

ERRATUM

## Erratum to: Social Thinking®: Science, Pseudoscience, or Antiscience?

Justin B. Leaf<sup>1</sup> · Alyne Kassardjian<sup>1</sup> · Misty L. Oppenheim-Leaf<sup>2</sup> · Joseph H. Cihon<sup>1</sup> · Mitchell Taubman<sup>1</sup> · Ronald Leaf<sup>1</sup> · John McEachin<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 28 March 2016  
© Association for Behavior Analysis International 2016

### Erratum to: Behav Analysis Practice DOI 10.1007/s40617-016-0108-1

In our recent published discussion article (Leaf et al., 2016), we referred to the Behavior Analyst Certification Board®'s (BACB®) ethics code and disciplinary system in relation to certified behavior analysts who would implement, recommend, or endorse Social Thinking®. Below is the paragraph that was written in the original manuscript:

Behaviorists should not engage in procedures during clinical practice that would be considered pseudoscience or anti-science, as doing so can cause harm to an individual diagnosed with ASD and their family. Additionally, doing so would not align with a behaviorist's training. As such, both certified and non-certified behavior analysts should not implement, recommend, or endorse Social Thinking®; doing so would violate the ethical guidelines described by the BACB® (BACB 2015; retrieved from: <http://www.bacb.com/index.php?page=57>). The ethical

standards of BACB state that behavior analysts have to design behavior change programs that are consistent with behavior analytic principles and indicate that endorsement of Social Thinking® would be a violation of a client's rights to effective treatment (BACB 2015; retrieved from: <http://www.bacb.com/index.php?page=57>). These violations could result in disciplinary action against a certified behavior analyst.”

However, the paragraph should have read as follows:

Behaviorists should not engage in procedures during clinical practice that would be considered pseudoscience or anti-science, as doing so can cause harm to an individual diagnosed with ASD and their family. Additionally, doing so would not align with a behaviorist's training. As such, both certified and non-certified behavior analysts should carefully consider the evidence base reviewed here before implementing, recommending, or endorsing Social Thinking®. Our conclusion is that Social Thinking® is

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40617-016-0108-1>.

✉ Justin B. Leaf  
Jblautpar@aol.com

Alyne Kassardjian  
Akautpar@aol.com

Misty L. Oppenheim-Leaf  
Molbtlc@aol.com

Joseph H. Cihon  
Jcjhonautpar@aol.com

Mitchell Taubman  
Mtautpar@aol.com

Ronald Leaf  
Rlautpar@aol.com

John McEachin  
Jmautpar@aol.com

<sup>1</sup> Autism Partnership Foundation, 200 Marina Drive, Seal Beach, CA 90740, USA

<sup>2</sup> Behavior Therapy and Learning Center, 200 Marina Drive, Seal Beach, CA 90740, USA

not consistent with behavior-analytic principles. Therefore, we believe it falls within the definition of “non-behavior-analytic” interventions as described in Section 8.01 of the BACB® *Professional and Ethical Compliance Code for Behavior Analysts* (BACB, 2016; retrieved from: <http://bacb.com/ethics-code>). The ethics code of the BACB requires use of the following written disclaimer on all names and descriptions of non-behavior-analytic interventions: “These interventions are not behavior-analytic in nature and are not covered by my BACB credential.” (BACB, p. 16).

**Compliance and Ethical Standards** This erratum does not include any human or animal participants. There are no conflicts of interest for this erratum across all authors.

## Reference

- Leaf, J. B., Kassardjian, A., Oppenheim-Leaf, M. L., Cihon, J. H., Taubman, M., Leaf, R., et al. (2016). Social thinking®: science, pseudoscience, or antiscience? *Behavior Analysis in Practice*. doi: 10.1007/s40617-016-0108-1.