

Selecting Lower Priced Grocery Items

Objective: To teach students to select lower priced grocery items.

Setting and Materials:

Settings: Self-contained high school classroom & community grocery store

Materials: Two sets each of:

1. Pencil
2. Paper
3. 3 X 5 inch Vertical number line (with “9” at top and “0” at bottom)
4. 40 Grocery items priced from .10 to \$9.99 displayed on a shelf
5. Tokens and back-up reinforcers

Content Taught

Task Analysis for Selecting Lower Priced Items

1. Writes the price of one item
2. Writes the price of the other item
3. Says first number in price
4. Points to the number on number line
5. Says first number in other price
6. Points to the number on number line
7. Says which number is lower, or, if same, says the numbers are the same
- 8a. Matches lower number with item OR...
- 8b. If numbers are the same, mark slashes through the first number in each price (on paper)
9. Says second number in price
10. Points to the number on number line
11. Says second number in other price
12. Points to the number on number line

13. Says which number is lower, or, if same, says the numbers are the same
- 14a. Matches lower number with item OR...
- 14b. If numbers are the same, mark slashes through the second number in each price (on paper)
15. Says third number in price
16. Points to the number on number line
17. Says third number in other price
18. Points to the number on number line
19. Says which number is lower, or, if same, says the numbers are the same
- 20a. Matches lower number with item OR...
- 20b. If numbers are the same, mark slashes through the third number in each price (on paper) and chooses either item

Teaching Procedures

1. Seven pairs of items are randomly intermixed prior to each session and presented two times each for a total of 14 trials.
2. Present a similar pair of randomly selected items and say "Which item is cheaper?"
3. During the initial instructional sessions provide task request while providing controlling prompt of modeling correct response along with a verbal description (say "point to the number on the number line" while pointing to number on number line).
4. Sessions remain at 0 second delay until student achieves 100% correct responses for one session.
5. Then, a 5 second delay interval is used during all subsequent instructional sessions.
6. After presenting task request, wait 5 seconds and if student response has not occurred, provide controlling prompt.
7. When student initiates response, either before or after the prompt, wait 10 seconds for student to complete response.
8. Correct responses are counted if student initiates correct step before controlling prompt and completes step within 10 seconds (correct anticipation), or if student initiates correct step

within 5 seconds of receiving the controlling prompt and completes the step within 10 seconds (correct wait). Correct responses are rewarded with teacher praise.

9. Incorrect responses include:

- a) Non-wait errors, if a student initiates a step before controlling prompt, but a) does not complete step within 10 seconds, b) fails to perform step correctly, c) performs and incorrect step. With non-wait errors say, “Wrong, if you do not know, wait”
- b) Wait errors, if a student initiates a step after controlling prompt, but a) does not complete step within 10 seconds, b) fails to perform step correctly, c) performs and incorrect step. With wait errors say, “Wrong, do it this way”, and model correct response and provide the controlling prompt.
- c) No response errors occur when a student fails to initiate a response within 5 seconds of the controlling prompt. With no response errors model correct response and provide controlling prompt.

10. When the student reaches 90% correct responses (both anticipation and waits) a token is delivered that can be exchanged at end of each session for a back-up reinforcer.

Evaluation

Student performance can be assessed by collecting data on the number of correct steps on the task analysis.

Lesson Plan Based on:

Sandknop, P. A., Schuster, J. W., Wolery, M., & Cross, D. P. (1992). The use of an adaptive device to teach students with moderate mental retardation to select lower priced grocery items. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*, 27, 219-229.