Generalization

1. Stimulus generalization: Occurrence of a response in the presence of **stimuli that are different** than those originally paired with reinforcement

2. Response generalization: Occurrence of **responses that are different** than those originally paired with reinforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Target R</td>
<td>Direct result of contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Stim</td>
<td>Target R</td>
<td>Stimulus generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Different R</td>
<td>Response generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Stim</td>
<td>Different R</td>
<td>Stim &amp; Response generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generalization Strategies

1. Reinforce occurrences of generalization (S,R): Reinforce R in presence of other stimuli (S); reinforce other Rs (R)

2. Teach Rs that encounter natural reinforcement contingencies (S): Select R for which Sr is already available

3. Modify natural contingencies (S): Rearrange unsupportive environment

4. Use a variety of relevant stimulus situations in training (S): Use multiple stimulus examples

5. Incorporate common stimuli (S): Include stimuli from generalization setting during training

6. Teach functionally equivalent Rs (R): Teach a variety of Rs that produce the same outcome

7. Incorporate “self-generated” mediators (S): Add rules or other cues to prompt R in natural environment

General focus: To demonstrate methods for the prevention of child molestation involving abduction
Specific aims:
1. To teach young children socially appropriate responses when approached by a stranger
2. To illustrate several generalization programming techniques proposed by Stokes and Baer (1977)
   Programming common stimuli (make training and testing contexts similar)
   Training multiple exemplars

Procedures
Participants: 3 children (1 F, 2 M), 3-5 yoa
Locations: 3 near school + community (?)
Lures: Suspects and lure types (a) simple, (b) authority, (c) incentive
DV: Motor (goes away, stays, goes with) and verbal (aprop, inapprop, none) components

Testing (probe) procedure: Teacher leaves, suspect approaches, teacher interrupts

Measurement and reliability:
   Suspect is primary observer and wears tape recorder
   Teacher also scores motor R (direct) and verbal R from tape
   Proportion of sessions and calculation: fine

Experimental design: Multiple Baseline across subjects
   Baseline: 3 lures at both school and community settings
   Training (school only): Trainer role play, child role play
      Correct R → Praise (intermittent materials or play)
      Incorrect R → Additional training
Criterion: Correct R on each lure over 3 days
Generality: Repeat of 3 lures in community
Follow-up: 12 weeks post-training in community

Results
BL: Ss went w/ lure on all but 1 probe
Training: Ss met criterion on school probes, except see Stan’s authority probe
Generality: Ss met criterion on community probes
Follow-up: Both Ss (Patty, Stan) tested met criterion

Major contributions:
   Self-protection from abduction taught quickly
   Real-life measures (suspects, lure types, locations, follow-up)
   Nice methodological features (abduction scenario, reliability)

Limitations: None, really

Extensions: Large-scale replication