Respondent Conditioning

Based on Pavlov's work on the salivary reflex in dogs Also known as Pavlovian or Classical conditioning

Based on physiological responses to environmental stimulation

Contingency: Relationship between antecedent stimuli

Definition: Process whereby a previously neutral stimulus elicits a response due to pairing of the neutral stimulus with an unconditioned eliciting stimulus

Respondent Conditioning Paradigm

Before conditioning:

Unconditioned stimulus (US) → Unconditioned response (UR)

Meat powder → Salivation

During conditioning:

Neutral stimulus (NS) + (US) \rightarrow Unconditioned response (UR)

Metronome + Meat powder \rightarrow Salivation (UR)

Following conditioning:

Conditioned stimulus (CS) \rightarrow Conditioned response (CR)

Metronome \rightarrow Salivation (CR)

Extinction:

Repeated CS presentations → Disappearance of CR

Metronome \rightarrow No salivation

An Example

Scenario: A patient goes to clinic to receive chemotherapy for cancer (the 4th session out of a 12-session course). As the patient enters the waiting room, she begins to feel nauseous and she vomits. Upon questioning, the patient says "I get queasy on my chemo day." This scenario recurs a few more times, until the patient drops out of therapy

Responses of interest:

Anticipatory nausea & vomiting

Dropping out of therapy

Anticipatory Nausea & Vomiting (ANV)

<u>Initial therapy sessions:</u>

Chemotherapy (US) → Post-chemotherapy nausea and vomiting or "PCNV" (UR)

But: A number of stimuli (NS) are paired with US

Eg: Wait room + chemotherapy → PCNV

<u>Later therapy sessions</u>:

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{See nurse (CS)} & \rightarrow \text{ANV (CR)} \\ \text{Wait room (CS)} & \rightarrow \text{ANV (CR)} \\ \text{Parking lot (CS)} & \rightarrow \text{ANV (CR)} \\ \text{Smell coffee (CS)} & \rightarrow \text{ANV (CR)} \\ \text{Perfume (CS)} & \rightarrow \text{ANV (CR)} \\ \end{array}$

Dropping out of Therapy

Antecedent Event \rightarrow Response \rightarrow Consequence

Chemotherapy day \rightarrow Go to clinic \rightarrow Chemotherapy (PCNV, ANV)

Chemotherapy day → Stay home → Avoid nausea (Sr-)

Respondent vs. Operant Conditioning

Similarities: Both processes involve

Learning produced by environmental contingencies Responding controlled by antecedent stimuli

Difference between respondent and operant contingencies:

Respondent Conditioning: Pairing of antecedent stimuli (NS \rightarrow US), one of which (US) already elicits a

response, which produces: $CS \rightarrow CR$

Operant Conditioning: <u>Pairing of response and consequence</u> $(R \to Sr)$, which occurs in presence of antecedent stimuli that may acquire discriminative properties, which produces: $S^D \to R \to Sr$

Whitehead, Lurie, & Blackwell (1976)

General Focus: To promote research on interactions between classical and operant conditioning

Specific Aim: To demonstrate a method for classical conditioning of decreases in human systolic blood pressure

Procedures

Participants: Exp (6 normal, 4 hypertensive), control (4 normal)

Apparatus: Tilt table with timer and bell

IV (US, CS):

US: 15° downward head tilt

CS: Timer noise + timer "ding" + tilt-table motor

DV (UR, CR):

Systolic BP, measured via sphygmomanometer w/ light Measures taken once during each trial and once at end of ITI

Note: Reported as mean BP (no individual data)

Reliability?

Procedure: 90-min session, 3 BL trials, 30 conditioning/test trials

Baseline: 3 consecutive BP readings, taken 1 min apart

Conditioning/Test trials:

Exp: 15 CS+US conditioning trials interspersed with 5 CS-only test trials (1, 7, 11, 16, 20), then 10 CS-only EXT

trials (21-30)

Control: 15 CS-only and 15 US-only trials, randomly presented

Experimental Design:

ABA (Exp only): CS-only trials during BL (A), conditioning (B), and EXT (A)

Multielement (Exp only): CS-only trials vs. ITIs during conditioning

Group design: CS-only trials for Exp vs. Control group

Results

BP (Normal Exp, Normal Control) < BP (Hypertensive Exp)
ABA comparison: CS-only trials: Conditioning < BL and EXT

Multielement comparison: During conditioning: CS-only trials < ITIs

Group comparison: CS-only trials: Exp < Control

Implications and Extensions

Major contribution: Rapid method for classical conditioning of systolic BP

Limitations:

No data on individual performance

No reliability data

Small Δ - in BP (M = 4.35 mm Hg)

Extensions:

Classical conditioning of other Rs: Heart rate, muscle tension, skin temperature

Operant conditioning of BP and other Rs

Clinical application