CHANGEOVER DELAY AND CONCURRENT-SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE IN DOMESTIC HENS

WILLIAM TEMPLE, JAN M. SCOWN, AND T. MARY FOSTER

UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO AND WAIKATO AREA HEALTH BOARD

Six domestic hens were exposed to a series of five pairs of two-key concurrent variable-interval schedules with a range of changeover delays from no delay to 15 s. Times spent responding on each alternative and total, within-, and post-changeover-delay response ratios were analyzed in terms of the generalized matching law. The sensitivity parameters, a , for response and time data were generally low when no changeover delay was programmed but were not 0.0. They were higher for all other changeover-delay values, with some tendency to increase as the changeover delay lengthened at very short delays. Within-delay responding was insensitive to reinforcement-rate differences at all changeover delays (a values close to 0.0). As a result of this insensitivity, post-changeover-delay responding was more sensitive to reinforcement-rate changes than was total responding. Interchangeover intervals increased systematically with changeover-delay duration. Responding, particularly after the changeover delay, was well predicted by an equation based on a reinforcer-loss model.

Key words: concurrent schedules, changeover delay, matching, key peck, hens

Herrnstein (1961) proposed the use of a changeover delay (COD) to prevent the direct reinforcement of alternation between concurrently programmed schedules of reinforcement. Its use is now common in the study of choice (Davison & McCarthy, 1988; de Villiers, 1977). Typically, such a delay is arranged so that a reinforcer, even if programmed, is unavailable for a short period following a changeover to a schedule. The effect of the delay has been interpreted as preventing reinforcers delivered by one schedule from exerting control over behavior on the other schedule or the behavior of changing over (Catania, 1966; Catania & Cutts, 1963). Herrnstein (1961) reported that without such a delay, relative measures of behavior on the two keys tended to indifference and did not match the reinforcement rates arranged.

Baum (1974) suggested that the best descriptions of concurrent schedule behavior came from a power function, termed the generalized matching law, which in logarithmic terms reads:

$$\log\left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right) = a \log\left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}\right) + \log c, \quad (1)$$

where B is the measure of behavior (responses or times spent on each schedule), R is the obtained reinforcement rate, and the subscripts denote the two alternatives. The slope of the line (a matching line) fitted to the logarithmic data, a , is a measure of the degree to which behavior is influenced by differences in reinforcement rates (the sensitivity of behavior to reinforcement). $\log c$ (the intercept) is an estimate of bias in behavior for one or other schedule.

Baum (1974, 1979) suggested that the common finding of "undermatching" (a values less than 1, or a tendency towards indifference) might result from several possible procedural variations. One of these was variations in the length of the COD. In his review, de Villiers (1977) drew a similar conclusion. Neither conclusion was based on any data sets in which CODs and reinforcement rates had been varied systematically. Shull and Pliskoff (1967) had reported data from varying the COD from 0 s to 20 s but used only one pair of unequal schedules. They found increasing degrees of matching of behavior to the reinforcement rates from that schedule pair with increasing COD values, but close inspection of their data shows that this did not reverse when the COD was again reduced. Davison and McCarthy (1988) calculated point estimates of a from Shull and Pliskoff's data. These ranged from under 0.2 at a 0-s COD to around 0.8 to 1.0 once a 20-s COD was reached. Because Shull and Pliskoff did not vary relative reinforcement rates, it is impossible to be certain that these changes in

This research was supported by the New Zealand University Grants Committee and the Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand. The data formed part of a thesis submitted by the second author to the University of Waikato in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the PhD degree. Reprints may be obtained from Bill Temple, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag, Hamilton, New Zealand.

sensitivity to reinforcement were not confounded with changes in bias. However, others have found a different result. For example, Allison and Lloyd (1971) and Silberberg and Fantino (1970) reported no change in the degree of matching over the range of COD values they studied (2.0 to 12.5 s and 0.875 to 3.5 s, respectively). When dependent concurrent schedules, which maintain equality between the programmed and obtained reinforcement rate rates, have been used the results are no more clear. Stubbs and Pliskoff (1969) used dependent schedules and COD values of 0, 8, 16, and 32 s. They reported that, for the one pair of unequal schedules they studied, the responses, times, and reinforcement ratios were all close to 0.75 for all COD values. They did not vary reinforcement rate. In contrast, Silberberg and Schrot (1974), also using dependent schedules, kept the reinforcement proportion constant and reported increases in response and time proportions with increasing COD. Thus the results are equivocal. Clearly there are suggestions that overall choice sensitivity to reinforcement may be altered by the length of the COD, and yet there seem to be no systematic investigations of the effects of changing this most common of concurrent-schedule experimental parameters.

Both Baum (1974, 1979) and de Villiers (1977) have stated that some minimum value of the COD is necessary for matching, but that beyond that value matching will be found. However, there are no available data that investigate this proposition fully. Some authors have reported matching with no programmed COD (e.g., Heyman, 1979). Baum (1982) concluded that there is every chance of obtaining matching with no programmed COD as long as sufficient care is taken with the procedure. It is still not clear what parameters of the procedure need to be chosen with care.

Behavior during the COD period has been reported to be insensitive or even slightly negatively sensitive (Silberberg & Fantino, 1970) to differences in the obtained reinforcement rate, although this latter conclusion is based on group, rather than individual, data. On the basis of the tendency for animals to respond roughly equally to each alternative during the COD, Baum (1982) suggested that responding during CODs should possibly be excluded from the analyses of choice. This suggestion has been opposed by Davison and McCarthy (1988). However, when behavior during the COD is

on a different (changeover) key or when it is in the form of travel between the alternatives, it is commonly excluded from measures of choice (e.g., Baum, 1982; Davison, 1991; Pliskoff, Cicerone, & Nelson, 1978).

Some experimenters, who have used different changeover requirements (such as changeover ratios on a separate key) and have excluded behavior on the ratio from their analyses, have reported overmatching (a values greater than 1.0) in postchangeover responding. For example, Davison (1991, Parts 1 through 3), using a changeover key with fixed-interval (FI) schedules, found a marked increase in sensitivity to reinforcement in responding (a values increasing from 0.96 to 1.73) on the main key when the FI on the changeover key was increased from 0 s to 10 s, but he also found that a further increase to FI 20 s did not additionally increase response or time sensitivity. Davison's data were best described in terms of a reinforcer-loss model, in which the reinforcers lost by initiation of a changeover were a major variable. Pliskoff *et al.* (1978) reported increases in the degree of overmatching in main-key responding between changeover requirements of fixed-ratio (FR) 5 and 10, unfortunately using different subjects for each FR.

Because there appear to be no data sets available in which COD and relative reinforcement rates have been varied systematically over a series of conditions, the present experiment was intended to do just that. This allowed full matching lines to be fitted to the data and estimates of a obtained independent of changes in bias. We also recorded behavior during and after the COD separately.

The behavior of domestic hens, particularly in relation to the assessment of preferences and needs, is of increasing interest to people concerned with the welfare of intensively farmed species. Hens are not unlike pigeons as experimental subjects and will respond on similar (but more robust) keys. Hence, hens were chosen as subjects, but this was not expected to produce species-specific results.

With very little information as to appropriate values, a series of variable-interval (VI) schedule pairs were chosen to give a range of ratios of reinforcement rates from 1:6 to 4:1. The individual schedules ranged from VI 30 s to VI 180 s. Again these were values that seemed to be reasonable by extrapolation from values used with pigeons, although the overall

reinforcement rates delivered by the pairs varied. The COD was varied from no COD (requiring only one peck to a key if reinforcement were available) to a 15-s COD, thereby covering and extending the range of values commonly used with pigeons. The hens were exposed to a series of schedule pairs at each COD value, and the order of conditions was such as to reverse expected preference between successive conditions. It was expected that increases in COD would affect overall sensitivity as assessed by a in Equation 1, and that beyond a certain value there may be no further changes, although there was a reasonable argument that the higher values might have led again to overall insensitivity as the COD period became a larger fraction of the total session.

METHOD

Subjects

Six experimentally naive domestic laying-breed hens (White Shaver 288 strain), 8 months old at the start of the study, were maintained within 20 g of 80% of their free-feeding weights. At these weights the hens laid eggs infrequently but had full fleshy combs. They were housed in individual cages with water and grit freely available.

Apparatus

The particle-board chamber was 41 cm wide (response wall) by 54 cm high and 57 cm long. Two Perspex keys (3 cm diameter) with metal surrounds and lit by white 1-W bulbs were mounted 20 cm apart, 39 cm above the grid floor. A centrally located opening (7 cm by 10 cm by 7 cm deep), 14.5 cm from the floor on the response wall, provided access to a food magazine that presented kibbled (rolled) wheat at an opening 2 cm by 3 cm when raised for 2.5 s. It was lit by a 1-W bulb. Effective pecks (exceeding 0.2 N) to lit keys extinguished the lights behind them and produced a brief tone from an externally mounted speaker, both for 35 ms. Experimental events were controlled and data were counted by remotely situated solid-state logic equipment.

Procedure

The hens were trained to eat from the magazine and then, by the method of reinforcement of successive approximations, were trained to peck an illuminated response key. Once re-

sponding to both keys separately (on a VI 60-s schedule) was established over 20 sessions, equal, independent VI schedules were introduced and a 2-s COD was programmed. They were given no exposure to shorter CODs before this.

The hens were then exposed in daily sessions, 7 days per week, to independent concurrent VI VI schedules. Over different conditions the VI schedules and the COD values (from no COD to a 15-s COD) were varied. The VI schedules consisted of a pseudorandom sequence of 12 intervals generated by an arithmetic progression, with the smallest interval being one 12th of the average and the difference between successive terms being twice that value. At each COD value, at least five (six in the case of the 2-s COD) pairs of VI schedules were used. The condition in which the COD was varied for the first time (Condition 7) was repeated as Condition 11. Three hens (11, 13, and 15) experienced a decrease in COD (from 2 s to no COD) as the first manipulation, and 3 (12, 14, and 16) experienced an increase (to 7.5 s). The no-COD condition required only one peck to a key and was strictly not equivalent to a 0-s COD that would have required a minimum of two pecks. In all other conditions, the COD was timed from the first peck on a schedule following pecking on the other schedule.

Each condition remained in effect until the behavior of each hen had reached a stability criterion of five, not necessarily consecutive, times. The criterion required that the median of the proportion of responses made to the left key over the most recent five sessions be within .05 of the median from the preceding five sessions. This criterion imposes a minimum of 14 sessions per condition. Sessions began and ended (after 40 reinforcements) in blackout. There was no illumination other than the key and magazine lights. Table 1 presents the order of the conditions, the COD values, and the number of days each condition was in effect. Responses on both keys both within and after the COD, the times spent responding on both keys, and the numbers of reinforcements obtained and changeovers made were recorded.

RESULTS

The numbers of responses made to each schedule (total and within COD), the times spent responding, the numbers of reinforce-

Table 1

The sequence of experimental conditions, the COD values, the reinforcement schedules, and the number of sessions each was in effect. Hens 11, 13, and 15 experienced no COD before 7.5 s.

Condition	COD (s)	VI schedules (s)		Sessions
		Left	Right	
1	2	60	60	43
2	2	30	120	27
3	2	120	60	22
4	2	60	180	31
5	2	180	30	30
6	2	30	60	72
7	no or 7.5	60	60	41
8	no or 7.5	180	30	24
9	no or 7.5	30	120	29
10	no or 7.5	120	60	29
11	no or 7.5	60	60	35
12	no or 7.5	30	60	31
13	7.5 or no	60	60	34
14	7.5 or no	180	30	32
15	7.5 or no	30	120	41
16	7.5 or no	120	60	26
17	7.5 or no	30	60	66
18	15	60	60	67
19	15	180	30	22
20	15	30	120	28
21	15	120	60	62
22	15	30	60	46
23	4	60	60	37
24	4	180	30	24
25	4	30	120	42
26	4	120	60	25
27	4	30	60	37

ments obtained, and the numbers of changeovers made during the last 5 days of each condition are provided in the Appendix. The sums of these data (except Condition 7) were used in all analyses. Condition 7 was the condition in which the COD was first varied, and the data from this condition did not replicate the earlier equal-schedule condition (Condition 1) and in many cases deviated considerably from equality of reinforcement. When the equal schedules were repeated with the same COD (Condition 11), the data were similar to the original data and hence were taken as representative of the hens' behavior under equal schedules.

Lines were fitted, by the method of least squares, to the logarithms of the ratios of total responses, times allocated to each schedule, responses within the COD, and responses after the COD as functions of the logarithms of the obtained reinforcement ratios for each COD value. All ratios were taken to the left key (i.e.,

right-key value over left-key value). The slopes (a in Equation 1), intercepts ($\log c$ in Equation 1) and goodness-of-fit parameters (proportion of variance accounted for by the line and the standard error of the data about the line) of these lines are presented for all COD values in Table 2. There are, logically, no data given for responding during or after the COD when there was no COD. In all cases, the generalized matching law equation has provided a good description of the data as evidenced by high proportions of explained variance. Although the slopes of the fitted lines varied, there were no systematic effects of the COD on bias ($\log c$), and the large majority of bias measures were close to zero.

The slopes (a values) of all four sets of fitted lines for each hen and condition are shown as a function of COD in Figure 1. Although the no-COD condition is not strictly part of the same function, the data points are joined to give an extreme end point for the total response and time data functions. In some sense, the no-COD data points for responding can be seen as the end points for the post-COD response functions. The slopes of the lines fitted to total responses made and times spent were similar to each other for all hens. For 5 of the 6 hens, the a values for both measures were lowest when no COD was programmed (response slopes between 0.31 and 0.74, time slopes between 0.35 and 0.70). The a values were larger when the COD was 2 s (between 0.69 and 0.98 for responses and between 0.76 and 1.0 for times). As the COD increased in length beyond 2 s, both response and time slope measures remained relatively constant and were generally close to 1.0, with no tendency to increase further. The slopes for Hen 16 showed little change with the introduction of a COD or with further increases COD length but remained stable and below 1.0.

For all hens and all CODs, responding during the COD (Figure 1) was insensitive to reinforcement-rate differences with a values close to zero. Although the proportions of variance accounted for were low, the standard errors of estimate were small, showing that the data were well described by the lines. The a values for the lines fitted to the post-COD responses for Hens 11 through 15 were higher than 1.0 in all but two cases (of the 25) and were all above 0.90. Although there are some consistent trends in these slopes for individual

Fig. 1. The slopes (*a* values) of the lines fitted to the logarithms of the ratios of total responses (filled circles), times spent responding (unfilled circles), and responses within the COD (unfilled squares) and after the COD (filled squares) as functions of the COD for each hen. The dashed line represents an *a* value of 1.0. The solid line is the *x* axis.

hens, these vary markedly from hen to hen, and there are no systematic trends with COD across all hens. Hen 16's data were, again, slightly exceptional in that although they also showed no trends, the slopes were all below 1.0.

In Figure 2 the group-average interchangeover intervals (dwell times) for each key and all pairs of reinforcement schedules are plotted as functions of the log reinforcer ratios, taken to the left key, for each COD separately. These averages reflect the individual data well. (It should be noted that the y -axis scales vary across this figure.) The shortest interchangeover times were associated with the leanest schedules, and there were systematic increases in these with increasing reinforcement rate regardless of COD value. These average dwell times also increased considerably with increases in COD. This can be seen in the changes in the values for the equal schedule conditions. With equal schedules and no programmed COD, the dwell times were around 6 s; with the 15-s COD, they were around 100 s. Other CODs gave values between these figures.

DISCUSSION

It has been frequently suggested that the size of the COD is related to the degree of matching found (e.g., Baum, 1979; de Villiers, 1977). The present data are, to our knowledge, the only set in which both schedule values and CODs have been varied over such a wide range of values. The data, therefore, bear on several suggestions made on the basis of more restricted data sets.

The current data suggest first that, in contrast to Herrnstein's (1961) findings, behavior is not insensitive when no COD is arranged, although sensitivity may be reduced. The major relevant difference between the present study and Herrnstein's study lies in the pre-training given. Herrnstein's subjects were trained to alternate between the keys; ours were not. These data confirm that when there is no specific training to alternate between the schedules, the behavior remains somewhat sensitive to the changes in reinforcement rate when no COD is programmed. It should be noted that the lowest sensitivities were found when no COD was programmed. If there had been a condition with a 0-s COD (requiring a minimum of two pecks for reinforcement

delivery), it is quite reasonable to assume that the sensitivities found would have been greater than those reported for the no-COD condition (and hence closer to 1.0) but still less than those found for the 2-s COD.

Second, the data suggest that as the COD increases in length, the sensitivity of the behavior to reinforcement-rate changes also increases. The sensitivity appears to approach an asymptote. Although for 4 birds the maximum a value was around 1.0, it did not reach this value for the other 2 birds. There is no sign that with a longer COD these 2 birds would have shown "perfect" sensitivity. Thus, in general, there appears to have been an increase in a with increased COD to a particular value of a , but this value was not necessarily 1.0. Thus there is some confirmation that the degree of matching is related to the COD length for very short CODs but that at longer CODs the sensitivity stays relatively constant, and exact matching does not necessarily occur.

The findings were similar for both response and time measures. There was no tendency for one or the other measure to give steeper slopes or closer matching over all the CODs studied. For one COD length (7.5 s), time slopes were all steeper than the response slopes. Had this been the only data set available for these animals, it could have been taken as support for this common finding. However, there were no other consistent differences at any of the other four COD lengths studied, suggesting that the difference between response and time slopes is not a general finding.

A major feature of these data was the lack of sensitivity during the COD period. This finding is consistent with the individual-subject data of Silberberg and Fantino (1970). This insensitivity supports Baum's (1982) suggestion that within-COD behavior can well be excluded from analyses of choice because it is not influenced by the variables that control overall response distributions. Much the same data would be likely to have been generated had the changeover requirement been an FI schedule on another key, such as was reported by Davison (1991), because equal CODs or equal FI schedules would produce approximately equal behavior and would show little or no sensitivity to reinforcement. Removal of this insensitive behavior from the response ratio, leaving only the post-COD behavior, results in increases in the sensitivities for the

Fig. 2. The average dwell times (interchangeover intervals) for the group of hens for each key plotted as a function of the log obtained reinforcement-rate ratios. Each graph presents the data from a different value of COD and has a different scale on the y axis.

remaining responses. Thus, it is suggested that only post-COD responding should be used in measuring the sensitivity of behavior to the reinforcement-rate changes. This would make the data from concurrent schedules using CODs equivalent to those from concurrent schedules in which the changeover behavior does not occur on the "main" keys, such as those using real travel time through key separation (with no behavior recorded during this changeover) (e.g., Baum, 1982) or those using changeover ratios (CORs) (e.g., Davison, 1991). COR procedures normally require a number of responses to a separate key to initiate a changeover between the schedules. This changeover behavior is not included in the measure of sensitivity, and the data from such procedures generally show matching or overmatching rather than undermatching (Davison & McCarthy, 1988), a result similar to the post-COD behavior here.

Davison (1991) assessed two models for predicting concurrent performance when changeover requirements are varied. He concluded in favor of a slightly modified form of Davison and McCarthy's (1988) reinforcer-loss model rather than Baum's (1982) punishment model. For Davison's (1991) data, the equation

$$\frac{B_1}{B_2} = c \left(\frac{R_1 - \alpha L_{21}}{R_2 - \alpha L_{12}} \right) \quad (2)$$

described his data well and had the advantage of requiring no fitting parameters. In this equation B and R are as defined for Equation 1, L refers to the reinforcers lost on the schedule to which the animal is changing (i.e., the expected number of reinforcers the schedule would have arranged during the COD time had the schedule operated during the COD), and α is a scaling parameter that Davison set equal to 1. When looking at the present data it was not clear whether the above model should be applied to the total responding on each alternative, as would be conventional for reporting and analyzing two-key concurrent-schedule performance, or to the post-COD responding only, which would be analogous to Davison's (1991) and Baum's (1982) main-key responding, because changeover behavior took place on a another key or was a journey. Accordingly, the model was used to predict the log ratios of both of these and the times spent on each alternative for the group-average data

from all hens. The results of the response-based predictions are presented in Figure 3. (The time data were very similar to the total response data and are not presented.) For all three measures the predictions gave good linear fits, with percentages of variances accounted for over 97% and intercepts close to 0. The fitted lines, however, differed in slope. For total responding and times, the slopes were 0.78 and 0.80, respectively. The model predicted more extreme values than were found. For post-COD responding the fitted line slope was 0.99. The percentages of variance accounted for by lines of slope 1.0 (perfect prediction) were 90% and 92% (total responses and times) and 97% (post-COD responding). Clearly, although Davison and McCarthy's reinforcer-loss model makes good predictions for all three measures, it does so virtually perfectly for post-COD responding. This is particularly notable in that no fitting parameters were used. These data further support our suggestion that it is only on post-COD behavior (or after other CO requirements) that the variables that influence animals' preferences have their effects. Often these data do not exactly match obtained reinforcement ratios, but the argument for their use as measures of preference seems to be strong.

Davison (1991) also presented a model for predicting interchangeover intervals (dwell times in the language of foraging models) when changeover requirements are varied. It was based on Hunter and Davison's (1978) model and used the equation

$$c_{12} = b[(T_{12} + G)(T_{21} + G)]^e \frac{R_1 R_2}{(\sum R)^2}, \quad (3)$$

where C is the changeover rate, b is a constant (equal to 1), G is the minimum time to move between the schedules (taken as 1 s), and T is the duration of the COD, which may differ in each direction as denoted by the two sets of subscripts. The variable power e was chosen by Davison as that which gave the best fit. He used -0.6 . Unfortunately, we could not find any parameters that gave good fits to our data using this equation. The best fit we could achieve had a percentage of variance accounted for of 75%, so these are not presented. The main problem in fitting this model to our data was that the equation makes the same predictions for each schedule when the CODs are equal and the reinforcement rates are differ-

Fig. 3. The group-average logarithms of the total response ratios and the post-COD response ratios plotted as functions of the predictions made using Equation 2. The dashed line represents perfect prediction. The solid line was fitted to the data, and its parameters are shown with their standard errors.

ent. Our data, shown in Figure 2, clearly did not follow this pattern, in that dwell times were different when the reinforcement rates differed. Overall the equation did, however, predict the general finding that dwell times increased with increasing COD. Dwell times are clearly influenced by schedule parameters. Their accurate prediction seems to be elusive at this stage.

There is another apparent problem with Equation 3. The equation, as presented by Davison (1991), seems to be unusual in that it is dimensionally inconsistent. The prediction C is of changeover rates and therefore should have the dimension of actions per unit time (T^{-1}), or the reciprocals, dwell times, should have the dimension time, usually in seconds. These are the axes in Davison's Figure 8. If, however, an iterative fit is carried out and a value of -0.6 is chosen for e (as Davison reports), then the equation has the dimensions of T times T all to the power -0.6 (from the first two terms) and T times T divided by T times T (from the last, reinforcement, term). Because the last section has no dimensions, it is clear that the equation will predict rates in terms of actions per second raised to the 1.2, or dwell times will be in seconds raised to this power. If the only power that allows dimensional consistency ($e = -0.5$) is fixed, then the

predictive power of the equation is reduced. It should be noted that this criticism does not apply to the use of fractional powers in the normal generalized matching law (Equation 1), because both sides of the equation are ratios of like measures and therefore have no dimensions.

Overall these data provide good support for the use of the generalized matching law to describe concurrent-schedule performance. They support Davison's (1991) simplification of Davison and McCarthy's (1988) reinforcer-loss model for predicting behavior ratios. This is particularly true when within-COD responding is excluded, thus making the measures (post-COD) more like changeover-ratio, changeover-schedule, and changeover-by-traveling data. They support a common suggestion (de Villiers, 1977) that "sufficient" is sufficient where CODs are concerned. They do not seem to support Hunter and Davison's (1978) model for interchangeover-interval prediction.

REFERENCES

- Allison, T. S., & Lloyd, K. E. (1971). Concurrent schedules of reinforcement: Effects of gradual and abrupt increases in changeover delay. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 16, 67-74.
- Baum, W. M. (1974). On two types of deviation from

- the matching law: Bias and undermatching. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 22, 231-242.
- Baum, W. M. (1979). Matching, undermatching and overmatching in studies of choice. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 32, 269-281.
- Baum, W. M. (1982). Choice, changeover and travel. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 38, 35-49.
- Catania, A. C. (1966). Concurrent operants. In W. K. Honig (Ed.), *Operant behavior: Areas of research and application* (pp. 213-270). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Catania, A. C., & Cutts, D. (1963). Experimental control of superstitious responding in humans. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 11, 327-383.
- Davison, M. (1991). Choice, changeover, and travel: A quantitative model. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 55, 47-61.
- Davison, M., & McCarthy, D. (1988). *The matching law: A research review*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- de Villiers, P. A. (1977). Choice in concurrent schedules and a quantitative formulation of the law of effect. In W. K. Honig & J. E. R. Staddon (Eds.), *Handbook of operant behavior* (pp. 233-287). New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1961). Relative and absolute strength of response as a function of frequency of reinforcement. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 4, 267-272.
- Heyman, G. M. (1979). A Markov model description of changeover probabilities on concurrent variable-interval schedules. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 31, 41-51.
- Hunter, I. W., & Davison, M. C. (1978). Response rate and changeover performance on concurrent variable-interval schedules. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 29, 535-556.
- Pliskoff, S. S., Cicerone, R., & Nelson, T. D. (1978). Local response-rate constancy on concurrent variable-interval schedules of reinforcement. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 29, 431-446.
- Shull, R. L., & Pliskoff, S. S. (1967). COD and concurrent schedules: Some effects on relative performance measures. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 10, 517-527.
- Silberberg, A., & Fantino, E. (1970). Choice, rate of reinforcement, and the COD. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 13, 187-197.
- Silberberg, A., & Schrot, J. (1974). A yoked-chamber comparison of concurrent and multiple schedules: The relationship between component duration and responding. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 22, 21-30.
- Stubbs, D. A., & Pliskoff, S. S. (1969). Concurrent responding with fixed relative rate of reinforcement. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 12, 887-895.

Received February 2, 1993
Final acceptance August 30, 1994

APPENDIX

The hen numbers, the total numbers of responses made at each alternative, the changeover-delay values, the condition code, the responses during the changeover delay, the times spent responding, the numbers of reinforcers obtained, and the total numbers of changeovers made for each bird for each of the last 5 days of each condition. Column 2 contains a condition identifier code corresponding to a particular pair of schedules (see note below). The order in which the conditions occurred is given in Table 1.

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
11	7	0	278	106	0	0	638	355	17	13	171
11	7	0	290	112	0	0	591	353	15	15	169
11	7	0	237	95	0	0	615	350	15	15	155
11	7	0	257	94	0	0	604	340	16	14	162
11	7	0	274	96	0	0	662	353	16	14	163
11	1	0	120	198	0	0	335	791	5	35	167
11	1	0	119	192	0	0	348	754	7	33	173
11	1	0	102	259	0	0	269	846	5	35	181
11	1	0	155	321	0	0	350	1,032	8	32	252
11	1	0	122	218	0	0	477	979	7	33	185
11	5	0	277	71	0	0	808	285	35	5	131
11	5	0	220	85	0	0	641	320	31	9	140
11	5	0	203	62	0	0	703	236	31	9	118
11	5	0	241	90	0	0	640	318	31	9	147
11	5	0	268	108	0	0	635	328	31	9	200
11	2	0	243	325	0	0	555	1,077	13	27	317
11	2	0	223	309	0	0	551	1,132	13	27	319
11	2	0	224	367	0	0	481	1,247	13	27	343
11	2	0	203	350	0	0	457	1,257	13	27	324
11	2	0	195	311	0	0	500	1,223	13	27	279
11	3	0	257	161	0	0	645	590	21	19	230
11	3	0	290	197	0	0	576	638	20	20	280
11	3	0	300	166	0	0	645	618	20	20	248
11	3	0	329	211	0	0	643	613	20	20	279
11	3	0	432	268	0	0	651	498	20	20	267
11	4	0	302	110	0	0	525	297	27	13	188
11	4	0	300	89	0	0	590	251	27	13	168
11	4	0	273	116	0	0	526	302	26	14	211
11	4	0	302	112	0	0	571	323	27	13	208
11	4	0	329	121	0	0	592	297	27	13	206
12	3	0	260	242	0	0	696	619	21	19	257
12	3	0	241	249	0	0	672	695	18	22	187
12	3	0	307	285	0	0	724	592	20	20	252
12	3	0	243	221	0	0	713	595	19	19	186
12	3	0	295	251	0	0	715	562	20	20	232
12	1	0	153	375	0	0	339	1,041	0	40	148
12	1	0	88	259	0	0	256	839	6	34	111
12	1	0	112	246	0	0	325	753	6	34	130
12	1	0	87	257	0	0	262	827	6	34	123
12	1	0	104	253	0	0	319	809	5	35	142
12	5	0	275	79	0	0	757	235	32	8	136
12	5	0	275	79	0	0	769	200	31	9	121
12	5	0	309	72	0	0	827	207	33	7	134
12	5	0	327	75	0	0	832	178	33	7	130
12	5	0	320	89	0	0	787	192	32	8	146
12	2	0	360	565	0	0	690	1,130	12	28	448
12	2	0	456	593	0	0	695	1,175	12	27	478
12	2	0	363	480	0	0	699	1,051	13	27	363
12	2	0	404	542	0	0	798	1,035	13	27	540
12	2	0	408	458	0	0	794	958	14	26	478
12	4	0	370	123	0	0	597	298	26	14	102
12	4	0	165	120	0	0	550	318	26	14	124

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
12	4	0	223	138	0	0	544	316	27	13	166
12	4	0	218	163	0	0	563	321	26	14	178
12	4	0	197	128	0	0	557	320	27	13	150
13	7	0	408	174	0	0	656	330	15	15	146
13	7	0	303	156	0	0	608	360	16	14	139
13	7	0	266	165	0	0	576	346	16	14	140
13	7	0	361	168	0	0	639	365	16	14	173
13	7	0	309	159	0	0	621	334	15	15	147
13	1	0	179	454	0	0	388	679	6	34	184
13	1	0	178	473	0	0	354	762	5	35	170
13	1	0	190	547	0	0	313	716	6	34	134
13	1	0	177	744	0	0	360	1,024	6	34	171
13	1	0	282	1,016	0	0	590	1,360	9	31	271
13	5	0	354	149	0	0	804	282	33	7	238
13	5	0	382	134	0	0	736	214	32	8	216
13	5	0	386	166	0	0	784	280	33	7	240
13	5	0	319	157	0	0	704	260	31	9	200
13	5	0	428	149	0	0	831	241	33	7	200
13	2	0	400	514	0	0	868	847	13	27	399
13	2	0	383	589	0	0	804	960	13	27	368
13	2	0	375	517	0	0	793	936	13	27	340
13	2	0	393	481	0	0	844	845	13	27	346
13	2	0	418	453	0	0	866	820	13	27	302
13	3	0	411	286	0	0	838	524	19	21	301
13	3	0	460	265	0	0	875	474	20	20	291
13	3	0	449	287	0	0	854	484	20	20	295
13	3	0	410	246	0	0	830	458	20	20	282
13	3	0	417	277	0	0	836	474	21	19	299
13	4	0	331	146	0	0	603	254	28	12	213
13	4	0	280	116	0	0	633	254	27	13	185
13	4	0	265	138	0	0	585	277	27	13	200
13	4	0	282	132	0	0	575	274	27	13	210
13	4	0	291	129	0	0	582	268	27	13	188
14	3	0	165	246	0	0	502	780	20	20	228
14	3	0	205	172	0	0	643	693	21	19	194
14	3	0	288	173	0	0	770	589	21	19	202
14	3	0	221	172	0	0	608	672	20	20	190
14	3	0	192	67	0	0	1,260	388	24	16	88
14	1	0	71	412	0	0	142	929	6	34	108
14	1	0	55	438	0	0	131	941	4	36	85
14	1	0	41	371	0	0	81	936	6	34	75
14	1	0	65	495	0	0	113	970	5	35	111
14	1	0	62	335	0	0	125	846	7	32	116
14	5	0	171	127	0	0	622	541	33	7	180
14	5	0	107	89	0	0	553	581	31	9	101
14	5	0	157	102	0	0	593	441	31	9	146
14	5	0	134	116	0	0	551	605	31	9	154
14	5	0	207	99	0	0	630	377	31	9	158
14	2	0	130	585	0	0	252	1,483	13	27	244
14	2	0	135	493	0	0	322	1,470	13	27	240
14	2	0	120	467	0	0	262	1,349	13	27	216
14	2	0	125	491	0	0	329	1,385	13	27	223
14	2	0	131	466	0	0	306	1,455	14	26	211
14	4	0	98	180	0	0	276	652	26	14	164
14	4	0	78	154	0	0	221	686	25	15	138
14	4	0	91	153	0	0	250	663	25	15	156
14	4	0	102	198	0	0	289	641	26	14	187
14	4	0	96	187	0	0	240	631	27	13	160

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
15	7	0	329	262	0	0	544	497	15	15	271
15	7	0	275	245	0	0	538	477	16	14	241
15	7	0	273	199	0	0	575	492	16	14	243
15	7	0	285	231	0	0	536	466	14	16	274
15	7	0	232	249	0	0	459	519	15	15	294
15	1	0	279	307	0	0	507	707	6	34	370
15	1	0	252	292	0	0	540	692	7	33	409
15	1	0	235	343	0	0	456	776	5	35	388
15	1	0	230	327	0	0	475	767	7	33	399
15	1	0	456	554	0	0	905	1,306	10	30	608
15	5	0	398	183	0	0	776	721	32	8	324
15	5	0	489	221	0	0	750	312	32	8	342
15	5	0	473	238	0	0	716	320	32	8	362
15	5	0	477	222	0	0	809	327	33	7	384
15	5	0	418	249	0	0	735	346	32	8	414
15	2	0	530	509	0	0	896	851	14	26	586
15	2	0	526	490	0	0	922	807	14	26	615
15	2	0	509	472	0	0	950	782	14	26	634
15	2	0	524	429	0	0	930	772	13	27	554
15	2	0	531	487	0	0	876	799	14	26	570
15	3	0	392	425	0	0	664	634	20	20	528
15	3	0	490	393	0	0	719	609	20	20	535
15	3	0	463	414	0	0	692	650	20	20	535
15	3	0	487	404	0	0	774	638	21	19	557
15	3	0	502	483	0	0	716	694	19	21	620
15	4	0	344	182	0	0	601	285	26	14	343
15	4	0	324	186	0	0	572	316	26	14	323
15	4	0	302	230	0	0	554	370	27	13	370
15	4	0	320	216	0	0	589	310	27	13	382
15	4	0	352	207	0	0	574	310	27	13	356
16	3	0	149	280	0	0	355	1,011	19	21	239
16	3	0	111	198	0	0	296	1,014	19	21	188
16	3	0	162	278	0	0	348	943	19	21	253
16	3	0	105	212	0	0	291	1,095	19	21	180
16	3	0	49	166	0	0	249	1,158	18	22	83
16	1	0	40	279	0	0	105	1,004	5	35	78
16	1	0	28	222	0	0	81	942	7	33	56
16	1	0	54	353	0	0	113	975	4	36	105
16	1	0	37	312	0	0	81	934	6	34	72
16	1	0	49	369	0	0	84	1,013	4	36	94
16	5	0	164	114	0	0	656	404	31	9	168
16	5	0	146	81	0	0	746	350	33	7	124
16	5	0	140	78	0	0	695	385	30	10	130
16	5	0	145	86	0	0	637	369	31	9	124
16	5	0	182	101	0	0	735	370	32	8	145
16	2	0	144	295	0	0	363	1,345	14	26	206
16	2	0	141	295	0	0	365	1,365	14	26	198
16	2	0	132	362	0	0	304	1,504	13	27	222
16	2	0	139	343	0	0	325	1,443	13	27	221
16	2	0	116	372	0	0	266	1,489	12	28	207
16	4	0	209	179	0	0	425	503	27	13	307
16	4	0	168	169	0	0	376	560	26	14	276
16	4	0	170	190	0	0	322	600	26	14	314
16	4	0	176	172	0	0	349	527	26	14	281
16	4	0	232	221	0	0	390	543	26	14	336
11	3	2	296	533	155	180	373	596	14	16	76
11	3	2	390	483	138	158	467	654	15	15	70
11	3	2	261	684	105	127	302	784	14	16	51

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
11	3	2	340	493	137	131	375	724	14	16	63
11	3	2	253	565	150	198	349	648	14	16	59
11	5	2	473	178	105	69	516	294	24	6	46
11	5	2	409	165	89	63	547	269	24	6	44
11	5	2	331	119	86	66	523	219	24	6	49
11	5	2	316	146	68	68	521	233	24	6	36
11	5	2	404	143	64	61	594	224	26	4	35
11	2	2	146	635	106	81	156	1,242	8	22	52
11	2	2	121	482	87	70	170	1,098	8	22	50
11	2	2	152	536	115	88	179	1,045	9	21	63
11	2	2	147	585	103	60	150	1,061	9	21	48
11	2	2	158	564	127	68	183	1,133	7	23	65
11	6	2	532	396	268	148	716	709	21	9	135
11	6	2	506	391	242	163	711	695	22	8	129
11	6	2	654	280	204	125	869	538	23	7	111
11	6	2	498	326	169	121	761	651	22	8	103
11	6	2	633	306	213	131	819	598	22	8	111
11	1	2	59	423	39	22	55	772	3	27	17
11	1	2	97	383	43	23	91	762	3	27	17
11	1	2	102	312	63	36	107	614	4	26	26
11	1	2	60	382	43	25	80	694	4	26	22
11	1	2	68	389	45	28	79	712	3	27	22
11	4	2	339	106	62	59	509	134	21	9	32
11	4	2	357	85	61	58	509	119	21	9	31
11	4	2	260	76	52	48	446	146	21	9	31
11	4	2	315	81	52	49	501	130	21	9	33
11	4	2	382	78	51	47	500	106	22	8	30
12	3	2	295	194	104	95	639	342	15	15	62
12	3	2	275	188	116	95	622	341	16	14	71
12	3	2	260	246	112	93	602	414	15	15	70
12	3	2	221	249	113	112	541	416	14	16	72
12	3	2	217	306	127	128	525	488	13	17	85
12	5	2	227	62	28	33	699	209	25	5	30
12	5	2	233	110	47	53	607	229	24	6	44
12	5	2	229	63	34	37	639	169	25	5	30
12	5	2	216	62	19	30	691	152	26	4	24
12	5	2	191	65	20	28	597	201	24	6	26
12	2	2	190	621	68	66	308	995	7	23	18
12	2	2	136	560	51	57	267	1,008	9	21	40
12	2	2	105	621	44	43	223	1,151	7	23	34
12	2	2	115	670	44	53	280	1,156	6	24	43
12	2	2	93	557	42	41	246	1,051	8	22	36
12	6	2	355	79	32	41	1,289	257	25	5	43
12	6	2	386	133	45	64	1,196	343	24	6	50
12	6	2	319	215	59	108	994	447	22	8	64
12	6	2	306	294	65	134	1,002	561	23	7	76
12	6	2	359	181	61	80	1,097	439	24	6	63
12	1	2	11	254	5	8	54	749	1	29	9
12	1	2	18	293	5	9	70	715	2	28	9
12	1	2	8	360	3	1	24	832	1	29	2
12	1	2	0	368	0	0	0	838	0	30	0
12	1	2	0	334	0	0	0	889	0	30	0
12	4	2	252	33	36	15	651	418	24	6	26
12	4	2	177	48	11	10	688	236	24	6	16
12	4	2	163	57	18	13	558	311	20	10	19
12	4	2	160	89	20	15	505	351	18	12	18
12	4	2	215	40	25	16	587	163	23	7	22
13	3	2	216	187	106	64	512	462	16	14	59

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				L	R	L	R	COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R					
13	3	2	271	195	101	73	596	411	16	14	59
13	3	2	212	195	108	75	542	441	16	14	68
13	3	2	223	205	110	80	534	406	16	14	64
13	3	2	226	257	133	106	548	484	16	14	83
13	5	2	341	58	27	31	693	136	26	4	24
13	5	2	361	27	14	16	697	61	27	3	12
13	5	2	384	84	33	34	728	137	26	4	24
13	5	2	382	54	28	29	651	129	25	5	24
13	5	2	393	97	39	39	628	168	26	4	30
13	2	2	362	334	83	105	692	661	11	19	91
13	2	2	359	358	94	112	735	690	10	20	95
13	2	2	326	334	103	108	663	682	11	19	97
13	2	2	305	357	94	106	664	991	11	19	82
13	2	2	412	464	149	125	582	706	10	20	93
13	6	2	475	238	80	85	893	479	22	8	70
13	6	2	516	232	79	89	970	427	22	8	72
13	6	2	637	195	69	72	1,121	347	24	6	62
13	6	2	603	152	53	56	1,145	284	23	7	47
13	6	2	590	210	72	85	1,088	352	23	7	64
13	1	2	67	317	29	27	137	629	6	24	25
13	1	2	116	342	47	49	226	619	6	24	40
13	1	2	117	320	47	48	214	589	5	25	36
13	1	2	111	317	52	46	232	621	5	25	41
13	1	2	105	307	43	40	216	579	6	24	32
13	4	2	321	130	51	38	448	224	21	9	33
13	4	2	270	154	51	46	404	264	21	9	39
13	4	2	285	129	50	35	411	241	21	9	35
13	4	2	301	148	62	47	433	260	23	7	43
13	4	2	285	175	55	49	425	307	20	10	44
14	3	2	274	337	185	109	394	646	14	16	80
14	3	2	273	383	151	120	367	664	15	15	69
14	3	2	263	388	165	104	369	715	13	17	71
14	3	2	288	410	179	135	408	692	14	16	82
14	3	2	231	497	144	105	288	758	14	16	61
14	5	2	281	103	48	26	588	164	24	6	28
14	5	2	305	181	77	70	555	250	23	7	40
14	5	2	283	194	82	91	513	259	23	7	52
14	5	2	259	159	54	117	518	214	23	7	51
14	5	2	241	135	40	59	524	190	22	8	36
14	2	2	217	544	140	115	297	943	9	21	71
14	2	2	193	528	124	105	242	1,017	8	22	68
14	2	2	189	610	106	102	219	1,040	9	21	59
14	2	2	232	550	103	133	387	847	10	20	74
14	2	2	207	533	123	119	313	905	9	21	74
14	6	2	485	205	83	102	1,161	354	24	6	66
14	6	2	533	163	66	94	1,271	240	24	6	58
14	6	2	406	102	58	69	1,208	217	23	7	55
14	6	2	495	127	41	76	1,307	202	25	5	45
14	6	2	362	84	26	54	1,298	222	25	5	36
14	1	2	87	365	43	31	130	710	4	26	22
14	1	2	73	354	36	35	102	752	3	27	21
14	1	2	90	422	43	43	130	711	3	27	24
14	1	2	74	419	41	30	86	762	3	27	18
14	1	2	86	355	51	37	79	747	3	27	24
14	4	2	425	178	107	84	423	191	20	10	44
14	4	2	451	129	72	66	499	141	21	9	34
14	4	2	418	218	128	100	444	221	21	9	50
14	4	2	313	209	94	95	379	229	20	10	42

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
14	4	2	435	184	103	89	452	192	21	9	42
15	3	2	157	273	120	84	380	710	13	17	55
15	3	2	171	243	140	66	413	641	14	16	58
15	3	2	177	207	147	62	423	713	14	16	62
15	3	2	150	249	132	62	331	672	13	17	52
15	3	2	154	303	124	63	300	709	13	17	52
15	5	2	233	75	40	10	641	228	25	5	22
15	5	2	327	14	6	10	790	40	28	2	10
15	5	2	264	24	13	13	764	62	27	3	10
15	5	2	219	57	31	21	713	201	25	5	23
15	5	2	192	49	23	19	675	187	26	4	22
15	2	2	208	365	120	63	308	1,050	9	21	57
15	2	2	236	357	140	74	363	1,046	8	22	68
15	2	2	230	353	126	87	402	935	10	20	70
15	2	2	210	356	108	70	342	887	9	21	55
15	2	2	171	359	89	53	308	1,062	9	21	49
15	6	2	432	330	198	111	814	744	21	9	108
15	6	2	411	335	180	111	816	743	22	8	104
15	6	2	454	294	199	107	869	682	23	7	100
15	6	2	446	267	141	97	861	609	22	8	84
15	6	2	419	355	162	106	697	747	21	9	90
15	1	2	79	219	30	22	139	696	4	26	25
15	1	2	68	218	38	30	142	676	5	25	29
15	1	2	54	186	36	19	244	689	3	27	24
15	1	2	81	213	47	26	131	712	3	27	30
15	1	2	64	178	36	21	136	723	3	27	22
15	4	2	204	107	57	40	436	296	20	10	37
15	4	2	195	111	84	62	433	341	20	10	47
15	4	2	242	95	87	58	481	244	21	9	46
15	4	2	245	69	64	42	501	203	22	8	37
15	4	2	158	118	63	62	592	689	14	16	51
16	3	2	154	546	79	63	277	816	13	17	41
16	3	2	132	521	80	61	300	797	13	17	49
16	3	2	129	434	92	77	337	719	13	17	60
16	3	2	215	466	125	98	410	689	15	15	67
16	3	2	165	436	113	86	366	690	15	15	63
16	5	2	190	101	23	23	593	295	24	6	24
16	5	2	148	101	22	29	537	254	23	7	25
16	5	2	223	134	35	40	551	241	24	6	30
16	5	2	272	112	27	30	622	197	25	5	22
16	5	2	240	107	25	36	569	204	24	6	26
16	2	2	190	471	80	92	497	749	10	20	78
16	2	2	202	445	66	76	473	770	10	20	64
16	2	2	241	402	77	73	545	721	11	19	65
16	2	2	246	504	71	81	584	845	10	20	71
16	2	2	250	399	94	100	606	737	10	20	87
16	6	2	398	289	131	123	878	588	22	8	102
16	6	2	447	312	167	154	865	579	21	9	110
16	6	2	417	277	134	110	899	568	22	8	95
16	6	2	513	222	135	117	973	522	21	9	100
16	6	2	521	180	138	101	970	470	22	8	98
16	1	2	115	197	50	53	328	560	5	25	51
16	1	2	118	210	51	59	386	571	4	26	53
16	1	2	112	197	60	54	315	536	7	23	51
16	1	2	52	184	30	37	270	681	3	27	40
16	1	2	67	202	38	40	267	589	5	25	44
16	4	2	149	100	31	27	534	309	22	8	27
16	4	2	192	44	14	14	727	165	25	5	17

APPENDIX
(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
16	4	2	186	56	14	13	629	220	23	7	16
16	4	2	227	38	14	9	721	103	26	4	13
16	4	2	125	58	16	20	543	236	21	9	24
11	3	4	456	416	133	142	759	582	21	19	52
11	3	4	401	429	130	178	746	558	22	18	64
11	3	4	502	451	145	171	915	651	22	18	69
11	3	4	568	328	130	154	954	445	22	18	55
11	3	4	475	444	160	169	830	595	20	20	63
11	1	4	65	681	40	41	105	1,089	3	37	23
11	1	4	123	586	66	57	180	894	4	36	29
11	1	4	90	637	49	57	164	994	3	37	23
11	1	4	69	603	27	29	121	906	4	36	15
11	1	4	55	697	25	24	84	960	4	36	9
11	5	4	418	79	38	50	830	142	35	5	22
11	5	4	573	25	17	21	1,055	38	38	2	10
11	5	4	545	56	26	27	997	69	37	3	10
11	5	4	473	89	52	59	869	113	34	6	22
11	5	4	485	75	31	53	925	112	35	5	20
11	2	4	311	731	150	170	579	1,230	13	27	77
11	2	4	267	665	159	164	557	1,307	13	27	92
11	2	4	271	725	159	158	535	1,311	12	28	85
11	2	4	170	863	96	109	332	1,554	10	30	59
11	2	4	134	833	92	116	277	1,578	10	30	71
11	4	4	429	76	42	55	901	115	33	7	28
11	4	4	498	46	22	32	917	74	33	7	15
11	4	4	365	133	39	79	804	190	30	10	25
11	4	4	383	65	26	46	848	98	33	7	18
11	4	4	385	67	25	45	844	117	32	8	20
12	3	4	314	365	65	50	671	758	17	23	40
12	3	4	299	343	67	49	678	772	19	21	41
12	3	4	404	238	65	45	904	584	20	20	40
12	3	4	415	168	58	48	913	407	22	18	38
12	3	4	471	223	61	57	1,027	483	23	17	39
12	1	4	7	590	5	5	19	1,093	2	38	4
12	1	4	114	409	41	40	224	865	5	35	26
12	1	4	55	471	19	21	130	1,018	3	37	16
12	1	4	112	378	36	46	227	835	6	34	26
12	1	4	72	388	25	29	175	928	5	35	20
12	5	4	367	96	24	30	897	180	33	7	19
12	5	4	312	80	26	37	795	201	32	8	22
12	5	4	336	89	25	28	793	226	33	7	22
12	5	4	319	107	37	46	799	272	33	7	34
12	5	4	361	37	15	22	902	117	34	6	16
12	2	4	177	477	59	42	502	1,289	11	29	48
12	2	4	202	427	46	49	626	1,216	11	29	43
12	2	4	239	495	54	58	613	1,158	12	28	46
12	2	4	230	500	59	61	568	1,175	12	28	48
12	2	4	194	564	45	50	488	1,252	12	28	37
12	4	4	231	164	40	35	621	457	27	13	32
12	4	4	246	66	34	28	767	271	30	10	31
12	4	4	338	59	29	21	827	213	31	9	27
12	4	4	381	44	19	18	888	160	33	7	18
12	4	4	419	45	19	13	968	167	34	6	16
13	3	4	591	363	111	90	909	558	23	17	53
13	3	4	714	279	88	74	1,057	441	26	14	42
13	3	4	573	368	100	101	915	536	22	18	52
13	3	4	701	238	74	77	1,043	381	24	16	43
13	3	4	517	357	114	99	844	528	21	19	51
13	1	4	46	805	28	20	87	1,045	3	37	15

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times	Reinforcers		COs	
			Total		In COD			L	R		
			L	R	L	R					
13	1	4	111	622	45	34	210	909	4	36	28
13	1	4	66	725	28	33	146	961	4	36	16
13	1	4	315	624	52	55	429	921	5	35	30
13	1	4	114	660	53	38	197	948	4	36	26
13	5	4	734	47	25	16	971	87	36	4	13
13	5	4	606	157	38	17	862	223	34	6	16
13	5	4	665	56	31	24	935	121	34	6	15
13	5	4	705	39	18	14	974	70	36	4	11
13	5	4	716	24	19	15	964	63	36	4	10
13	2	4	515	597	112	129	855	981	13	27	70
13	2	4	462	696	129	104	827	1,049	13	27	72
13	2	4	564	582	141	109	964	932	14	26	80
13	2	4	533	610	139	102	960	981	13	27	80
13	2	4	423	630	91	110	872	935	13	27	67
13	4	4	357	145	59	49	679	268	28	12	36
13	4	4	469	100	62	52	735	196	31	9	30
13	4	4	485	63	44	28	752	141	30	10	20
13	4	4	364	208	51	50	601	303	27	13	25
13	4	4	469	223	45	28	706	296	30	10	20
14	3	4	100	593	36	68	371	1,261	14	26	42
14	3	4	170	538	37	63	529	1,117	14	26	35
14	3	4	154	412	42	69	549	898	17	23	41
14	3	4	173	494	47	43	470	1,091	15	25	34
14	3	4	130	687	31	58	434	1,293	12	28	34
14	1	4	0	689	0	0	0	1,198	0	40	0
14	1	4	11	634	3	8	61	1,087	2	38	6
14	1	4	0	706	0	0	0	1,184	0	40	0
14	1	4	41	542	20	20	116	964	3	37	16
14	1	4	32	598	11	16	74	1,038	2	38	8
14	5	4	459	84	31	59	951	116	34	6	24
14	5	4	436	97	47	57	870	158	33	7	28
14	5	4	392	164	48	71	848	260	33	7	34
14	5	4	612	19	15	12	1,117	33	39	1	7
14	5	4	512	62	22	36	980	91	35	5	14
14	2	4	121	960	61	72	280	1,607	10	30	38
14	2	4	132	812	63	83	393	1,490	9	31	50
14	2	4	74	1,096	39	42	165	1,853	6	34	25
14	2	4	117	941	57	84	292	1,540	12	28	44
14	2	4	101	929	45	57	241	1,613	8	32	32
14	4	4	333	181	28	26	773	343	32	8	18
14	4	4	334	192	47	50	665	350	27	13	32
14	4	4	325	171	59	61	661	334	28	12	33
14	4	4	272	222	48	51	609	464	27	13	31
14	4	4	337	103	24	29	701	249	31	9	20
15	3	4	315	597	126	93	411	889	18	22	49
15	3	4	346	653	133	87	434	961	18	22	49
15	3	4	384	663	146	95	453	901	18	22	48
15	3	4	546	585	143	128	717	776	20	20	56
15	3	4	422	566	98	96	581	822	19	21	45
15	1	4	66	821	34	30	71	996	3	37	12
15	1	4	161	650	82	66	187	887	5	35	30
15	1	4	129	571	77	68	143	766	7	33	28
15	1	4	227	560	88	89	261	792	6	34	32
15	1	4	69	691	29	33	82	1,064	2	38	12
15	5	4	618	122	74	75	872	147	34	6	25
15	5	4	613	167	85	83	873	201	34	6	30
15	5	4	779	36	39	28	1,031	51	37	3	13
15	5	4	681	120	54	53	903	133	35	5	18
15	5	4	687	103	56	53	940	123	35	5	20

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
15	2	4	410	766	170	133	581	1,219	11	29	58
15	2	4	331	867	165	124	455	1,341	11	29	54
15	2	4	336	1,081	162	125	394	1,431	12	28	46
15	2	4	343	982	142	109	438	1,260	11	29	42
15	2	4	359	1,031	131	96	462	1,415	11	29	42
15	4	4	524	194	72	109	736	208	30	10	30
15	4	4	610	87	54	55	847	103	32	8	20
15	4	4	523	158	85	88	764	209	31	9	28
15	4	4	508	102	43	61	799	124	31	9	19
15	4	4	593	78	41	57	901	99	33	7	18
16	3	4	435	246	66	69	959	549	23	17	42
16	3	4	363	280	62	78	858	587	22	18	47
16	3	4	323	303	73	79	781	636	20	20	48
16	3	4	312	326	77	86	728	658	20	20	51
16	3	4	347	261	65	65	852	611	22	18	42
16	1	4	38	523	16	11	98	1,061	3	37	10
16	1	4	32	653	8	4	63	1,067	3	37	4
16	1	4	128	603	23	29	234	953	3	37	16
16	1	4	40	709	18	15	78	1,059	2	38	10
16	1	4	13	781	4	6	46	1,134	1	39	4
16	5	4	282	171	24	21	788	376	33	7	19
16	5	4	349	94	33	24	884	253	33	7	22
16	5	4	371	74	17	19	959	184	36	4	14
16	5	4	359	112	26	27	855	267	35	5	20
16	5	4	504	13	4	3	1,108	38	39	1	2
16	2	4	234	337	51	43	665	1,241	13	27	48
16	2	4	325	420	52	43	770	1,148	13	27	40
16	2	4	204	550	52	54	498	1,426	11	29	47
16	2	4	194	483	49	40	534	1,312	12	28	42
16	2	4	181	518	55	50	505	1,379	11	29	42
16	4	4	305	186	15	19	816	340	30	10	14
16	4	4	253	122	31	29	747	367	28	12	24
16	4	4	313	74	21	19	807	231	30	10	18
16	4	4	233	125	28	19	667	380	29	11	23
16	4	4	219	150	29	25	647	397	29	11	25
11	3	7	490	669	225	188	627	990	16	24	55
11	3	7	589	366	220	170	798	647	20	20	55
11	3	7	506	403	236	173	738	730	20	20	58
11	3	7	431	493	214	183	620	813	17	23	58
11	3	7	322	694	180	150	471	1,104	16	24	46
11	1	7	17	583	16	6	14	1,134	1	39	2
11	1	7	113	582	29	18	96	1,130	1	39	5
11	1	7	0	652	0	5	2	1,134	0	40	1
11	1	7	16	572	15	7	14	1,109	1	39	3
11	1	7	198	445	45	21	166	1,046	2	38	7
11	5	7	702	0	0	0	1,152	0	40	0	0
11	5	7	563	197	79	103	977	271	35	5	24
11	5	7	590	79	33	38	1,038	118	37	3	11
11	5	7	498	67	36	44	994	129	37	3	16
11	5	7	505	62	32	44	988	91	36	4	12
11	2	7	106	699	75	62	245	1,541	9	31	26
11	2	7	58	854	47	30	118	1,922	5	35	16
11	2	7	56	1,078	33	36	97	2,048	3	37	13
11	2	7	92	832	46	45	193	1,748	8	32	18
11	2	7	163	808	63	64	368	1,681	7	33	21
11	4	7	272	178	27	74	728	277	29	11	13
11	4	7	324	143	20	34	863	257	33	7	6
11	4	7	286	53	19	41	947	114	36	4	10
11	4	7	359	107	31	18	969	223	36	4	6

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
11	4	7	328	122	19	25	954	255	35	5	6
12	7	7	557	234	90	63	767	432	18	12	27
12	7	7	552	130	95	49	869	374	18	12	31
12	7	7	504	87	74	33	908	331	18	12	23
12	7	7	355	245	83	42	660	599	17	13	29
12	7	7	661	94	58	24	1,178	278	23	7	17
12	1	7	45	477	20	18	107	1,064	3	37	8
12	1	7	32	522	21	14	49	1,042	1	39	5
12	1	7	22	616	16	11	45	1,087	2	38	4
12	1	7	100	779	25	19	189	1,355	1	39	8
12	1	7	338	1,019	77	64	629	1,904	10	30	24
12	5	7	470	0	0	0	1,130	0	40	0	0
12	5	7	388	33	16	25	1,002	57	38	2	6
12	5	7	443	45	19	18	1,054	45	39	1	4
12	5	7	434	20	9	12	1,069	21	39	1	2
12	5	7	426	16	10	14	1,046	23	38	2	4
12	2	7	360	518	58	76	860	1,133	12	28	34
12	2	7	400	411	52	57	1,058	1,080	14	26	31
12	2	7	366	460	53	49	926	1,130	13	27	28
12	2	7	176	592	70	61	447	1,390	11	29	31
12	2	7	282	518	87	93	650	1,153	11	29	40
12	3	7	413	153	46	71	1,111	417	26	14	30
12	3	7	319	175	41	44	1,048	562	24	16	30
12	3	7	380	215	50	89	1,044	506	24	16	33
12	3	7	278	254	37	63	919	643	22	18	28
12	3	7	185	428	62	123	562	718	19	21	36
12	4	7	364	155	33	32	909	229	33	7	13
12	4	7	486	120	32	56	992	145	37	3	10
12	4	7	467	29	12	18	1,043	68	37	3	6
12	4	7	437	82	33	43	944	125	34	6	11
12	4	7	301	114	30	47	774	261	30	10	16
13	3	7	501	387	129	125	878	603	21	19	44
13	3	7	522	434	144	133	834	719	22	18	49
13	3	7	556	377	171	133	889	694	23	17	53
13	3	7	713	430	152	136	996	654	23	17	49
13	3	7	568	398	139	108	824	590	22	18	43
13	1	7	46	712	36	38	73	1,020	2	38	11
13	1	7	57	640	40	38	89	989	3	37	12
13	1	7	83	679	55	52	109	955	4	36	14
13	1	7	30	805	24	27	41	1,033	2	38	6
13	1	7	64	693	54	51	82	954	5	35	12
13	5	7	682	95	51	65	981	114	35	5	13
13	5	7	565	263	87	89	895	298	33	7	21
13	5	7	600	70	37	43	975	100	37	3	12
13	5	7	591	59	22	39	967	76	36	4	8
13	5	7	632	57	30	14	1,073	68	39	1	8
13	2	7	397	953	167	208	578	1,257	12	28	44
13	2	7	207	1,065	100	146	361	1,326	12	27	34
13	2	7	363	984	167	215	575	1,405	12	28	52
13	2	7	539	1,023	114	168	729	1,366	11	29	37
13	2	7	335	861	164	182	527	1,319	12	28	47
13	4	7	701	112	39	61	999	114	37	3	9
13	4	7	576	78	36	53	1,001	105	36	4	12
13	4	7	570	53	30	42	990	75	36	4	10
13	4	7	644	64	20	54	988	66	36	4	8
13	4	7	590	126	38	60	856	159	33	7	12
14	7	7	465	309	127	89	697	509	16	14	35
14	7	7	395	262	211	150	680	527	16	14	58
14	7	7	364	298	119	95	550	502	16	14	31

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
14	7	7	548	308	158	163	806	444	16	14	43
14	7	7	429	346	113	117	581	528	13	17	31
14	1	7	12	725	11	3	13	1,103	1	39	2
14	1	7	29	730	16	15	37	1,080	1	39	4
14	1	7	14	766	13	4	10	1,113	1	39	2
14	1	7	287	941	78	50	467	1,525	7	33	16
14	1	7	373	1,915	206	89	467	3,103	9	31	43
14	5	7	556	41	17	27	973	53	38	2	6
14	5	7	690	62	37	44	1,026	73	37	3	12
14	5	7	677	33	11	29	1,024	37	37	3	5
14	5	7	662	11	5	9	1,064	14	39	1	2
14	5	7	566	74	33	45	933	106	36	4	10
14	2	7	141	773	95	51	211	1,670	7	33	25
14	2	7	202	806	135	79	302	1,779	8	32	30
14	2	7	147	750	95	57	261	1,659	7	33	26
14	2	7	101	834	76	59	153	1,761	6	34	17
14	2	7	246	681	102	68	397	1,467	9	31	22
14	3	7	320	398	153	103	635	926	19	21	39
14	3	7	567	200	117	86	1,120	449	26	14	31
14	3	7	343	335	81	69	787	814	19	21	26
14	3	7	311	406	130	145	691	827	18	22	57
14	3	7	279	525	148	114	516	1,041	16	24	42
14	4	7	699	27	23	23	1,038	41	37	3	6
14	4	7	504	58	22	28	997	229	34	6	7
14	4	7	574	77	48	42	1,068	131	36	4	12
14	4	7	539	35	25	24	1,066	69	37	3	6
14	4	7	526	56	6	11	1,150	80	39	1	2
15	3	7	292	735	158	147	388	1,098	16	24	48
15	3	7	345	677	154	130	426	981	17	23	40
15	3	7	424	547	156	129	532	905	17	23	46
15	3	7	702	625	213	194	873	1,008	20	20	66
15	3	7	496	693	194	160	581	1,022	17	23	49
15	1	7	56	662	42	29	66	1,036	3	37	10
15	1	7	33	638	27	21	38	1,108	2	38	6
15	1	7	97	621	64	44	107	1,014	3	37	16
15	1	7	82	573	63	39	85	941	4	36	12
15	1	7	36	618	26	23	51	1,056	2	38	8
15	5	7	494	177	72	108	820	218	34	6	25
15	5	7	599	110	52	79	958	134	36	4	17
15	5	7	685	37	19	33	1,068	42	38	2	8
15	5	7	688	44	22	40	1,056	57	37	3	10
15	5	7	758	58	20	35	1,116	54	39	1	8
15	2	7	357	839	161	127	475	1,332	12	28	40
15	2	7	422	808	170	107	500	1,287	12	28	39
15	2	7	400	878	200	135	450	1,377	12	28	46
15	2	7	417	777	193	134	531	1,243	12	28	46
15	2	7	418	829	150	119	518	1,304	10	30	41
15	4	7	492	101	35	70	851	141	32	8	13
15	4	7	521	91	45	73	945	124	34	6	20
15	4	7	491	145	44	83	843	227	32	8	26
15	4	7	526	97	38	77	841	127	34	6	14
15	4	7	565	139	62	91	852	192	31	9	18
16	7	7	332	78	50	48	944	302	20	10	28
16	7	7	306	143	64	57	826	544	16	14	31
16	7	7	238	143	67	58	766	546	18	12	34
16	7	7	291	116	127	42	662	506	16	14	29
16	7	7	310	164	51	33	803	619	16	14	21
16	1	7	104	194	25	22	338	992	5	35	16
16	1	7	88	288	30	26	297	1,021	4	36	14

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
16	1	7	31	359	12	9	111	1,057	3	37	5
16	1	7	84	532	30	22	219	1,644	5	35	12
16	1	7	537	980	122	103	862	2,118	10	30	35
16	5	7	200	15	2	13	1,048	47	38	2	4
16	5	7	220	95	7	7	963	331	34	6	4
16	5	7	251	64	8	0	1,101	188	40	0	1
16	5	7	195	15	6	3	1,039	102	37	3	4
16	5	7	235	11	5	9	1,101	39	38	2	4
16	2	7	170	504	84	61	424	1,491	10	30	30
16	2	7	215	435	91	96	555	1,208	11	29	38
16	2	7	254	349	107	80	717	1,313	13	27	43
16	2	7	226	365	94	68	672	1,457	11	29	40
16	2	7	258	393	107	79	609	1,302	13	27	37
16	3	7	217	184	81	66	772	908	17	23	42
16	3	7	188	205	72	59	632	1,002	17	23	33
16	3	7	241	236	98	72	642	884	19	21	39
16	3	7	220	330	54	50	620	1,125	16	24	23
16	3	7	388	285	123	121	815	760	20	20	48
16	4	7	258	36	5	8	1,210	90	39	1	2
16	4	7	369	0	0	0	1,233	0	40	0	0
16	4	7	313	0	0	0	1,156	0	40	0	0
16	4	7	465	0	0	0	1,176	0	40	0	0
16	4	7	277	17	4	12	1,096	51	37	3	4
11	3	15	697	280	91	86	1,360	502	27	13	19
11	3	15	223	1,010	78	44	451	1,589	11	29	10
11	3	15	357	611	89	116	828	1,059	18	22	27
11	3	15	397	503	99	152	968	878	21	19	30
11	3	15	429	517	71	102	925	818	22	18	19
11	1	15	1	720	1	7	11	1,145	0	40	2
11	1	15	1	712	1	15	12	1,159	0	40	3
11	1	15	1	709	1	17	15	1,144	0	40	3
11	1	15	31	778	0	10	69	1,132	0	40	1
11	1	15	3	782	3	32	13	1,152	0	40	5
11	5	15	616	37	11	19	1,088	53	39	1	5
11	5	15	658	23	19	9	1,135	44	39	1	3
11	5	15	526	59	46	51	1,050	105	38	2	12
11	5	15	631	0	0	0	1,138	0	40	0	0
11	5	15	542	28	31	24	1,083	57	39	1	8
11	2	15	45	1,251	43	29	87	2,119	2	38	5
11	2	15	17	1,372	16	14	43	2,220	1	39	3
11	2	15	47	1,389	45	61	78	2,214	2	38	12
11	2	15	1	1,290	1	14	23	2,344	0	40	3
11	2	15	2	1,414	1	16	13	2,334	0	40	3
11	4	15	759	58	25	24	1,127	98	37	3	4
11	4	15	847	87	23	27	1,305	154	38	2	4
11	4	15	753	172	57	70	1,170	282	35	5	20
11	4	15	675	156	31	27	979	257	35	5	4
11	4	15	654	81	14	9	1,076	177	37	3	4
12	3	15	315	270	122	103	956	746	20	20	45
12	3	15	288	345	87	97	980	866	19	21	37
12	3	15	415	318	87	94	1,095	792	22	18	30
12	3	15	452	278	116	110	1,167	682	24	16	35
12	3	15	433	214	76	87	1,229	636	24	16	30
12	1	15	17	469	8	9	51	1,168	1	39	2
12	1	15	2	478	2	15	4	1,139	0	40	4
12	1	15	21	436	12	11	71	1,131	2	38	4
12	1	15	4	499	4	7	12	1,141	0	40	2
12	1	15	11	486	10	12	22	1,143	1	39	4
12	5	15	477	0	0	0	1,182	0	40	0	0

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses								COs
			Total		In COD		Times		Reinforcers		
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
12	5	15	464	2	8	2	1,131	5	40	0	2
12	5	15	454	50	30	23	1,123	85	39	1	8
12	5	15	391	141	0	7	1,067	257	37	3	1
12	5	15	373	0	0	0	1,204	0	40	0	0
12	2	15	179	909	59	51	412	1,731	7	33	18
12	2	15	159	785	57	69	422	1,690	8	32	18
12	2	15	94	763	47	46	257	1,702	7	33	14
12	2	15	107	889	39	43	336	1,903	7	33	13
12	2	15	51	894	34	27	212	2,091	5	35	12
12	4	15	489	99	12	21	1,092	168	37	3	4
12	4	15	514	0	0	0	1,200	0	40	0	0
12	4	15	458	40	16	14	1,067	76	37	3	4
12	4	15	547	56	10	15	1,109	85	37	3	2
12	4	15	503	0	0	0	1,151	0	40	0	0
13	3	15	1,204	96	55	45	1,937	186	35	5	11
13	3	15	775	280	84	92	1,318	426	28	12	18
13	3	15	886	182	92	87	1,448	313	30	10	17
13	3	15	1,179	274	53	63	1,734	352	31	9	12
13	3	15	945	292	67	93	1,454	417	28	12	16
13	1	15	0	776	0	0	0	1,149	0	40	0
13	1	15	1	790	1	7	2	1,147	0	40	2
13	1	15	127	707	41	39	213	1,066	4	36	7
13	1	15	33	700	27	32	54	1,087	2	38	6
13	1	15	16	681	14	20	27	1,080	1	39	4
13	5	15	726	35	30	31	1,035	56	38	2	6
13	5	15	727	7	8	7	1,158	12	40	0	2
13	5	15	729	185	29	29	1,054	206	38	2	6
13	5	15	704	0	10	0	1,097	3	40	0	1
13	5	15	711	13	12	11	1,066	34	39	1	4
13	2	15	385	791	96	86	756	1,395	13	27	22
13	2	15	220	1,132	55	78	462	1,861	5	35	16
13	2	15	478	1,182	89	76	883	1,820	9	31	20
13	2	15	272	1,097	73	84	569	1,696	9	31	19
13	2	15	278	1,030	98	110	560	1,596	10	30	24
13	4	15	625	1	6	1	1,173	7	40	0	2
13	4	15	592	0	0	0	1,105	0	40	0	0
13	4	15	636	19	4	14	1,112	32	39	1	2
13	4	15	640	15	19	13	1,125	29	39	1	4
13	4	15	607	0	0	0	1,146	0	40	0	0
14	3	15	86	994	17	43	232	1,960	4	36	13
14	3	15	134	910	19	57	397	1,840	6	34	16
14	3	15	63	980	24	34	158	2,022	4	36	9
14	3	15	37	1,039	31	40	83	2,151	3	37	10
14	3	15	72	892	42	58	171	1,931	5	35	16
14	1	15	0	653	0	0	0	1,189	0	40	0
14	1	15	10	569	8	8	23	1,155	1	39	2
14	1	15	0	565	0	8	7	1,085	0	40	1
14	1	15	0	640	0	0	0	1,179	0	40	0
14	1	15	1	646	0	6	5	1,176	0	40	2
14	5	15	405	338	26	34	999	821	34	6	10
14	5	15	375	162	36	36	978	398	34	6	14
14	5	15	409	216	40	31	981	461	33	7	14
14	5	15	384	25	14	13	1,146	85	38	2	6
14	5	15	330	335	41	53	919	785	31	9	14
14	2	15	0	1,065	0	0	0	2,433	0	40	0
14	2	15	0	1,035	0	0	0	2,456	0	40	0
14	2	15	0	897	0	0	0	2,285	0	40	0
14	2	15	0	819	0	0	0	2,423	0	40	0
14	2	15	0	985	0	0	0	2,463	0	40	0

APPENDIX

(Continued)

Hen	Code	COD	Responses				Times		Reinforcers		COs
			Total		In COD						
			L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	
14	4	15	201	496	23	23	586	1,165	20	20	8
14	4	15	214	477	40	52	606	1,011	21	19	14
14	4	15	305	173	21	32	908	371	32	8	8
14	4	15	433	84	8	18	1,132	190	37	3	4
14	4	15	343	305	14	26	898	660	28	12	6
15	3	15	575	352	119	191	1,127	596	22	18	36
15	3	15	796	316	89	113	1,482	515	28	12	28
15	3	15	448	549	163	256	814	838	19	21	48
15	3	15	585	527	178	240	965	806	21	19	46
15	3	15	496	622	134	169	935	965	20	20	27
15	1	15	12	603	11	15	29	1,132	1	39	4
15	1	15	10	738	9	11	18	1,119	1	39	2
15	1	15	100	719	35	28	97	1,077	2	38	4
15	1	15	25	799	20	30	28	1,144	1	39	6
15	1	15	39	744	23	25	53	1,100	2	38	4
15	5	15	783	20	13	17	1,087	25	39	1	2
15	5	15	867	0	0	0	1,179	0	40	0	0
15	5	15	760	112	32	31	1,043	135	37	3	5
15	5	15	854	0	0	0	1,162	40	40	0	0
15	5	15	766	0	0	0	1,130	0	40	0	0
15	2	15	202	1,051	102	93	280	1,723	7	33	18
15	2	15	203	1,032	113	108	321	1,614	8	32	22
15	2	15	261	1,141	120	111	418	1,781	8	32	20
15	2	15	142	1,182	58	60	248	1,941	5	35	10
15	2	15	200	1,069	99	88	324	1,765	7	33	24
15	4	15	792	197	18	18	1,021	234	36	4	2
15	4	15	497	556	9	18	733	726	27	13	3
15	4	15	761	69	23	49	1,025	100	36	4	8
15	4	15	794	0	0	0	1,135	0	40	0	0
15	4	15	741	0	0	0	1,135	0	40	0	0
16	3	15	344	229	58	83	1,224	674	24	16	25
16	3	15	259	285	75	108	843	777	22	18	27
16	3	15	294	368	72	117	893	927	20	20	28
16	3	15	249	371	61	80	829	1,046	18	22	23
16	3	15	188	371	70	99	663	1,158	16	24	33
16	1	15	35	369	13	24	117	1,061	3	37	6
16	1	15	20	401	13	20	53	1,104	2	38	4
16	1	15	21	478	9	16	64	1,163	0	40	4
16	1	15	22	414	13	13	66	1,084	2	38	4
16	1	15	0	461	0	0	0	1,144	0	40	0
16	5	15	514	0	0	0	1,129	0	40	0	0
16	5	15	532	174	19	5	1,052	270	37	3	2
16	5	15	533	201	21	10	1,080	280	38	2	3
16	5	15	521	11	13	10	1,158	27	39	1	4
16	5	15	509	50	13	9	1,127	86	39	1	2
16	2	15	246	722	33	47	607	1,648	9	31	9
16	2	15	50	1,002	15	33	141	2,165	3	37	6
16	2	15	261	1,141	120	111	418	1,781	8	32	20
16	2	15	444	856	67	83	770	1,563	10	30	16
16	2	15	57	981	24	39	144	2,089	3	37	8
16	4	15	564	0	4	0	1,154	14	40	0	1
16	4	15	593	0	0	0	1,187	0	40	0	0
16	4	15	641	0	2	0	1,159	2	40	0	1
16	4	15	647	0	0	0	1,187	0	40	0	0
16	4	15	640	0	0	0	1,159	0	40	0	0

Note. Condition codes: 1 = VI 180 s VI 30 s, 2 = VI 120 s VI 60 s, 3 = VI 60 s VI 60 s, 4 = VI 30 s VI 60 s, 5 = VI 30 s VI 120 s, 6 = VI 60 s VI 180 s, 7 = VI 60 s VI 60 s (replication).