavioral assessment will be reviewed later in the chapter.

FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Functional assessment is often confused with functional analysis (O’Neill, 2005). However, these terms are distinct from one another (Gresham, Quinn, & Restori, 1999; Herner, 1994). Functional assessment refers to the utilization of methods and techniques to identify target behaviors, including stimuli that precede (i.e., antecedents) and follow (i.e., consequences, target behaviors); conducting a functional analysis; and developing treatment interventions. Functional analysis is limited to the process by which environmental events are manipulated to estimate their impact on target behaviors, and is, therefore, a component of functional assessment.

IDENTIFICATION OF TARGET BEHAVIORS

The first step in the functional assessment process is the identification of target behaviors. Generally, the clinician and client work together to identify target problem behaviors. This process begins by broadly identifying behavioral patterns, and later specifying these behavioral patterns into well-defined behaviors (Donohue, Ammerman, & Zelis, 1998), including the manner by which these behaviors are performed, as well as their frequency, duration, and severity (O’Neill, 2005).

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

Functional analysis involves formulating hypotheses regarding the function, or purpose, of target behaviors (Gresham et al., 1999). Relationships between the variables that proceed, co-occur, and follow target behaviors are examined through the ABC model of functional analysis (i.e., antecedents, behaviors, consequences). An extension of this model, the SORC model includes antecedent stimuli (S), factors inherent to organism (O), target response (R), and consequences (C) (Goldfried & Sprafkin, 1976). This model includes current environmental stimuli and consequences, as well as individual physiology and learning history. The way in which this information is obtained and utilized is dependent on the method of functional analysis.

Indirect functional analysis involves utilization of interviewing procedures that are specifically designed to identify the function of relationships existing between target behaviors and relevant antecedents and consequences (Iwata & Worsdell, 2005). In this process, clinicians formulate hypotheses about the maintenance of target behaviors
behavioral analysts may assess interviewee beliefs about how the behavior is maintained, how the problem may be solved, and successful and unsuccessful strategies that may have been used to cope with target behaviors. This method is easily implemented. However, verbal reports have been reported to be unreliable (Sturmey, 1994).

Descriptive functional analysis involves systematic observation of target behavior to aid in hypothesis formulation (Sulzer-Azaroff & Mayer, 1977). Data obtained in this method is utilized in the formulation of hypotheses regarding the function of target behaviors. These hypotheses are confirmed or disconfirmed by examining the correlations between occurrence of target behaviors and antecedents and consequences. Descriptive functional analysis is a more reliable method than indirect functional analysis, as it does not rely upon self-report. However, this method relies on correlations and fails to provide a means of experimentally testing hypotheses (Iwata & Worsdell, 2005).

Experimental functional analysis is the method of experimentally manipulating the environment to develop and test hypotheses that are pertinent to the maintenance of target behaviors. Environmental events may be presented or withdrawn for short time periods to assess the affect on target behaviors (O’Neill, 2005). Behavior occurrence during these trials is compared to identify the function of the target behaviors and the maintaining variables (Iwata & Worsdell, 2005). Although this method is relatively time consuming, experimental manipulation offers great promise when accurate assessment is wanting.

Treatment Interventions

Once target behaviors and their functional relationships have been identified, treatment intervention may be developed and implemented. When multiple target behaviors are identified, the clinician may choose to initially focus on a single behavior or address multiple behaviors concurrently. It is customary to initially target the behavior causing greatest distress to the client, thus assisting the client in being able to attend to other behaviors. Another approach is to first target the behavior most amenable to change so that the client is encouraged by the effect of treatment (O’Leary & Wilson, 1975). When the client lacks motivation, the clinician may choose to first address the behavior that is most disruptive to the client’s significant others (Tharp & Wetzel, 1969). In addressing multiple behaviors concurrently, clinicians must examine whether behaviors are influenced by one another. Related behaviors are referred to as response classes. Response classes include behaviors that have seemingly different characteristics, but have similar effects on the environment or contextual variables (O’Neill, 2005).

Self-Report Assessment

Information from self-report assessment strategies (e.g., questionnaires, self-monitoring) is obtained directly from the client. Self-report methods are cost-effective, easily administered, and amenable to the assessment of motoric, physiological, and cognitive processes (Cone, 1978). Self-report assessment generally requires less time and resources than other forms of assessment, such as behavioral observation. The primary criticism of self-reports is that client’s may provide inaccurate information due to various factors, including intentional false reporting and memory deficits. However,
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Barlow, Hayes, and Nelson (1984) argued the client’s perception of their problem is an important component of the therapeutic process, and Evans (1986) noted that the theoretical assumptions of behavioral assessment do not include unconscious processes that would lead to distortion of self-reports of behavior.

Self-Report Measures/Instruments

Self-report measures present clients with statements regarding the presence, frequency, or severity of their thoughts and behaviors. Measures differ in their number of items, but frequently utilize a Likert-type response scale (e.g., 7 = Extremely happy, 1 = Extremely unhappy). Standardized rating scales and problem behavior checklists are generally paper-and-pencil measures. However, some measures may be administered via computer. Computer-administered assessments often have the advantage of automated scoring, which can reduce the time of assessment interpretation. Although most measures are completed by the client, some measures may be completed by significant others or family members to gain a greater understanding of the problem.

Self-report measures vary in their degree of specificity. Some instruments assess multiple domains (e.g., depression, anxiety, conduct problems) broadly, while others assess specific behavioral categories more comprehensively. Determination of the type of measure to employ is dependent upon the objective of assessment. General measures are beneficial in the initial stages of assessment to identify the areas in which the client is experiencing greatest relative difficulty. Specific measures are useful when the clinician is interested in assessing detailed information about a client’s identified problem and usually are administered once the initial target behaviors have been identified during broad-based assessment. Determination of which measure to use should include an examination of the reliability and validity of potential instruments because self-report inventories vary in degree of psychometric validation.

The Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1994) is a broad-based self-report checklist that assesses nine dimensions (i.e., Somatization, Obsessive-Compulsive, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Depression, Anxiety, Hostility, Phobic Anxiety, Paranoid Ideation, and Psychoticism) and three global indices of distress (i.e., Global Severity Index, Positive Symptom Distress Index, and Positive Symptom Total). Clients respond to 90 items measuring symptom presence and severity on a 5-point rating scale ranging from “not at all” to “extremely.” The SCL-90-R may be utilized to initially identify problems and measure treatment progress and outcomes. The SCL-90-R includes computer-based administration requiring approximately 12 to 15 minutes. The SCL-90-R has been reported to have above satisfactory ratings of internal consistency (Derogatis, Rickels, & Rock, 1976; Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno, & Villasenor, 1988), and high levels of convergent-discriminant validity (see Derogatis, 1983). Most SCL-90-R item stems are behaviorally specified, (e.g., shouting or throwing things) although some are not amenable to functional analysis (e.g., never feeling close to another person).

Beck Depression Inventory II The Beck Depression Inventory Second Edition (BDI-II; Beck, Brown, & Steer, 1996a) is a specific self-report inventory used to assess the presence and severity of various symptoms of depression. The measure consists of 21 items; each item has four alternative responses from which the individual can choose, which are then scored, 0 to 3. The BDI-II is available in a paper-and-pencil
version. Total administration requires approximately 5 minutes and may be conducted by the clinician or self-administered by the client. The BDI-II has been reported to have good reliability, and high content and convergent validity (Beck, Brown, & Steer, 1996b). Although frequently utilized to measure depression, many of the items are designed to measure cognitive processes (e.g., I feel that I am a total failure as a person) limiting its application to traditional functional assessment.

**Self-Monitoring**

Self-monitoring is the process of “systematically observing and recording aspects of one’s own behavior” (Bornstein, Hamilton, & Bornstein, 1986, p. 176). Functionally related internal and external environmental events may be recorded to gain better understanding of the client’s behavior (Cone, 1999). This form of self-report assessment is frequently used in clinical psychology. Indeed, in a survey of behavioral practitioners, 83% reported using self-monitoring with their clients (Elliott, Miltenberger, Kaster-Bundgaard, & Lumley, 1996).

Clients may use self-monitoring to track thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Client recordings may include the frequency and duration of target behavior, as well as relevant antecedents and consequences to assist in understanding the function of behavior. Because clients are responsible for monitoring their behavior, the client and clinician should agree on operational definitions of the target behavior and relevant contextual variables to be monitored (Korotitsch & Nelson-Gray, 1999). Some authors reported finding increased accuracy when clients were trained in how to monitor behavior (Hamilton & Bornstein, 1977; Nelson, Lapinski, & Boykin, 1978). Thus, clients should have a thorough understanding of the recording process.

The way in which self-monitoring is structured may vary. Clients may record behavior at every occurrence, during a specific time period, or during specific situations. Barton, Blanchard, and Veazy (1999) recommend that the time period monitored by clients be specific to the monitored behavior and purpose of the data. Cone (1999) suggested that clinicians consider: (a) when and how frequent behavior should be monitored, (b) the time period for monitoring, (c) what is to be recorded, (d) the format of the record, (e) whether and how to use cues, (f) the number of different variables to be recorded, and (g) any techniques for assuring compliance.

Clients most often record their behavior on paper-and-pencil forms, although counters, tape recorders, and journals are also useful in the monitoring process. Paper-and-pencil forms and counters can quickly capture the frequency of behavior. Unlike counters, paper-and-pencil forms allow detailed information including severity ratings and contextual variables to be recorded. Tape recorders and journals offer the additional advantage of comprehensive verbatim responses, although much of the information recorded may be irrelevant to the treatment plan.

Self-monitoring may assist in the initial assessment process through identification of target behaviors and relevant contextual variables. Monitoring can also be used to establish baseline rates of behavior (Ciminero, Nelson, & Lipinski, 1977; Korotisch & Nelson-Gray, 1999). This gathering of information further contributes to the development of a functional analysis through the formulation of hypotheses regarding target behavior and maintaining variables. When diagnostic classification is unclear, self-monitoring can aid in appropriate diagnosis. Treatment plans can then be developed accordingly (Korotisch & Nelson-Gray, 1999).
Utilization of self-monitoring during treatment assists clients in gaining increased awareness of behavior occurrence and behavior management (Korotitsch & Nelson-Gray, 1999; Wilson & Vitousek, 1999). Indeed, merely attending to the occurrence of behavior may alter behavior in the direction of the therapeutic goal (Baird & Nelson-Gray, 1999). Monitoring can also be used in treatment to monitor treatment gains and outcomes. Recordings throughout treatment can be compared to base rate information to assess behavior changes. If behavior change is not reflected in recordings, intervention strategies may be altered.

Self-monitoring is an inexpensive, convenient technique that requires less of the clinician's time and resources than other methods (e.g., behavioral observation). In addition to convenience, self-monitoring is less intrusive. Since clients record behaviors themselves, there is no need for the presence of observers, and recordings are less likely to be biased by observer perception. Clients are also benefited by being provided with a method of attending to their behavior and responses. Bornstein and colleagues (1986) noted the immediate self-derived feedback outside of therapy through self-reporting methods empowers clients. Self-monitoring also has a wide range of application.

Despite benefits of self-monitoring, the technique is not without criticism. Reactivity to monitoring may occur. Response reactivity occurs when clients purposely alter their report of behavior as a result of attention (Ciminero et al., 1977). Frequency or severity of problem behavior may be inflated to signal need for treatment (Craske & Tsao, 1999), or underreported if the client fears negative consequences for failing to reflect treatment gains. Contrarily, clients may underreport problem behavior to impress the therapist or "get out" of therapy commitments. Accuracy may also be affected by the limitations of memory. If the client records retrospectively, aspects of the monitored variables may not be remembered. Further, easily remembered events might be recorded as occurring more frequently (Craske & Tsao, 1999). To increase accuracy of data, observer load is an important consideration (Hayes & Cavior, 1977, 1980). Baird and Nelson-Gray (1999) suggest it is best to initiate the monitoring process with a few behaviors, and gradually increase the number of monitored behaviors with the passage of time.

Behavioral Interviews

Behavioral interviewing uses the framework of learning principles (i.e., operant and classical conditioning) to elicit information from the client, and initiate functional analysis of the problem (Sarwer & Sayers, 1998). The interview is often the first step in identifying the problem behavior(s), generating hypotheses, and gathering information (Glass & Arnkoff, 1989). Most clients are cooperative and provide detailed information regarding their problems and the antecedents and consequences. However, there are times when clients are not able to fully describe what is wrong. In instances such as these, it may be helpful for the clinician to ascertain motivations for the referral.

Interviews used in behavioral assessment vary in structure. The content and organization of unstructured interviews is dependent upon the clinician and the goal of the interview. Semi-structured and structured interviews are less flexible. Semi-structured interviews include standardized questions and formats, but do permit the clinician leeway to ask follow-up questions, select questions to ask from an available list, and permit idiosyncratic queries. Structured interviews are fully structured
interviews that clearly delineate the format of the interview and the questions to be read verbatim by the clinician. They do not allow rephrasing or additional questions to be posed to the client.

**Unstructured Interviews**  Clinicians frequently use unstructured interviews at the outset of the assessment and therapeutic process to identify client’s problem. The clinician works with the client to identify, and operationally define the problem. Lazarus (1973) proposed the BASIC ID approach to assessing content areas in interviews [i.e., behavior (B), affect (A), sensation (S), imagery (I), cognitions (C), interpersonal relationships (I), and possible drug utilization (D)]. Assessment of medical history is customary, as medical conditions may contribute to problem behavior. In keeping with behavioral assumptions, interviews are chiefly focused on current problem behavior, contextual variables, and treatment utility. The history of the problem may be assessed, but the emphasis is on recent events.

Kratochwill (1985) provides a four-stage format relevant to discussing topics during an unstructured interview:

1. Problem identification is the specification of problem to establish base rates and treatment goals.
2. Problem analysis is the assessment of contextual variables and client resources.
3. Plan implementation is the proposed data collection for evaluation of treatment progress.
4. Treatment evaluation concerns how pre- and postlevels of behavior will be compared.

Witt and Elliott (1983) suggested a more detailed organization for unstructured interviews:

1. The clinician begins by providing an overview of the interview agenda and a rationale for problem specification.
2. Clinician and client work together to identify and clearly define problem behaviors.
3. The problem behavior is further defined by assessing frequency, duration, and intensity.
4. Relevant antecedents and consequences are identified.
5. Realistic treatment goals and deadlines are discussed and agreed upon by the clinician and client.
6. The client’s strengths are identified.
7. Any behavior to be recorded and the method of the recording are identified.
8. The way in which treatment efficacy will be assessed is discussed.
9. The clinician summarizes the information discussed and obtains agreement from the client.

These suggestions provide the clinician with a format for organizing unstructured interviews. However, clinicians have the freedom to vary the content of the interview, the specific questions posed, and the amount of time spent on each area. Unstructured interviews should be tailored to the client’s needs and responses during the interview process. Through individualization of the interview, the clinician may obtain information from the client that would not have otherwise been disclosed.
A major advantage of unstructured interviews is the flexibility to assess multiple areas and spontaneously alter the interview format based on information obtained. In addition to identifying problem behavior and contextual variables, unstructured interviews provide an opportunity for clinicians to formulate and inquire about hypotheses regarding the function of behavior. Depending on the information obtained, the clinician may determine whether further assessment measures are necessitated. Flexibility of the unstructured interview allows the clinician to explore client initiated content, and provide empathy, which may assist in establishing rapport. The interaction also provides an opportunity for the clinician to gain an impression of the client, and may serve as an observation measure if the client displays problem behavior during the interview.

Semi-Structured and Structured Interviews

Semi-structured and structured interviews provide an organized approach to interviewing. Both forms of interview provide clinicians with a standardized set of questions, sequence for asking questions, and behavior ratings. The difference lies in the degree of structure. Semi-structured interviews allow clinicians to rephrase questions and ask additional questions for clarification. Structured interviews require clinicians to ask questions verbatim without deviation. This may be beneficial for interviewers with less experience and clinical skill, provided they receive training on the specific interview.

As compared with unstructured interviews, clinicians may achieve more accurate diagnoses through the use of semi-structured and structured interviews as they assure coverage of diagnostic criteria. Diagnostic accuracy is particularly important in research, and clinical settings for which accurate classification is crucial (i.e., forensic settings). Structured interviews are also used to verify diagnostic impressions gained during unstructured interviews. If clinicians are unsure of a client’s diagnosis, they may use a semi-structured or structured interview to assist in differential diagnosis. The emphasis on diagnostic criteria, however, does not provide a thorough examination of contextual variables.

Although structured interviews have been criticized for failing to provide an opportunity to build rapport (Segal & Coolidge, 2003), they have demonstrated greater reliability and validity than unstructured interviews (Rogers, 2001; Segal & Coolidge, 2003). Reliability across interviewers is an important aspect of assessment when working with managed care systems that require diagnostic certainty and base reimbursement on diagnosis. Reliable measures also provide a more accurate measure of treatment outcome. However, it is important to note that psychometric properties vary across specific interviews, as indicated below.

Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders

The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders (SCID-I) is a semi-structured interview for assessing Diagnostic and Statistical Manual disorders (DSM-IV) (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) Axis I disorders. Multiple versions of the interview are available depending on the type of client to be interviewed and the setting in which the interview is to be conducted (e.g., patient/nonpatient client, research/clinical setting). The clinical version (SCID-CV; First, Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 1997) provides open-ended prompts with close-ended follow-up questions to assess both current (i.e., within the past month) and lifetime symptomology. The interview is comprised of 6 major modules: Mood Episodes, Psychotic Symptoms, Psychotic Disorders, Mood Disorders, Substance Use Disorders, and Anxiety and other Disorders, and requires 30 to 90 minutes for administration. However, the clinician
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has the discretion to utilize all modules, or chose the modules that are most relevant to the client's presenting problem. The SCID-I has been used as the "gold standard" for validity (e.g., Shear, Greeno, & Kang, 2000; Steiner, Tebes, & Sledge, 1995). Reliability is generally good, and varies across modules (Zanarini, et al., 2000).

**Diagnostic Interview Schedule for DSM-IV** The Diagnostic Interview Schedule (DIS-IV) for DSM-IV (Robins et al., 2000) is a fully structured interview for assessing DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 1994) disorders. All questions and probes are provided, and presented verbatim. Questions are close-ended as a means of limiting variability. The DIS-IV requires 90 to 120 minutes to administer. Clinicians may choose which modules to administer, or utilize the optional termination points within each disorder section if the client does not endorse sufficient symptoms. Given the complexity of the interview, training is recommended.

**DIRECT BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION**

Behavioral observation of specified behaviors is the hallmark of behavioral assessment (Algozzine, Konrad, & Test, 2005) and is the preferred method of obtaining information about problem behaviors (Groth-Marnat, 2003). Jordan and Franklin (2003) report behavioral observation is one of the most effective measures of frequency and duration of behavior. Although other methods are more commonly utilized, these methods are more likely to be influenced by reporting biases. The more removed from the time and place of the occurrence of the behavior, the more indirect the assessment and the greater chance of error. Behavioral observation should ideally occur in naturalistic environments (e.g., home, school, work), and should involve a range of appropriate and inappropriate social behavior (Algozzine et al., 2005). In conducting in vivo assessment the observer has little control over the behaviors that are observed. In vivo observations are most effective when assessing high frequency, global behaviors and are valuable for measuring change following clinical intervention (Groth-Marnat, 2003).

Defining the target behavior, in measurable, observable terms is a necessary first step to behavioral observation (Groth-Marnat, 2003). Any definition of a behavior should include specific examples of behavioral performance to assist in achieving sufficient reliability between raters. For some behaviors, such as measuring how many alcoholic beverages the client consumes (e.g., 12 ounces of beer, 5 ounces of wine), this is an easy process. Other behaviors, such as assertiveness, are more difficult and must be clearly defined (e.g., refusing an offer to ingest an alcoholic beverage). The target behaviors for observation will be derived from information obtained from the interview, anecdotal observations (e.g., observation of argument with spouse in waiting room), self-report inventories, and other assessment strategies (Groth-Marnat, 2003).

An observational assessment generally focuses on the here and now. Thus, the clinician’s attention is focused on the immediate behavior, its antecedents (what happened just before the behavior) and its consequences (what happens right afterward). In conducting informal observations, an observer may observe behavior for a specific period of time and provide a narrative summary of relevant actions, often called a narrative recording. For example, a clinician working with an individual who self-reports social skill deficits may observe this person at a party. The clinician would then return to the office and make notes of observed actions. This type of observation is very helpful in defining more specific areas for future assessment to be measured.
quantitatively (Groth-Marnat, 2003). Formal observations identify previously defined behaviors. In a formal observation, the observer decides ahead of time who will be observed, what they will be doing, when and where the observation will take place, and how the behavior will be counted. The behavior must be operationalized prior to the observation so that the observer is able to measure it and keep a record. An example of a well-defined behavior would be, “asking a coworker how she is feeling during a work break,” whereas a poorly defined behavior would be, “being friendly.” Once the target behavior occurs, the clinician records its occurrence, along with relevant antecedents (e.g., presence of one person who smiles, solving a work-related problem successfully) and consequences (e.g., person returns salutation).

It is necessary to fully understand the various dimensions of behavior prior to conducting formal observations (Algozzine et al., 2005). For instance, frequency is the number of times an individual engages in the target behavior within a given time frame; the clinician must be clear about when the behavior begins and ends (e.g., Sam swore at his supervisee three times during the 8-hour work day). Rates per minute, hour or day can be derived from frequency data, thereby allowing comparisons across observations. Duration is how long the individual engages in the target behavior during the specified time period (e.g., Sam engaged in a conversation with his coworker for 2 minutes during the 1-hour lunch). Latency refers to the length of time that elapses between the antecedent stimulus and the onset of the behavior (e.g., Thirty minutes after Sam arrived home, he began crying). The magnitude of the behavior is the force, intensity, or severity of the behavior, but relies on a qualitative judgment (1 = Extremely angry, 5 = Extremely happy). What the behavior looks like motorically is the topography of behavior, while locus is where the behavior occurs.

Participant and Nonparticipant Observers
O’Brien, Kaplar, and Haynes (2005) describe both nonparticipant and participant observers. Nonparticipant observers are generally individuals who are trained to record the occurrence of behaviors and contributing variables. These individuals are not, however, part of the client’s environment. They receive formal training and are hired to conduct the observations and collect data on the problem behavior and causal variables. One downfall of this type of assessment is the cost associated with the training and hiring of such individuals. Participant observers are involved in the client’s natural environment. They may include family members, coworkers, teachers, hospital staff, or other caregivers. Due to their regular involvement in the client’s life, they are able to conduct observations in many different settings across substantial periods of time. There are drawbacks to utilizing these individuals. Given their multiple roles and responsibilities, they are generally able to record a limited number of events. In addition, their reports may be biased due to their relationship with the client, thus affecting objectivity of their recordings (O’Brien et al., 2005).

Direct behavioral observation can also be conducted with more than one observer at a time, making it a very effective measurement strategy (Jordan & Franklin, 2003). Two observers might be used in a residential or hospital setting. For instance, both a nurse and a mental health technician might be trained to observe a client’s behavior, and would record their observations. Then, interobserver agreement could be obtained as a measure of reliability. The use of two observers is time consuming, expensive, and not always practical, usually demanding an assessment of interrater/interobserver reliability.