Mind the Gap DRAFT—EXACT CONTENTS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Stimulus-Stimulus Pairing

KIKI YABLON, MA, KPA-CTP, CPDT-KA

Overview

- What is stimulus-stimulus pairing?
- How do we talk about using it?
- How do we actually use it?
- Could we use it more effectively or efficiently?
- Some ways I have used it

What Is Stimulus Pairing?

- Causing one stimulus to precede and/or predict another closely in time
- Is it operant or respondent (classical) conditioning?
- We can ask what behavior we're talking about and what was learned
- We can ask what procedure
- We can ask all of the above



Classical Conditioning: What Is Learned

- "Conditioned emotional responses"
- Little Albert: Startling, whimpering, crying, pulling and crawling away, shaking head from side to side
- From Mine! Tail wagging, "happy facial expression" orienting toward where the appetitive stimulus originates, lifting the head from guarded object upon the trainer's approach



Note he fears over Santa Class

JOHN B. WATSON, AKRON PSYCHOLOGY ARCHIVES / WATSON & RAYNER, 1920 / JEAN DONALDSON, "MINE!"

Operant Conditioning: What Is Learned





Michael and Noodles

 We started saying 'breakfast' in an excited way as we were wiping him down after his morning walk.
 At some point I was saying it repeatedly, on our way home, and it turned sing-songy."



• What constitutes the "CER" here?

What Is Most Useful?

- In applied practice
- Rather than label stimulus pairing procedures one or the other, why not
- Identify the behavior(s) of interest
- Identify the procedures likely to influence them
- Describe what we do
 "technologically" rather than with
 labels

BAER, WOLF, & RISLEY (1968)

And a second sec

"Classically Conditioning" a...

- Teaching a recall cue by pairing a word or other event with food
- Teaching a drop by pairing a word with food
- Teaching a drop by pairing a word with a toy toss
- We could ask "what behavior" and "what was learned"

 We could say it was "taught by stimulus pairing" which would definitely be accurate and prompt us to look at all processes and stimulus roles

Eileen and Clara

 When the first dog barks, give the second dog cheese

Conditioning a Positive Response to Another Dog Barking, and Other Distractions.

HTTPS://EILEENANDDOGS.COM/BLOG/2012/12/18/CLASSICAL-CONDITIONING-POSITIVE-RESPONSE-TO-BARKING/

Eileen and Clara

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view:

S1: Summer barks S2: Eileen picks up cheese can S3: Cheese in mouth

Operant view: A1: Summer barks A2: Eileen picks up cheese can B: Clara orients to can C: Cheese in mouth

Chirag and Bracken

 Start counting and put food on the ground



CHIRAG PATEL, HTTPS://YOUTU.BE/RASTKCWTDBK

Chirag and Bracken

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view:

S1: Counting S2: Putting food on ground S3: Food in mouth

Operant view:

A1: Counting A2: Putting food on the ground B: Dog comes C: Food accessible B2: Dog eats (incompatible with holding toy) C: Food in mouth

Denise and Dice

 While the dog is biting, say "out" then throw the toy and say "toy" regardless of behavior.



DENISE FENZI, HTTPS://WWW.INSTAGRAM.COM/P/CP_SVYBNWTE/

Denise and Dice

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful? Respondent view: S1: Say "out" S2: Say toy/throw toy S3: Toy access

Operant view:

A1: Say "out" A2: Throw toy B: Dog releases and turns away C: Toy access B: Dog retrieves toy C: Denise tugs



- Compare to "magazine training"
- Noncontingent delivery of reinforcer, take care that no particular response is reinforced

Magazine training serves two functions. First, it teaches the subject scheme to find the seinforcement and how to deal with it. Second, it excludioles the discriminative function of the ethnolit which are corelated with seinforcement delivery (32). That is to are, the constated stand come to mark these occursions upon which magazine behavior will be reinforced. When the ethnolity occur, magazine approach is followed monodiately by minforcement.



CC BY SA 4.0/SIDMAN, TACTICS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Developing the Operant Contingency

"Pavlov's dog might prick up its ears when it hears the metronome tick, and that is followed by the reinforcing event. Did the reinforcing event occur because the metronome sounds, or because the dog pricked up its ears? There's no way the animal can distinguish between the two on a single occasion. The moment of reinforcement the procedures are identical. The differences in the procedures, in the outcome, though, emerge over time." —John Donahoe

DONAHOE (2022), HTTPS://BARRETTINITIATIVE.ORG/VIDEO-GALLERY

- As the contingency develops, we can change the procedure
- With antecedent arrangement to reduce errors, we may not even need to
- Treat delivery can influence future reps
 As antecedent to make behavior
 - more likely
- As reinforcer for additional behavior between stimuli



- likely to come toward boundary
- Treat delivery: encourages weight shift backward

HANNAH BRANIGAN, HTTPS://YOUTU.BE/SUIRDLRBJOG

Hannah and Spark

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view:
S1: Door jamb
S2: Click
S3: Treat tossed behind
S4: Food in mouth

Operant view: A1: Hannah in room

B1: Dog wallks toward Hannah

A2: Door jamb

A4: Treat behind

B: Dog shifts weight

C: Food accessible

C: Food in mouth

A3: Click

backward

B2: Dog eats

Contingency development:

A1: Hannah in room B1: Dog wallks toward Hannah

A2: Door jamb

- B2: Dog plants front feet
- C3: Click
- **CO**I Officia

C4: Treat behind

Sarah and a Client

- Say "ok" and put the bowl down by right foot
- Antecedent arrangement: dog probably has some reinforcement history for sitting on the doormat

Operant view:

A1: Presence of

mat

SARAH OWINGS

Sarah and Client

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view: S1: "OK" S2: Put bowl down by foot

A2: Bowl down S3: Food in mouth B: Dog gets up C: Access to bowl

Contingency development:

A1: Presence of handler, mat B1: Dog sits C1/A2: "OK" B2: Dog gets up C2/A1: Bowl down B3: Dog goes to bowl C3: Food



Anthony and the Door

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view:

mouth

A1: Open door/ S1: Open door (or some piece)/chime chime S2: Mark A2: Mark and reach into bag S3: Reach into bag B: Dog orients S4: Treat in toward me C: Treat

Operant view:

Contingency development:

A1: Open door/ chime B: Dog orients toward me for 1 s

C: Mark, reach into bag, treat

Kirby and the Door Chime

- When the door chime sounds, toss a treat to the mat, regardless of behavior
- When the door chime sounds, if the dog moves toward the mat, toss a treat to the mat
- Previous history with antecedent of mat



Kirby and the Door Chime

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

S1: Door chime S2: Toss treat to mat S3: Food in mouth

Respondent view: **Operant view:** A1: Door chime A2: Toss treat to mat B: Orientation or movement toward the mat or lying down

C: Treat

Contingency development:

A1: Open door/ chime B: Go to mat and

lie down C: Mark and treat

Archie at the Top of the Stairs

- Approach gate (from up or down) and toss treat to side of stairs
- Open gate and toss to side
- Open gate, if dog moves toward side, toss treat
- Mat with previous history added as target to toss treat



Archie at the Top of the Stairs

Respondent view:

S3: Food in mouth

side

side of stairs

C: Food

What behavior?

What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

S1: Approach gate S2: Toss treat to side of stairs

Capitalizing on reinforcement history already associated with the mat

Operant view: Contingency development: A1: Approach gate

A1: Approach gate A2: Toss treat to B: Dog goes to side of stairs B: Dog goes to

C: Toss treat to side

Wait When the Leash Is Dropped

Mark/treat when the leash hits the ground



Mark/treat when the dog turns upon the leash dropping



Wait When the Leash is Dropped

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

S2: Click S3: Treat by me

Respondent view: **Operant view:** S1: Drop leash A1: Drop leash A2: Click B: Dog orients to me C: Treat by me

Contingency development:

A1: Drop leash A2: Click B: Dog comes further toward me C: Treat by me

Leash Dip

In my other presentation this week, briefly:



Operant view:

A1: Leash dips

B: Dog orients to

C: Treat by me

A2: Marker

me

Leash Dip

What behavior? What is learned? What is the procedure? Which is more useful?

Respondent view: S1: Leash dips S2: Marker S3: Treat by me

Developing the contingency

A1: Leash diips B: Dog orients to me A2: Mark, reach for treat, move B: Dog follows

C: Treat by me



Location, Location, Location

- Where you put the appetitive stimulus (e.g., treat) when pairing can influence what behavior evolves between stimuli
- Sunny and the leash



Location, Location, Location

- Behavior may also evolve before first stimulus
- Behavior that evolves between stimuli may start to occur before first stimulus—one way to get a start button
- Dolly and the leash



Common Applications

Look at That Dog > click/treat

Dog > click > orient > treat

Dog > orient > click/treat

Trainer approach > toss food

Start Button

Small piece of procedure > treat

Some behavior > small piece of procedure > treat

Small piece of procedure > some behavior > treat

Lindsay Wood Resource Guarding Trainer approach > dog lifts head > toss food

Other Ideas

• Could we teach dogs to go in the direction of leash tension without waiting for them to "give"?

Counterconditioning

- Is a "pure" respondent view suddenly more useful when the target behavior is "emotional"?
 - Are emotions respondent?
- How are we assessing whether CC has occurred?
- "Anticipatory behavior"
- Will the animal behave to produce the stimulus?
- Is it a conditioned reinforcer?
- What are the parameters of effective pairing given these goals?

Response-Contingent Pairing

- It may be as or more effective to make the pairing contingent on a response from the learner
- Variety of study designs, procedures, ways of measuring effectiveness, responses required for pairing
- Studied with "neutral" stimuli
 Limited populations, types of stimuli, relatively small number of studies

Overall, there is promising evidence regarding procedures that require participants to actively respond in the pairing trial. Compared to RIP, both RCP and OUT precodures rather showed better results (Direier et al., 2021, Holdh et al., 2009) or were regally effective his predeted by participants (e.g., OUT) presedances. Expert et al., 2020). These results were constants to different ests of standa, social crismil administered via comparity (Noth et al., 2000), press: (Direier et al., 2021), and et al., 2020). These results were constants to different ests of standa, social crismil administered via comparity (Noth et al., 2000), press: (Direier et al., 2021), and presch swork (Catoper & Petrondorin, 2017; Lepper et al., 2021), Positive results for QUT7, though, some not tephaned in Rodrigues and Cataterni's ands (2017), which reported "bath the respond drot procedure (pairing) resulted is mover obtain and reducing effects that the spinal procedure (discommentive standaes procedure)² (p. 196).

CLO & DOUNAVI, 2022

Finn and Fire

- Touch lighter > food went fine
- Could not get treat in before bark once I started to light it
- Could have kept going but:
- Not "under threshold"
- Potentially turning light into cue to bark



Finn and Fire

- Put mat under Finn
- Arranged environment to make responses I wanted more likely ("under threshold")
- He controls timing of next pairing—I don't do it if he isn't on the mat
- Competing behavior gives me time to show him what the lighter predicts



Finn and Fire

Faded mat



Finn and Fire

 Reintroduced mat to work on grill



Finn and Fire

- Gas fireplace
- Once again broke down into pieces and worked back up
- Each "fire" situation involved unique stimuli



Scout and the Ice Maker

- Previous: tried lowering intensity by having her out of room, wearing a snood
- Response contingent: Look/ wag > small piece of procedure > treat
- Is she "conflicted," "scared" or are we capturing circling?



Scout and the Ice Maker

 Added mat same session!





Scout and the Ice Maker

 Starting away from the mat—another question



Scout and the Ice Maker

 Probe: What happens without the mat?



Scout and the Ice Maker

Back to mat
Fading mat (half, quarter, washcloth)



Scout and the Ice Maker

 Napping in the back room, where she previously would hide from the sound



Scout and the Ice Maker

 Mat faded, no circling, approaches



Scout and the Phone Tones

 Working on a similar procedure for running away and hiding from iPhone sounds



Does Scout "Like" the Ice Maker Now?

· How would we decide?

Parting Thoughts

- When we pair stimuli, we may teach new elicitors for respondent behavior, evoke new operant behaviors, and teach new cues for operant behaviors behaviors (which may also serve as elicitors for respondent behavior)
- We can (and often do, whether aware of it or not) teach operant behavior during stimulus pairing
 procedures. In fact, that may help explain why they "work."
- Arranging antecedents carefully makes it likelier that we will get the behaviors we want—both kinds
- Antecedents can include the delivery of the previous reinforcer/previous unconditioned stimulus
- Antecedents can include cues for behavior-reinforcer contingencies that compete with undesirable behavior
- There may be an advantage to using operant procedures to condition reinforcers, and someone should look at whether that's true of counterconditioning aversive stimuli

Where to Find Me

- kikiyablondogtraining.com
- Instagram: @kiki.yablon
- Facebook (less often): <u>https://www.facebook.com/KikiYablonDogTraining</u>