

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

AUTO-SHAPING A SIMPLE OPERANT IN HUMANS
USING SLIDE PRESENTATION AS A REINFORCER.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Education at Massey University.

John Cameron Kirkland
1971.

ABSTRACT

Using slide presentation as a reinforcer a simple operant was auto-shaped in human subjects. The operant (bar tapping) was established, for most subjects, in an auto-shaping technique where a discriminative stimulus (S^D) was available. In this technique a response made in the presence of S^D was immediately reinforced. However, where no response was emitted in the presence of S^D the procedure was recycled, i.e. Chain FT 10-sec. (darkness) FT 10-sec. (S^D), with no reinforcement delivered.

Response-independent schedules (FT 10-sec.) were used

- (i) for an analysis of supersititious responding, and
- (ii) for a control condition. Responding was not maintained under the non-contingent conditions but was re-established under the response-contingent (training) schedules.

The educational implications of auto-shaping are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to extend my gratitude to the known persons who arranged the contingencies which shaped the following verbal behaviour.

Especially to Professor C.G.N. Hill whose continued emphasis on contingency-shaped rather than rule-governed behaviour involved him in considerable time spent in many discussions during which the operating contingencies were carefully manipulated.

Other influential persons include: Yvonne Wilks, for her initial encouragement; Dr. Melvin H. Marx, for his positive feedback to the initial idea; Drs. M.C. Davison and E.L. Glynn, whose critical comments at different stages helped shape the final report; members of the Departments of Education, Physics and Psychology for persevering with unusual problems; Miss Green, for tracking down comparatively unknown sources of information through the library; and Cheryl Kirkland, for her faith and love in listening to and bearing with a high-risk venture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement	iii
Table of contents	iv
List of figures	v
Introduction	1
Method	
Subjects	8
Apparatus	8
Procedure	9
Results	11
Discussion	16
Implications	21
Appendices	25
References	28

LIST OF FIGURES

		<u>Page</u>
Figure 1	Proportion of subjects responding on each trial for all experiments, under condition Ib.	12
Figure 2	Mean time taken for first response on each trial for all experiments, under condition IIb.	13
Figure 3	Mean number of responses emitted by subjects (during first ten trials) for all experiments, under conditions IIIa and IIIb.	14

LIST OF TABLES

Table I	Combination of S^A and S^D arranged into experimental conditions.	10
Table II	Combination of conditions making up the experiments.	11
Table III	Number of subjects in each experiment.	11
Table IV	Number of subjects indicating condition IIIa on the open-ended question.	15
Table V	Pearson Product Moment Correlation between T-scores and intelligence scores (B.40).	16