

# Natural reinforcement in a Walden two community<sup>1</sup>

*Reforzamiento natural en una comunidad tipo Walden dos*  
Los Horcones

## ABSTRACT

Los Horcones is a Walden two-type community which applies behavior technology principles to its daily functioning, at the same time that attempts to increase such technology through experiments on behaviors relevant to cultural design. Since in this community no money nor tokens are employed, communitarian reinforcers are used to achieve homogeneous consequences in the community. Both, communitarian reinforcers and communitarian discriminative stimuli form the concept of communitarian contingency in Los Horcones. To establish communitarian behavior, intrinsic or natural reinforcers are preferred over extrinsic or contrived reinforcers; some procedures have been developed in this community for making the natural consequences of a behavior reinforcing, and for maintaining naturally reinforced behavior.

DESCRIPTORS: Walden two, experimental community, behavior analysis, cultural design, natural reinforcement.

## RESUMEN

*Los Horcones es una comunidad tipo Walden Dos, que aplica los principios de la tecnología conductual a su funcionamiento diario, al mismo tiempo que intenta aumentar dicha tecnología por medio de experimentos sobre conductas relacionadas con el diseño de culturas. Dado que en esta comunidad no se emplean dinero o fichas, se utilizan reforzados comunitarios para lograr consecuencias homogéneas en la comunidad. Los reforzadores comunitarios y los estímulos discriminativos comunitarios forman el concepto de contingencia comunitaria en Los Horcones. Para establecer conducta comunitaria, los reforzadores intrínsecos o naturales son preferidos en lugar de los reforzadores*

<sup>1</sup>Paper presented at the ABA Convention, Milwaukee, Wis., May, 1981. This article is dedicated to the memory of Charles B. Ferster, who was always interested in Natural Reinforcement (cf. Ferster, 1967). Address reprint request to Los Horcones, Apartado 372, Hermosillo, Sonora, México.

*extrínsecos o arbitrarios; se han desarrollado en esta comunidad algunos procedimientos para hacer reforzantes las consecuencias naturales de una conducta, y para mantener la conducta reforzada naturalmente.*

*DESCRIPTORES: Walden dos, comunidad experimental, análisis conductual, diseño de culturas, reforzamiento natural.*

Los Horcones, a pilot Walden two type of experiment (Los Horcones, 1979; Skinner, 1948) initiated in 1973, utilizes a behavioral technology derived from the science of The Experimental Analysis of Behavior. This technology is constantly applied to human behavior in the community (Los Horcones, 1980).

The Walden Two society does not limit itself merely to the application of current behavioral technology. It seeks to increase such technology by experimental studies on human behavior, especially those behaviors that are relevant to cultural design (Los Horcones, 1978 b).

One of the fundamental assumptions of Walden Two is that science, mainly the science of Human Behavior, provides a technology and methodology for initiating, maintaining, and developing a planned society and also a means for developing a society in which the members cooperate, treat each other equally, and solve their problems peacefully.

The design of the Los Horcones community required at the outset the selection and specification of behavioral objectives that would apply to its children and adult members. Before deciding on the behavioral objectives the immediate and the long-term physical, biological and behavioral effects of each behavior were considered. This meant that each behavior had to be evaluated not only for its functional properties for a single member and for all the members of the community but also for the effects that the behavior might have on the immediate physical and biological environment.

The selection of objectives is based on the assumption that science provides us not only with procedures but with values as well. Admittedly, this is a controversial stance. Inasmuch as Los Horcones is currently writing an article describing our conception of values, the subject will not be discussed here.

Because the reason and techniques for specifying behavioral objectives had already been shown by the application of behavioral analysis in many settings, it was unnecessary to discuss the usefulness of this step, or to investigate how to specify behavioral objectives (Bijou, Peterson, Harris, Allen and Johnston, 1969; Vargas, 1977). The task was simply to define communitarian and non-communitarian behaviors. The objective definition of a communitarian behavior made its occurrence, observation, recording, and consequence more possible and increased agreement among the members about whether or not a particular behavior was communitarian.

Having selected and specified behavioral objectives for adult and child members (Los Horcones, 1978 a; Los Horcones, 1977), Los Horcones then sought to establish procedures that would be effective to produce, increase,

and maintain the objective communitarian behavior and to decrease or eliminate non-communitarian behaviors. Again, Experimental Analysis of Behavior supplied the necessary procedures, two of the most important being positive reinforcement and extinction.

The management of human behavior in the community is based on the reinforcement of communitarian behaviors and non-reinforcement of non-communitarian behaviors. What is actually involved in the reinforcement and extinction of behavior in a community setting such as Walden Two? How will they be administered and in what kind of programs? How will all members reinforce and extinguish the same behavior? These and many other questions were asked.

A competitive society has tokens (money) and many of the behaviors of its members are controlled by them. But in a community such as Walden Two, what kind of reinforcers can we use if tokens are eliminated? So we analyzed reinforcement contingencies in the community. We categorized the member's reinforcers as being communitarian and non-communitarian. Communitarian reinforcers were defined as those that, when administered to or consumed by a member, do not involve non-communitarian behavior. For example, having the opportunity to talk disapprovingly about another member's behavior while working may reinforce working, but this practice does not reinforce working with a communitarian reinforcer. Alternatively, if we reinforce the working by helping him or her with the work, we are supporting behavior with a communitarian reinforcer. In a Walden Two community the objective is to use only communitarian reinforcers to reinforce communitarian behaviors.

The next question, then, was how to appropriately use the communitarian reinforcers. How were we to encourage the members to reinforce the same communitarian behaviors and to extinguish the non-communitarian behaviors? At this point in our analysis, we introduced the concept of homogeneous consequentation, and considered it an objective of Walden Two. If we could make consequentation homogeneous, that is, arrange for a member to receive reinforcing consequences for his/her communitarian behavior by all the members of the community, we could assure face-to-face control of behavior without imposing special behavioral programs. Hence, procedures were designed and implemented to achieve homogeneous consequences in the community.

Our initial definition of communitarian behaviors focused only on the topography and frequency of the behavior. We later observed that behaviors considered communitarian on the basis of topography were not always communitarian. We found that the antecedent and consequent stimuli of target behavior were important in classifying them as communitarian or non-communitarian. There was a need to look at the controlling discriminative stimuli as well as the the reinforcers.

It was at that time that we introduced the concept of communitarian contingency, which includes: 1) communitarian discriminative stimuli,

2) communitarian behavior, and 3) communitarian reinforcers. For example, we can observe a member playing with children; this is a behavior with communitarian topography. However, we may later observe that the member engages in this behavior only in the presence of a visitor who frequently compliments him or her. This behavior with a communitarian topography is not communitarian because the antecedent and consequent stimulus are not communitarian. The community objective is not only to establish communitarian responses, but also to link them with communitarian stimuli and communitarian reinforcers.

Our analysis of a communitarian contingency led us to analyze its source of reinforcement. For example, if a member cleans his/her room, contingent on another member's approving behavior ("How nice and clean your room is") and not the consequences produced by his/her own behavior, the control of the behavior of cleaning the room was dependent on the presence of that other member. Thus, if for one reason or another the other member left the community, or if there was insufficient social reinforcement (approval), the member might stop cleaning the room. There the communitarian behavior was more weakly maintained than if it was controlled by the consequences of the member's own behavior (for example, seeing things in the room neatly in place, clean, etc.).

We needed to know how to establish the communitarian behavior of members under the control of the response-generated consequences and thereby transfer control of their communitarian responses from contrived contingencies to natural contingencies. We therefore initiated research on natural reinforcers.

This article summarizes some of our findings on natural reinforcement. We also present some of our generalizations to community life, thus providing an example of why a Walden Two community will never be a finished product. Its practices change on the basis of new data. We know that there is much more research to be done on natural reinforcers and that much of our research will have to be replicated.

## DEFINITIONS

All behavior has its consequences, and there is always a change in stimulation after it occurs. If the change in stimulation is produced by the behavior itself, we call it an intrinsic consequence; if the change in stimulation is not produced by the behavior itself we call it an extrinsic consequence.

The words "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" refer only to the origin of the consequences. If the consequence originates in the behavior itself, then it is intrinsic, but the term intrinsic does not mean the consequence was self-produced. If the consequence does not originate from the behavior itself, then it is extrinsic.

In this article we will use the term intrinsic as a synonym for natural and the term extrinsic as a synonym for contrived. So we say natural and

contrived reinforcement. As our investigations proceeded we found it convenient to classify natural reinforcement into two categories: absolute and relative. An absolute natural consequence is a consequence that is inevitably produced by the behavior itself, in that each time the behavior occurs the consequence necessarily occurs. These contingencies may incorporate the ecological reinforcers spoken of by Bijou and Baer (1978). For example, moving a switch has an absolute natural consequence; the tactile stimulation from the change in position.

We define as relative natural consequences, any consequence that is produced irregularly by the response itself. For example, when moving a switch, the sound produced when changing its position or the light in the light bulb are relative natural consequences. We say the consequence is relative because it depends upon the condition under which the response occurs and not upon the response itself. Thus if there is electricity, the light bulb is in good condition, and there are appropriate connections between the light bulb and the switch, the relative consequence is that the bulb will light up.

In the communitarian setting, absolute consequences of the behavior are seldom selected as the more relevant consequences to be established as reinforcers for the communitarian behavior. Interest is mostly in selecting relative natural consequences. For example, we do not want the behavior of sweeping to be solely controlled by the tactile stimuli of sweeping (absolute natural consequences), but also by the relative natural consequence of seeing a cleaned area.

## CONTRIVED REINFORCEMENT

We have defined contrived reinforcers as those which are not produced by the behavior itself, meaning that the reinforcer is not intrinsic. The reinforcer is produced from conditions extrinsic to the behavior. There is nothing wrong with contrived reinforcers as such (Skinner, 1977), but we consider as inappropriate the frequency of their usage.

The appropriate use of contrived reinforcers involves their use as a part of programs with the objective of conditioning a natural consequence of behavior as a reinforcer. This makes them, and not the contrived reinforcers, the ones that finally control the behavior.

A society that does not use contrived reinforcers appropriately prevents the responses of its members from being controlled by their natural consequences. This kind of society makes possible exploitation (those that have the sources of reinforcement and use them to make others do what they consider reinforcing), inequality (non-equitable reinforcement), aggression (counter aggression), and appropriation (it is necessary to have artificial reinforcers available to control).

The latter kind of society produces many of the social problems that some behavior analysts currently want to solve. For example, in our opinion,

education at all levels will continue to be a failure until students are reinforced by the natural consequences that their study produces and not by contrived reinforcers such as grades, diplomas, teachers or parental approval. From preschool to university education, from the behavior of making a bed to the behavior of making a scientist or lawyer or to the behavior of creating an artistic object, we observe the use of contrived reinforcement with all of its undesirable products. Walden Two is an alternative to contrived reinforcement systems. When contrived reinforcement is used at Walden Two, it is merely as a part of programs with the objective of establishing natural consequences as reinforcers as soon as possible. For Los Horcones this is the only appropriate use of contrived reinforcers in shaping human behavior.

## NATURAL REINFORCEMENT

A response is naturally reinforced when the consequences it produces function as reinforcers. Making natural consequences of communitarian behavior reinforcing in themselves has the following advantages over conditions in which communitarian behavior remain under the control of contrived reinforcers.

1. Natural reinforcement is more likely to be immediate because the response itself produces it. This feature obviously can accelerate shaping the communitarian behavior.

2. In natural reinforcement, the reinforcer can be received only if the subject engages in the correlated behavior; thus each behavior has its own reinforcer. In case of satiation only the behavior that produced the reinforcer stops occurring. In the case of contrived reinforcement, the same reinforcer can be used for various behaviors. In the case of satiation all those behaviors reinforced by the same reinforcer stop occurring.

3. It is practically impossible to artificially reinforce all communitary behaviors. However, if they are reinforced naturally, reinforcement occurs automatically each time the communitary behavior occurs. Natural reinforcement maintains behavior more effectively.

4. When reinforcing by contrived means, some stimulus components of the contrived contingency necessarily become discriminative stimuli and act to restrict occasions upon which a given behavior occurs. For example, a member may play with children only in front of the child behavior manager who has approved his/her behavior in the past. In natural reinforcement this control does not exist and instead the behavior itself is producing reinforcers (seeing children laughing, running, playing, etc.) in the presence of the children only. The children become discriminative stimuli for the members' playing with them. If the children are available, and the member has time, he will go to play with the children.

5. In natural reinforcement the source of reinforcement is the behavior itself. In this way the occurrence of the reinforcer depends solely on the behavior, while with contrived reinforcement, reinforcement depends on

other sources which can control its presentation or non-presentation. The possibility of dependence of our behavior upon that of others is very high in contrived reinforcement.

### VERIFYING THAT A BEHAVIOR IS BEING NATURALLY REINFORCED

How can we verify that a natural consequence of a behavior is reinforcing? We answer this question in terms of findings from a series of studies conducted with children at Los Horcones.

#### Procedure # 1

Withdraw the natural consequence and observe what happens to the behavior. In one experiment a child inserted a marble into a hose and the falling at the end of the hose produced a sound. When the sound was eliminated, the behavior of inserting the marble into a hose decreased in frequency. This demonstrated that the natural consequence, the sound, was reinforcing.

#### Procedure # 2

Use the natural consequence of one behavior as an immediate consequence of another behavior, if the behavior increases in frequency then the natural consequence is reinforcing. In another experiment it was observed that seeing a full container was a natural reinforcer for putting rings into it. The "receiver" had columns to be filled with rings. As the child filled each column, the experimenter covered it in such a way that the child could not see the filled receiver. Then the experimenter asked the child, "Would you like to see the full receiver?" If the child answered "yes." the experimenter said, "You must first fill another." The time it took to fill the second receiver under this condition was less than in baseline condition.

In another experiment, we made the natural consequence more reinforcing, and the child paid tokens in order to see the full receiver. The task involved lettered rings spelling her name.

#### Procedure # 3

Another way of verifying that a natural consequence is reinforcing is by introducing a contrived reinforcer. If the behavior stays at the same frequency we interpret it as indicating that the behavior is being naturally reinforced. In an experiment, after verifying that certain candies were a powerful reinforcer for the subject, the candies were given after the behavior of inserting a marble in a hose that was supposedly highly reinforced by its natural consequences (sound). This behavior did not increase. On the other hand, when the same reinforcer was made contingent on behavior that supposedly was not being naturally reinforced, the frequency of the behavior increase.

## Procedure # 4

The community may use the subjective report of a member about the consequences he/she thinks are controlling his/her behavior. There are many descriptions associated with natural reinforcement. The members report "I like the activity because I feel good doing it. I don't care if another person will tell me it's good—for me, just doing it is important." Also, we can sometimes use the report of another person: "Peter does the job because he feels obligated, not because he likes it." "Luis always smiles and talks when working in the garden, but not when washing dishes."

### MAKING NATURAL CONSEQUENCES REINFORCING

The main objective of behavioral programs applied in the community, other than establishing, increasing, or maintaining communitarian behavior, is to bring them under the control of their own natural consequences. This means that the natural consequences must be made reinforcing.

How can a natural consequence become reinforcing? It must be paired with a stimulus that already functions as a reinforcer. However, this does not tell us what kind of reinforcer should be used, what kind of natural consequences should be chosen, how the reinforcer should be withdrawn, etc. Los Horcones has conducted experiments in this area, which have provided data to help us design more effective procedures for making the natural consequences of a behavior reinforcing.

#### Rule 1. Description of behavior and its natural consequences.

Before conditioning natural consequences as reinforcers of communitarian behavior, it is necessary to describe the behavior in detail so that one can determine what its natural consequences are.

If we want to establish the natural consequences of the behavior of washing dishes as a reinforcer, it is first necessary to describe the behavior in detail. A sequence may be: cleaning leftovers from the plates, putting them into a sink full of water, soaping them, rubbing them, rinsing them, and putting them in a rack where they can be dried. In this way we can determine the natural consequences of the behavior of washing dishes. Some of them are: seeing the plate without leftovers, seeing the plate getting wet, feeling it wet and warm, seeing how soapy it gets and how the soap falls, and seeing it clean. This description shows some of the natural consequences of washing dishes.

#### Rule 2. Select natural consequences that are relevant.

After determining all the natural consequences of the behavior, we need to select those that we want to make reinforcing. We need to select consequences which also act as the criterion for observing whether or not the behavior has occurred. If, for the dishwashing behavior, the relevant natural

consequence is that the dishes are clean, then we select this consequence to condition it as reinforcing. Of course, it is possible to select other natural consequences.

**Rule 3. Select natural consequences that are easily observed.**

To condition natural consequences as reinforcers we select those that can be easily observed by the member who emits the behavior. If these observable consequences do not exist, then we modify conditions to make them observable. In one experiment, simply by making natural consequences more observable, those natural consequences were conditioned as reinforcers more rapidly than we tried to condition these same consequences when they were less observable.

One communitarian implication of these data is that we want "seeing clean dishes" to become a natural reinforcer for the behavior of washing them, then we have to modify all the conditions which make clean dishes easily observable. There should be enough light; an appropriate place for them; few objects should clutter the scene that will interfere with the observation of clean dishes, such as pots, pans, or towels.

**Rule 4. Present the basic reinforcer within one-half second after the natural consequence.**

For example, when a member is teaching a child to share toys, she might say: "John is using your toys; that's very nice. You can choose the toy that you want to play with."

**Rule 5. When administering a contrived reinforcer it is necessary to describe the natural consequence that will finally control the behavior.**

It was demonstrated in an experiment (Exp. 9) that describing natural consequences made it become a reinforcer more rapidly than when the reinforcer was administered without describing the natural consequence. Generalizing this to the community, an example might be given in which a child takes off his/her shoes and puts them in their place. The member not only tells him/her "very good," but will say "The shoes are in their place—very nice." If a member is playing with children, the child behavior manager not only tells the member "very good," but adds that "the children are laughing and running—how nice."

**Rule 6. Outside the setting where the behavior occurs, describe the natural consequences of a behavior in an approving way in front of the member to whom we want them to become reinforcing.**

In an experiment, simply by giving an approving description of the natural consequences of a behavior the consequence became reinforcing. There is a communitarian implication. Make approving comments about the order of the tools in the shop, in front of a new member, so that seeing the tools in order will become reinforcing.

**Rule 7. Select powerful basic reinforcers.**

Select a powerful reinforcer for the subject, remembering that the reinforcing function of a stimulus depends on the person who receives it; not who gives it. Actually, in Los Horcones, the most powerful reinforcers are: participatory (cooperating with the subject in the activity), connected reinforcers (giving a sponge to the member who is washing dishes), and, finally, reinforcers such as conversation or other verbal reinforcers.

**Rule 8. Select reinforcers that have a high probability of occurring in the environment where the behavior will be emitted.** Kazdin (1975) calls them naturally occurring reinforcers. For example, this rule is not being followed in the community if a member uses money as a basic reinforcer.

**Rule 9. Select reinforcers that facilitate the desired behavior and observe its consequences.** Avoid selecting reinforcers which may interfere with emission of the behavior.

For example, if the natural consequences of playing with the children, seeing them laughing, playing, running, are to become reinforcing for a member, we should use social reinforcers such as verbal approval. We should avoid reinforcers like a long conversation or giving him something to read. Such reinforcers interfere with the emission of the behavior. The member may stop playing with the children and continue the talk, or else start to read the book.

Reinforcers that facilitate the emission of a behavior are called "connected reinforcers." For example, in the case of the member who is learning to be reinforced by playing with children, the child behavior manager could come and give him/her a ball or other toys, or the community mat buy a swing set or arrange a playing area. Another example of connected reinforcement is to give some shelves or a board with hooks to a member who is learning to be reinforced by seeing tools in their place. Connected reinforcers make the behavior more likely to occur, and they facilitate the behavior; natural consequences. For this reason, they are widely used at Los Horcones.

**Rule 10. Selected participatory reinforcers as basic reinforcers.**

Participatory reinforcers are reinforcers in which the subject who administers the reinforcer cooperates to obtain the reinforcement. In an experiment in which the experimenter participated in the performance of the behavior, the subject emitted the behavior more frequently. After participation was withdrawn the behavior was not maintained. It was maintained, however, when the participatory reinforcement was paired with an approving description of the natural consequences of the behavior.

Communitarian generalization is a related concept. If we want a member to like to clean and straighten a community room, we can help him/her

(participatory reinforcement) and say at the same time, "How nice this looks, everything is clean and in order" (approving description of the natural consequence). If we merely help him, it is probable that the member will develop dependent behavior.

#### Rule 11. Selected communitarian reinforcers.

Avoid the use of non-communitarian reinforcers, even though they may be very powerful. If we want to pair the work behavior of a member with talking, we should select communitarian topics, and not non-communitarian talking for solution. Although this kind of talking may be more reinforcing, it is not generally helpful to the community to use non-communitarian reinforcers.

#### Rule 12. Use naturally reinforced behavior as basic reinforcers.

It may already be naturally reinforcing, for example, for a member to read. This reinforcement can be paired with seeing clean dishes and in this way be linked to the dishwashing behavior. Further, it may not even be necessary that the member be the one who washed them.

Rule 13. Gradually withdrawing basic reinforcement. This will involve changes from a continuous pairing program to an intermittent one.

### MAINTENANCE OF NATURALLY REINFORCED BEHAVIOR

What are the most effective procedures that can be used to maintain behavior under the control of natural consequences? Los Horcones has the following rules:

1. Maintain conditions that facilitate the naturally reinforced behavior as well as the observation of its reinforcing natural consequences. For example, for the behavior of playing with children, the community provides enough toys, playing areas, etc. For reading behavior, the community has a library of interesting books for both children and adults, and in an inviting reading setting. For the behavior of putting tools in place, the community has built the shop near working areas, where the tools are most often used.

2. When using contrived reinforcers as additional reinforcement for naturally reinforced behaviors, ensure that the member observes the natural consequences produced by his/her own behavior. For this purpose it is useful to describe natural consequences half a second to one second after administering reinforcement.

3. Occasionally reinforce with contrived connected reinforcers. For example, for those people who manage the economic aspect of Los Horcones, the community provides good accounting books and other materials. Nevertheless, instead of merely saying "You work well," or using some other non-connected contrived reinforcer, it is well to use contrived connected reinforcers from time to time.

4. Occasionally reinforce with contrived participatory reinforcers. For example, if the work manager sends a member to help a new member who is working hard, it is important for him/her to be aware that participatory reinforcement, when not appropriately used, can establish dependent behaviors. As we mentioned previously, one way to avoid dependent behavior is by having the member who participates (helping) approvingly describe the natural consequences of the behavior.

5. Occasionally change the characteristics of natural consequences. For example, for the behavior of putting tools back in the right place, provide new tools in the shop. For the children who are naturally reinforced by painting, provide new painting material.

6. Avoid pairing aversive stimuli with natural consequences.

In the following selection we will mention some ways of punishing naturally reinforced behavior and how punishment can be prevented.

### PUNISHMENT OF NATURALLY REINFORCED BEHAVIOR

The community must prevent naturally reinforced communitarian behaviors from being punished. They know that aversive stimuli paired with natural consequences subtract from the reinforcing functions of natural consequences. To avoid punishment of naturally reinforced communitarian behaviors, the community adheres to the following rules:

1. Avoid obstructing the omission of naturally reinforced behavior. For example, to maintain the behavior of cleaning the dining room, avoid putting too many objects into it.

2. Avoid obstructing the observation of natural reinforcing consequences. If a member is already reinforced by seeing a clean floor, and we permit other persons to step on the floor while he/she is cleaning it, then we punish his/her naturally reinforced behavior. In cooperative behavior, for example, this may occur when two members have cooperated in making craft articles for sale, and then the community sells the craft before one of them has seen the final product.

3. Avoid giving aversive verbal consequences to naturally reinforced behaviors. For example, if one member is working in carpentry and is naturally reinforced by a completed chair or table and another member makes a disapproving comment about his carpentry products, that is an aversive verbal consequence for the first member.

4. Avoid naturally reinforced behavior's coming under instructional control in such a way that the subject is required to emit the behavior even when he/she is satiated. An extreme example may be taken. A member is naturally reinforced by taking care of children, so the community gives him/her the assignment of working 10 hours a day taking care of children.

5. Avoid making emission of one naturally reinforced behavior incompatible with receiving reinforcement from another naturally reinforced

behavior. For example, a member may be naturally reinforced for working in agriculture, but his/her working hours are the very time when the rest of the community members are talking together in the living room. Consequently, his/her naturally reinforced behavior is incompatible with participating in the group talks, which is also very reinforcing.

6. Avoid requiring that naturally reinforced behavior be emitted at a predetermined time. For example, the naturally reinforced behavior of researching a problem could conceivably be punished if it had to be completed and read for presentation at a definite time, instead of when the investigation is naturally finished.

## CONCLUSION

Los Horcones considers the beginning of more intensive investigation in the field of natural reinforcement to be of utmost importance. This type of research will help us to arrive at an effective behavioral technology that we can use not only to establish behavior but to effectively establish the behavior under the control of natural reinforcement. Data on natural reinforcement may also help us solve many of the serious problems that currently exist in education, work settings, therapy, research, and many more aspects of society. Making available an effective behavioral technology of natural reinforcement would further allow the behavior analyst to use contrived reinforcers to make natural consequences reinforcing—a decided advantage in the control of human behavior. Data coming from these investigations have implications for the current way of social organization which, unfortunately, is based on a contrived reinforcement system with all their undesirable products.

Why not design a society based on a natural reinforcement system? We think Walden Two has made a good start.

## REFERENCES

- Bijou, S. W., Peterson, R. F., Harris, F. R., Allen, K. E. and Johnston, M. S. Methodology for experimental studies of young children in natural settings. *Psychological Record*, 1969, 9, 177-210.
- Bijou, S. W. & Baer, D. M. *Behavioral analysis of child development*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1978.
- Ferster, C. B. Arbitrary and Natural Reinforcement. *Psychological Record*, 1967, 17, 341-349.
- Kazdin, A. E. *Behavior Modification in Applied Settings*. The Dorsey Press, 1975.
- Los Horcones. List of Behavioral Objectives for the Children of the Community. Jan. 1977.
- Los Horcones. Current Behavior Code for Adults. Oct. 1978. (a)
- Los Horcones. Some results of Los Horcones: investigation in cooperative and competitive behavior, aggressive and pacific behavior, egalitarian and discriminatory behavior, appropriative and sharing behavior, 1978. (b)
- Los Horcones. Pilot Walden Two Experiments: Beginnings of a Planned Society. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Behavior Analysis. Dearborn Mich, 1979.
- Los Horcones. A Model of Organization of a Behavior Area in a Walden Two Community: Los Horcones Community, 1980.
- Skinner, B. F. *Walden Two*. New York: Mc. Millan, 1948.
- Skinner, B. F. *Human Behavior and Democracy*. Paper presented in American Psychological Association, Washington D. C., Sept. 1976 and *Psychology Today*, Sept. 1977.
- Vargas, Julie S. *Behavioral Psychology for Teachers*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.