Functional Analysis In Multiple Applied Mathematics

Lecturer, Ansam Ghazi NsaifALBU_Amer

Faculty of Basic Education

University of Wassit, Iraq

E mail: ansaif@uowasit.edu.iq

الملخص

أدرجت العديد من الأبحاث حول نتائج التحليل الوظيفي بيانات وصفية لمجموعة من المعلومات. ومع
ذلك ، تؤكد هذه المراجعة على دراسات التحليل الدالي الموجودة. كما هو موضح في هذا العمل ،
أسفرت نماذج التحليل الدالي الشاملة عن قاعدة بيانات ضخمة من الامتدادات والتكرارات على
مجموعة متنوعة من التركيبة السكانية ، والأداء الموضوعي ، والسيناريوهات. تتزايد معدلات نشر
بشكل تدريجي ، مما يشير إلى تقدم منهجي في استخدام عملية التحليل الوظيفي كأسلوب
أساسي لتقييم السلوك ، وبشكل أوسع ، كأداة لاستكشاف روابط الأداء بين البيئة.

Abstract

Numerous research of FA outcomes has incorporated descriptive data for a range of parameters. Nonetheless, this review emphasizes the extant functional analysis studies. As demonstrated in this work, extensive functional analysis models yielded a huge database of extensions and replications over a varied range of client demographics, objectiveperformances, and scenarios. FA research publication rates are gradually growing, indicating a systematic advancement in the use of the FA process as a primary approach of behavior valuation and, more broadly, as a tool for exploring environment–performance connections.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the topic of functional analysis, which is both important and useful. Functional analysis is crucial in both applied sciences and mathematics. The use of functional analysis (FA) approaches to discover environmental factors that perpetuate serious problem behaviors has caused in the increase of a number of personalized therapies that have developed therapy ability, productivity, and safety **(Hagopian et al., 2013)**

This article aims to introduce at least a portion of the topic of functional analysis that is essential and useful. In both the practical sciences and mathematics, functional analysis plays a crucial role.

Scientists and engineers excel in a wide range of mathematical disciplines. Sets, various forms of numbers, calculus, differential equations, and linear algebra are all common backgrounds (particularly with finite matrices). It is not uncommon to come across findings from another discipline of mathematics when dealing with sets of functions in these fields; this is common in quantum mechanics, for example, which is theoretically built on the generic linear algebra of operators and sets of Eigen functions. However, for scientists and engineers in that field, that subject of mathematics is not part of the standard course sequence.

Physical scientists and engineers are usually well-versed in a variety of mathematical disciplines. A typical basis includes sets, various kinds of numbers, calculus, differential equations, and linear algebra (particularly with finite matrices). When working with sets of functions in these disciplines, it is not uncommon to come across results from another field of mathematics; this is prevalent in quantum mechanics, for example, which is formally structured around the generic linear algebra of operators and sets of eigenfunctions. However, that branch of mathematics is not included in the standard course sequence for scientists and engineers in that field. Miller, D. A. B.

Functional analysis is a well-developed topic that mathematicians are interested in. Its writing, on the other hand, is rigidly mathematical, erecting a higher barrier of incomprehensibility for other mortals, owing to the fact that it is rarely taught to others. Its volumes are parched to the point of desiccation, as are many others in mathematics. That may appeal to mathematicians for its own sake, and it may even be seen as a virtue in the discipline.
The major goal of this study is to review the features of FA and to provide some previous research.

2. Different kinds of functional analysis

2.1 Functional analysis based on trials (TBFA)
Researchers have lately begun to investigate a new version based on normal functional analysis approaches, which entails separating the evaluation into independent trials that are spaced out in time and space. This method is known as trial-based functional analysis **(TBFA)Sigafoos and Saggers(1995)**.

The TBFA approach, showing detailed and outcomes in a natural setting, as part of continuing routines and activities. Instead of placing the subject in a simulated environment and giving antecedents and consequences on a pre-determined schedule, In the TBFA approach, an antecedent and consequence are presented in a discrete way. Instead of a percentage or rate of periods with problematic conduct, data on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of difficult conduct in response to that antecedent is collected in traditional functional analysis models in order to produce a proportion of trials with challenging attitudes.

In recent years, TBFA has acquired popularity in scientific circles. Eleven studies have looked into TBFA in the last four years to see how it influences challenging behavior. A systematic review of TBFA as a model for assessing the function of difficult behavior is required to guide best-practice, given the increasing usage of TBFA as a model for assessing the function of difficult behavior in peer-reviewed studies. The purpose of this study is to provide a complete review of studies that employ a TBFA to evaluate challenging behavior. 2.2 Functional analysis of precursors (PFAs) **Lalli, et al., (1995)**

2.2 Precursor Functional Analysis (PFAs)

Response classes are collections of responses. with the similar outcome **(Catania, 1998)**. These classes could be ordered hierarchically, with expectable and consistent temporal relationships, so that certain replies always occur first. When researchers arrange for the extinction of members of response classes that emerge initially, for example, they observe ordered and predictable increases in additional members of the class **(Magee & Ellis, 2000)** Additional explanations are possible, even if the results are consistent with a response-class hierarchy. Some antecedents may influence the likelihood of later target behavior reinforcement **(Fahmie & Iwata, 2011)**.

3. Precursor functional analysis development and evolution (PFAs)

Smith and Churchill (2002) looked at the FAs of four people who had severe problem manners (self-injurious behavior (SIB) or aggressiveness), then performed the FA procedures using precursor problem behavior rather than severe problem behavior as the experimental condition. Self-injury and violence were found to be more common during severe problem behavior FAs, while they were less common during PFAs. In addition, the FAs of precursor and serious issue behaviors were identical in that both identified each participant's sustaining contingency. These findings in caseearliestindication that PFA can reduce participant possibility during FA ways while correctly diagnosing serious problem behavior.

PFA has been duplicated and extended multiple times, with similar findings each time. Found 15 of 16 participants in published studies **(Borlase et al., 2017; Fritz et al., 2013)** had matches among PFAs and FAs of severe problem performance (94 percent). These studies **(Dracobly & Smith, 2012; Najdowski et al., 2008)**, which measured sharp problem attitude through PFA and baselines, discovered that severe easy behavior was reduced or removed in 17 of 20 cases during PFA (85 percent). These results recommend that PFA could be a feasible alternative for decreasing risk through FA.

4. Previous Research

Interventions focusing on FA outcomes, according to research, are effective in reducing or eradicating severe difficult performance **(Beavers, G. A. et al., 2013; Iwata, B., et al., 1994)**. Despite its apparent advantages, experts believe the FA has significant drawbacks.

Due to the essential of eliciting goal performances through the assessment, assessing severe problem attitudes may put clients, therapists, or both at risk.

Investigators have sought to lower the risk of FA by making it shorter **(Northup et al., 1991)**, using protectingapparatus, and establishing experimental consequences for less critical issue behaviors **(Le & Smith, 2002)**. The current narrative review focuses on the latter method, known as "precursor functional analysis" (PFA), in which we look at the conceptual and empirical underpinnings of PFA, as well as potential future research and practice opportunities.

Several assessments of FA findings have providingexpressive data on numerous parameters. Such as, FA results for 152 people who involved in self-injurious (SIB)conduct were published by **Iwata et al. (1994)**.All of the evaluations took place in housing institutions or set homes above an 11-year duration. The vast common of functional studies (95.4 percent) yielded variance response and, as a result, useful management planning results. Negative support in the procedure of task escape or further painful types of motivation was discovered to be the most common sustaining variable (38.1 percent). SIB was found to have 26.3 percent of the functions of social-positive support in the system of consideration or physical goods. It was revealed that automatic reinforcement kept 25.7 percent of the cases in place. In about 5% of functional investigations, several controls were indicated.

Kurtz et al. (2003) assessed FA results for 23 children under the age of 5 years who had been denoted for treatment of SIB and other severe disorders. In 70% of the cases, a caregiver acted as therapist during the functional analyses, which were showed in a university clinic setting. Functional studies were used to discover the sustaining elements for 87.5 percent of the mentioned behaviors. Negative reinforcement contributed for only 3.4 percent of the participants' SIB, whereas positive support (i.e., helpfulness, perceptible, helpfulness + perceptible) accounted for 37.9%.

Functional analysis was studied by **Skinner (1953)** to describe "cause-and-effect relationships" amid environment and performance; but, performance analysts and psychologists have expanded the term to encompass a wide variety of measures and processes that differ in many methods**(Iwata, B. A. et al., 2000)**.

E. G. Carr and Durand (1985) proposed additional approach for doing a functional study of problem performance. In four children with developmental disabilities, the impacts of three assessment conditions on a range of problem performances (aggressive, tantrums, SIB, resistance, and out of seat) were examined, with two antecedent factors, helpfulness and effort of training, modified. There were numerous patterns of abnormal performance found, proposing that key factors differed between people.

Functional analysis procedures represented by **Iwata et al. (1982)**the start of a complete method to involvement in which control methods developed from trial behavior analysis were

used not only to the handling of difficultperformance but also to its evaluation, as described by **E. G. Carr and Durand (1985)**.

Furthermore, both assessment models outperformed random methods to problem behavior therapy, resulting in the improvement of more detailedsupportbased therapies and a reduction in the usage of sentence**(Pelios, L. et al., 1999)**. In principle, FA has providing a method for predicting which medicines will work and which will not, as well as why they will or will not work. Following that, there will be a discussion of areas that require more research, as well as anevaluation of FAprocedure and a performance of best trainingproposals.

References

Hagopian, L. P., Rooker, G. W., Jessel, J., &DeLeon, I. G. (2013). Initial functional analysis outcomes and modifications in pursuit of differentiation: A summary of 176 inpatient cases. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 46, 88-100. https://doi.org/10. 1002/jaba.25.

D. A. B. Miller, "Waves, modes, communications, and optics," arXiv: 1904.05427 [physics.optics]

*Sigafoos, J., &Saggers, E. (1995). A discrete-trial approach to the functional analysis of aggressive behaviour in two boys with autism. Australia & New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities, 20, 287–297. doi:10.1080/07263869500035621

Catania, A. C. (1998). Learning (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Magee, S. K., & Ellis, J. (2000). Extinction effects during the assessment of multiple problem behaviors. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 33, 313-316. https://doi. org/10.1901/jaba.2000.33-313.

Fahmie, T. A., & Iwata, B. A. (2011). Topographical and functional properties of precursors to severe problem behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 44, 993-997. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2011.44-993

Lalli, J. S., Mace, F. C., Wohn, T., &Livezey, K. (1995). Identification and modification of a response-class hierarchy. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 28, 551-559. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1995.28-551

Richman, D. M., Wacker, D. P., Asmus, J. M., Casey, S. D., &Andelman, M. (1999). Further analysis of problem behavior in response class hierarchies. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 32, 269-283. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1999.32-269.

Smith, R. G., & Churchill, R. M. (2002). Identification of environmental determinants of behavior disorders through functional analysis of precursor behaviors. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 35, 125-136. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2002.35-125.

Borlase, M. A., Vladescu, J. C., Kisamore, A. N., Reeve, S. A., &Fetzer, J. L. (2017). Analysis of precursors to multiply controlled problem behavior: A replication. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 50, 668-674. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaba.398

Borrero, C. S., &Borrero, J. C. (2008). Descriptive and experimental analyses of potential precursors to problem behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 41, 83-96. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2008.41-83.

Fritz, J. N., Iwata, B. A., Hammond, J. L., & Bloom, S. E. (2013). Experimental analysis of precursors to severe problem behaviors. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 46, 101-129. https://doi.org/10. 1002/jaba.27

Herscovitch, B., Roscoe, E. M., Libby, M. E., Bourret, J. C., & Ahearn, W. H. (2009). A procedure for identifying precursors to problem behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 42, 697-702. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2009.42-697

Dracobly, J. D., & Smith, R. G. (2012). Progressing from identification and functional analysis of precursor behavior to treatment of self-injurious behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 45, 361-374. https:// doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2012.45-361

Najdowski, A. C., Wallace, M. D., Ellsworth, C. L., MacAleese, A. N., & Cleveland, J. M. (2008). Functional analyses and treatment of precursor behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 41, 97-105. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2008.41-97.

Beavers, G. A., Iwata, B. A., &Lerman, D. C. (2013). Thirty years of research on the functional analysis of problem behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 46(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaba.30

Iwata, B., Pace, G., Dorsey, M., Zarcone, J., Vollmer, T., Smith, R., . . . Willis, K. (1994b). The functions of self-injurious behavior: An experimentalepidemiological analysis. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27, 215-240. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba. 1994.27-215

Northup, J., Wacker, D., Sasso, G., Steege, M., Cigrand, K., Cook, J., &Deraad, A. (1991). A brief functional analysis of aggressive and alternative behavior in an outclinic setting. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 24, 509-522. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba. 1991.24-509

Le, D. D., & Smith, R. (2002). Functional analysis of self-injury with and without protective equipment. Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 14, 277-290. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016028522569

Iwata, B. A., Dorsey, M., Slifer, K. J., Bauman, K. E., & Richman, G. S. (1994a). Toward a functional analysis of self-injury. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27, 197-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-4684(82) 90003-9

Kurtz, P. F., Chin, M. D., Huete, J. M., Tarbox, R. S. F., O'Connor, J. T., Paclawskyj, T. R., et al. (2003). Functional analysis and treatment of self-injurious behavior in young students: A summary of 30 cases. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 36, 205–219.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Iwata, B. A., Kahng, S., Wallace, M. D., & Lindberg, J. S. (2000). The functional analysis model of behavioral assessment. In J. Austin & J. E. Carr (Eds.), *Handbook of applied behavior analysis* (pp. 61–90). Reno, NV: Context Press.

Carr, E. G., & Durand, V. M. (1985). Reducing behavior problems through functional communication training. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis,18,* 111–126.

Pelios, L., Morren, J., Tesch, D., & Axelrod, S. (1999). The impact of functional analysis methodology on treatment choice for self-injurious and aggressive behavior. *Journal of Applied BehaviorAnalysis, 32,* 185–195.

Iwata, B. A., Duncan, B. A., Zarcone, J. R., Lerman, D. C., & Shore, B. A. (1994). A sequential, test control methodology for conducting functional analyses of self-injurious behavior. *Behavior Modification,18,* 289–306.