The Effects of Added Visual Stimuli on Children's Learning of Four-Component Verbal Chains.

The present study assessed the effects of a distinct visual stimulus (a light) associated with each component of a four-component chain of nonsense syllables. When these added lights were used to train the chains of nonsense syllables, speed of acquisition was unaffected, but errors were reduced, loss of previously acquired responses was reduced, and the probability of correct responding independent of imitative prompts was increased. (Author)
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Abstract

The present study assessed the effects of a distinct visual stimulus (a light) associated with each component of a four-component chain of nonsense syllables. When these added lights were used to train the chains of nonsense syllables, speed of acquisition was unaffected, but errors were reduced, loss of previously acquired responses was reduced, and the probability of correct responding independent of imitative prompts was increased.
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Although much is known about chained schedule performance in animals (Kelleher, 1966) and operant chaining techniques have been successfully used in teaching verbal behavior to children (Risley, 1966; Wheeler & Sulzer, 1970), little research has attempted to delineate specific stimulus functions in the learning of heterogeneous verbal response sequences by children. The present study attempted to objectify some stimulus functions in verbal training procedures through the use of controlled visual and auditory stimuli. The primary concern was to assess the effect of external visual stimuli (lights) on the development of a verbal chain, and to examine relative efficiency, error rate, and training effectiveness of the two methods of training.

Method

Subjects

Three girls attending the summer session of the University School kindergarten at Southern Illinois University served as subjects. Chronological ages were 6-7, 5-9, and 6-0. Peabody (Dunn, 1959) mental ages were, respectively, 6-4, 8-2, and 6-4. All were given portions of a standard articulation test (Goldman & Fristoe, 1969) containing those phonemes used in the nonsense syllables. None made any articulation errors on the test.
Apparatus and Materials

The subjects' view of the apparatus is shown in Figure 1. Subjects sat at a table facing a 9 X 10-inch panel containing five small white lights, one centered near the top of the panel, and the other four arranged in a row across the lower half of the panel. The four lower lights, referred to as the component lights, could be continuously dimmed by means of a rheostat. The single top light, referred to as the top master light, was always used at full strength. To the left of the panel was a candy dispenser containing a variety of small edibles, to the right of the panel was a small speaker, and mounted on top of the panel was a microphone.

Auditory stimuli used were nine four-component chains of nonsense syllables (Blasdell & Jensen, 1970), shown in Table 1. Syllables were pre-recorded by a trained speaker, a radio announcer, keeping sound intensity and intonation as constant as possible. Syllables could be played through the child's speaker by means of a Bell & Howell Language Master in any order, with any inter-syllable interval, and with any number of repetitions of individual syllables.

Procedure

After initial instructions, one shaping session, and several adaptation sessions, experimental sessions were begun. No instructions were given during experimental sessions. The experimental conditions consisted of two methods of training a verbal response sequence of four nonsense syllables to be emitted in response to the onset of the top master light on the panel in front of the subject. The two methods differed only in whether or not the four component were used. Each subject received each training method four times, the order
of presentation being partially counterbalanced across subjects. Order of presentation is shown in Table 2. For each subject, each new training method was accompanied by a new set of nonsense syllables. Thus, each subject was exposed to eight different nonsense syllable chains during experimental sessions.

Method 1, No Lights (NL). With this training method, the top master light came on to signal the start of each trial. Simultaneous with the onset of the light, the first syllable of the chain was delivered through the speaker. None of the component lights in the bottom row were used in the NL condition. Following correct imitation of each syllable, the next syllable in the chain was delivered until all four syllables had been correctly imitated. Reinforcement was programmed to follow the last syllable in the chain, regardless of errors made. Failure to repeat any syllable correctly resulted in a re-presentation of that syllable until it was correctly imitated, followed by the presentation of the next syllable or reinforcement.

Once there had been five trials in which the above procedure was followed, fading of the auditory stimulus was begun until the response occurred immediately following the onset of the top master light alone. Fading was accomplished by delaying the presentation of auditory prompts to allow the subject to anticipate the prompt. Fading started with the final syllable in the chain and moved backwards through the first as the latter members of the chain were successfully anticipated.

Method 2, With Lights (WL). This condition utilized the four component lights in establishing the chain. The stimulus chain was presented as in the NL condition, and reinforcement contingencies and terminal behavior were the same. However, as each syllable was delivered auditorily, a corresponding component light was illuminated, going from left to right for each syllable.
Here, correct imitation of each syllable resulted in the illumination of the next light and delivery of the next auditory stimulus. Auditory fading was carried out exactly as in NL, but the component lights occurred without any delay until correct emission of each syllable in response to the onset of the proper component light alone occurred for two trials in succession. Then fading of the component lights was done simply by not turning them on, or, if the subject failed to respond, by gradually dimming the lights.

During all phases of the experiment, each syllable in the chains was scored right or wrong, prompted or not prompted. A syllable was scored correct if two out of the three phonemes in the syllable were reproduced correctly, and only the first occurrence of a response in a trial was scored. Six reliability checks covering 508 syllables yielded an overall agreement of 97%, with reliabilities for individual sessions ranging from 93% to 99%.

Results and Discussion

Addition of the lights in the WL condition failed to speed acquisition of the criterion behavior, as shown in Figure 2. Two subjects met criterion on every chain trained and failed to exhibit systematic differences in number of trials to criterion under the two training methods. The third subject reached criterion only two out of four times in the WL condition and only once out of four times in the NL condition.

However, the addition of lights did have an effect on number of errors made on individual syllables, number of times subjects missed a syllable once it had previously been anticipated during fading, and total number of syllables anticipated. As can be seen in Figure 3, the first two subjects made consistently fewer errors when trained with lights than without, and
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once these two subjects had successfully anticipated a syllable, they seldom needed another auditory prompt on that syllable in the WL condition. The third subject failed to show these effects because of her failure to learn most of the chains and her low overall rate of anticipations. As can be seen in Figure 4, all three subjects anticipated the auditory prompt more often during the WL conditions.

Although the use of added visual stimuli in the WL condition failed to speed acquisition of the terminal behavior, the effect of the lights on errors and anticipations is of interest. The present task was well within the capabilities of two of the subjects, and the ease of the task may explain the ineffectiveness of the lights in speeding acquisition. For subjects who might find such a task more difficult, the decrease in errors and the increase in anticipations accompanying training with lights might become very important in determining whether such subjects would learn at all.
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Table 1
Response Chains Used in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain/Component</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>tud*</td>
<td>gop</td>
<td>n-k</td>
<td>pim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>m-p</td>
<td>kit</td>
<td>pud</td>
<td>tok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>tuk</td>
<td>dit</td>
<td>m-p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>kig</td>
<td>p-d</td>
<td>gon</td>
<td>bug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>d-t</td>
<td>mob</td>
<td>tug</td>
<td>nin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>puk</td>
<td>nip</td>
<td>k-g</td>
<td>dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>k-n</td>
<td>gin</td>
<td>muk</td>
<td>bop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>nok</td>
<td>d-p</td>
<td>kim</td>
<td>gub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>tip</td>
<td>gum</td>
<td>n-g</td>
<td>pot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Letters here are International Phonetic Alphabet symbols
Table 2

Sequence of Training Methods and Syllable Chains for each Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td></td>
<td>NL B*</td>
<td>NL A</td>
<td>NL B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NL E</td>
<td>WL E</td>
<td>NL E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>WL C</td>
<td>NL D</td>
<td>WL D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>WL D</td>
<td>WL C</td>
<td>NL C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>NL A</td>
<td>NL B</td>
<td>WL A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>NL F</td>
<td>WL F</td>
<td>NL F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>WL G</td>
<td>NL G</td>
<td>WL G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>WL H</td>
<td>WL H</td>
<td>NL H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>NL I</td>
<td>NL I</td>
<td>WL I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NL B indicates No Lights condition, syllable chain B, etc.*
Figure Captions

Figure 1. Subject's view of apparatus. From left to right are a candy dispenser, the box containing the stimulus lights, with a microphone mounted atop the box, and the speaker through which the auditory stimuli were delivered.

Figure 2. Trials per session and trials to criterion when reached. An X above a bar indicates criterion was reached during that session. Letters at the bottom of each bar indicate syllable chain for that session. Open bars are the number of trials until the fading of the auditory prompt was complete, and blackened portions are trials with no auditory prompts until fading of the component lights was complete.

Figure 3. Incorrect responses and failures to anticipate a syllable after it had been correctly anticipated once as percent of total trials by individual component. Letters above each segment of figure indicate syllable chain used.

Figure 4. Percent of total syllables anticipated correctly for each chain trained.
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