

©2016 Wiley. This article may not exactly replicate the final version published in the SEAB journal. It is not the copy of record. Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing scholarworks-group@umbc.edu and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

Supplemental Information

Step 1: Pairing. During the pairing phase, the experimenter placed a token on the token board and then immediately delivered a highly preferred edible item to a plate within arms reach of the subject. We conducted five trials of Step 1 prior to advancing to Step 2.

Step 2: Exchange response training. During exchange training the experimenter placed a token on the token board and held his or her hand out for 10 s. If the subject independently exchanged the token the experimenter placed an edible item on a plate within arms reach of the subject. If the subject did not independently exchange the token within the 10 s, the therapist prompted the exchange response using 3-step guided compliance. Three-step guided compliance consisted of sequential verbal, model and physical prompts. Token exchanges at any level of prompting produced one edible reinforcer and non-responding following a prompt level resulted in a more intrusive prompt. For example, if the subject did not emit the exchange response independently within 10 s of the exchange signal (i.e., experimenter hand held out), the experimenter issued the verbal prompt, “Exchange your token.” If the subject exchanged the token the experimenter delivered an edible item. If the subject did not exchange the token following the verbal prompt, the experimenter issued a model prompt (i.e., placed the token in their own hand) while saying, “Exchange your token like this.” An exchange following the model prompt produced an edible reinforcer and a non-response following the model prompt resulted in a full-physical, hand-over-hand prompt to exchange the token. The mastery criterion for Step 2 was 3 consecutive trials during which the subject independently exchanged the token.

Step 3: Token production training. Step 3 was identical to Step 2 except that a) each session consisted of 10 trials and b) the subject was required to complete a simple academic task (e.g., sorting colors, matching shapes) to produce the token. The experimenter used 3-step guided compliance as described in Step 2 to evoke correct academic responses. Tokens were delivered on an FR 1 schedule contingent on task-completion regardless of level of prompting. Immediately following token deliver the experimenter held his or her hand out and allowed 10 s for an independent exchange. If 10 s elapsed without an independent exchange, the experimenter implemented the 3-step guided compliance procedure as described in Step 2. The mastery criterion for Step 3 was three consecutive sessions during which the subject independently exchanged the token during 90% of trials. Following mastery at one earned token, the exchange production schedule was increased to five earned tokens and finally ten earned tokens. Following mastery at 10 earned tokens, token training was complete and the subject was eligible to start the token analysis.