

Are speech-generating devices

Critical Review:

does not allow for true requesting in which the child requests something they want that is not immediately present. In addition, only six items were learned by the child during the study.

Choi, O'Reilly, Sigafoos, and Lancioni (2010) used a multiple baseline across participants design with four children, ranging in age from 6.5-9.5 years old. Three of the four children were diagnosed with autism and the other had severe developmental disabilities. Devices used included a Vantage, TechSpeak, Springboard, and picture exchange. The children had used these devices previously to request; this study taught the more advanced skills of rejecting and re-requesting, i.e., missing-item and wrong-item formats. A preference assessment was conducted in consultation with teachers prior to the start of the experiment to determine motivating activities.

The study consisted of three phases. First, pre-training taught the children to request missing items. Next, the experimental design taught rejecting and re-requesting responses. This phase consisted of baseline, training, intensive training for one of the four students, generalization, and follow-up. Interobserver agreement and procedural integrity were measured to be at least

week, which is suggestive of rapid learning. This is clinically significant as many students with disabilities spend a large amount of time in intensive intervention programs.

Reviews

Mirenda (2003) wrote a narrative review of research and directions for future research on preferable AAC modality and what is known about VOCAs for people with autism. Nine studies were described in the section of this paper on VOCAs. The article provides an in-depth summary of the current research. Overall, it is reported that there is suggestive evidence that supports the use of VOCAs with children with autism in a school

