An Overview of the Literature on the Token Economy in Schizophrenia

Dr Manish Tyagi, Assistant Professor

Department of Psychitary, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Email id- tyagimanish9836@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The basis for token economy interventions is based on operant conditioning concepts. Skinner proposed two blows of operant behavior, which are broad generalizations that apply to a wide variety of human actions and have been confirmed by a vast body of research investigations, building on the work of previous psychologists. The token economy is a therapy method based on operant conditioning and social learning concepts. The token economy, which was created in the 1950s and 1960s for long-stay hospital patients, has gone out of popularity since then. The present study was conducted as part of the Patient Outcomes Research Team's 2003 update of schizophrenia treatment guidelines (PORT). A total of 13 controlled token economy experiments were examined. The research, taken together, show that the token economy is successful in improving the adaptive behaviors of schizophrenia patients. The majority of the research, however, are restricted by methodological flaws and the historical circumstances in which they were conducted. More study is required to establish the token economy's particular advantages when used in conjunction with modern psychosocial and psychopharmacological therapies.

KEYWORDS: Behavior Therapy, Operant Conditioning, Schizophrenia, Social Learning, Token Economy

INTRODUCTION

For the treatment of patients with schizophrenia and other severe mental disorders, token economy treatments have been developed. However, these treatments have not been extensively used. The goal of this page is to provide a list of research papers on the token economy for schizophrenia sufferers [1]. The laws aid in the explanation of behavior's natural growth and occurrence. Through the use of operant conditioning techniques, the concepts may also be utilized to consciously alter behaviour [2]. Maladaptive behaviors are thought to be subject to the same blows of learning that control normal behavior.

The first principle, the law of effect, says that the frequency of action is influenced in part by the activity's consequences or effects. In other words, what follows will either enhance or diminish conduct. Reinforces are consequences that enhance the likelihood of a behavior. Primary reinforces are those that help people meet fundamental human needs like hunger and thirst. Response cost and punishment are two consequences that decrease the likelihood of action; they are less effective in altering behavior than reinforces [3]. When repercussions occur soon after an action, they are more likely to affect future behavior than when there is a lengthy delay between the activity and its consequences.

The blow of association through contiguity, the second principle of operant conditioning, states that if two events happen at the same time, they will become linked. Through its connection with reinforcing outcomes, a neutral stimulus coupled with a primary reinforcer becomes a reinforcer[4]. Money, for example, serves as a reinforcer in our culture not because of its intrinsic qualities, but because of the gratifying goods that are made accessible via its usage. In the 1950s, the operant learning paradigm was used to clinical psychiatric settings with the goal of changing severely regressed patients' behavior. Because they include the delivery of tokens

as instant reinforces for patients performing defined goal behaviors, such milieu-wide programs were dubbed betoken economies [5].

Adaptive habits, such as self-care or job skills, are often targeted. Patients may trade tokens for personally chosen reinforces, known as back-up or secondary reinforces, which include a variety of desired items or privileges, at a later time. Tokens or other comparable forms of exchange have the benefit of being easily given to patients once they have completed the desired actions. Tokens are used to bridge the gap between the time it takes to execute a behavior and the time it takes to get back-up reinforcers. Furthermore, unlike primary reinforcers, tokens are unaffected by the patient's satiety; that is, patients are driven to earn tokens even if they do not need the back-up reinforcers that may be bought with the tokens right away. Each token economy program has its own set of target behaviors, reinforcers, and exchange rates, which are defined by local conditions and the therapeutic requirements of the individual patient group [6]. Although comparable treatment techniques may be used in other groups, the focus of this study is on the use of the token economy in programs aimed mainly at schizophrenia patients.

The Schizophrenia Patient Outcomes Research Team (PORT) revised its guidelines in 2003, recommending that long-term inpatient or residential care facilities offer a behavioral intervention based on social learning concepts. This study backs up the PORT suggestion by include studies that have been published after prior comprehensive reviews of token economy research were released. Using the key search terms token economy, behavior therapy, social learning, operant conditioning, schizophrenia, a National Library of Medicine PubMed literature search found published papers reporting empirical trials of token economy treatments for individuals with schizophrenia.

The period covered by the PubMed literature search was 1966–2002. Studies that include a comparison condition with random assignment by person or group, or a comparison with matched controls, are included in this evaluation. Studies that use a quasi-experimental A-B-A design, in which each research participant acts as their own control refers to the baseline condition, and refers to the experimental condition, are also acceptable for inclusion[7]. The studies included in this review have to be published in English and clearly explain and implement a systematic token economy, social learning strategy aimed at changing patients' behavior. There were a total of 13 studies that satisfied the review's inclusion criteria. These researches have been summarized.

A total of around 1000 patients are participating in the studies, with about 600 of them coming from one research. All five trials with individual random assignment indicate that the token economy program has a substantial advantage[8]. The remaining studies include a within-subject alternating design, which includes group random assignment (two studies), comparison between groups without random assignment (three studies), and a within-subject alternating design (three studies). The research examined tend to concentrate on adaptable, observable, and operationally defined behaviors so that they may be objectively evaluated[9]. Self-care and other daily tasks, fundamental social contact, treatment involvement, and/or hospital job activity are all common target behaviors. Behavioral outcomes may be evaluated using ward rating scales as discrete occurrences or as continuous variables. Despite the fact that psychotic symptoms are seldom the focus of token economy programs, at least two research focused on negative symptoms and showed signs of improvement [10].

2. DISCUSSION

The token economy was shown to provide a substantial advantage in all but two of the experiments examined here. The token economy was contrasted to other active treatment methods in both of the negative trials, which may have confused the token economy. There are no evaluations that we are aware of that combine the findings of several studies that used an impact size analysis of the token economy in schizophrenia. Only three studies were determined to be suitable for inclusion in a recent Cochrane review; the study indicated that the token economy method may be beneficial for negative symptoms and that further research is needed. The token economy interventions vary across the research, according to the analysis.

The token economy intervention in most research consisted of rigorous reinforcement methods for specific actions. In many instances, the token economy was envisioned as an operant reinforcement program rather than a component of a broader set of rehabilitation methods. In a few research, however, reinforcement methods were employed as part of a larger behavioral program, with the wider token economy program serving as the experimental condition. The comprehensive social learning program exemplified such an approach. This program includes both skills training and operant token economy techniques in a reasonably enriched treatment setting. More recently, he looked at a program that blended a token economy with life skills training and active interpersonal encouragement.

Studies that focused on discrete reinforcement processes as well as those that utilized a broader-based token economy approach both showed positive outcomes for the token economy. The research under consideration may also be compared in terms of the treatment condition(s) against which the token economy was tested. The comparative condition in some of the trials, particularly the older ones, was treatment as usual, a normal (for the period) no enriched treatment setting; always, the token economy resulted in better results. The token economy has been likened to a more social, interpersonal approach in previous research. Directly comparing reinforcement methods to individual supportive treatment, for example, revealed no significant differences in result between the two situations.

The landmark research also included a supportive milieu therapy comparison group as well as a treatment-as-usual comparison group; the token economy beat both. Various aspects of the token economy were also compared in certain research in attempt to identify the intervention's active ingredients. A set of experiments, for example, looked at the relative benefit of token reinforcement with and without social praise and feedback, as well as a normal control group. Both active therapy groups demonstrated relative benefit in their trials. In a more recent study, researchers compared two kinds of contingent reinforcement, one positive and the other negative, to a no contingent reinforcement control condition. Both reinforcement groups outperformed the control group, while the active treatment groups did not vary significantly. The studies under consideration may also be evaluated in terms of the goal outcomes that were used to assess the token economy's success.

To evaluate patients in the token economy against the comparison condition, most research employed more than one kind of evaluation instrument. Ward rating measures, such as the Nurse Observation Scale for Inpatient Evaluation or the Wing Ward Behavior Scale, were the most frequent kind of outcome measure in the research. These metrics were employed in seven of the thirteen research examined, and they offer the most consistent evidence in support of the token economy. Behavior time sampling and behavior checklists were two additional types of outcome measures that were utilized; data from these measures similarly tended to indicate a relative advantage for patients in the token economy condition. Ratings on symptom rating scales and patients' performance on cognitive tests of orientation or intellect were less

consistently linked with improvement in the token economy compared to the comparator condition.

Three of the studies presently being evaluated and summarized are described and summarized in the next section. These three studies, which were published in separate decades, demonstrate the breadth of research on the token economy method. In the 1960s and 1970s, studies using an A-B-A design discovered a significant and often dramatic impact of contingent reinforcement. In a groundbreaking research, for example. Depending on whether or not contingent token reinforcement was given, female patients on a long-stay state hospital unit improved their ward work performance from virtually none to a high level. The patients were given the option of choosing their own commodities and privileges as part of the contingent reinforcement.

The use of individually calibrated reinforcement contingencies based on patients' previous levels of favored behaviors was critical in this important research. Despite the significant effect of the social learning approach in the study, the authors point out that about a quarter of the patients had only a minor effect on work performance as a result of the reinforcement procedure; this finding emphasizes the individual variability in response to the intervention. Individually random assignment studies offer the strongest proof of the token economy's advantages. The 6-year research was meticulous in its planning and execution, and it is the most thorough examination of the token economy to date.

The efficacy of three inpatient programs for severely disabled hospital patients: social learning token economy, milieu supportive, and conventional hospital management were compared in this research. A total of 84 patients were randomly assigned to one of three conditions from stratified blocks depending on their initial degree of functioning. The three initiatives were all launched at the same state hospital with the same amount of personnel. Patients were followed throughout the length of their hospital stay and, if feasible, following release into the community. According to the findings, 100 percent of the patients who participated in the social learning program improved significantly, compared to 55 percent in the milieu condition and 33 percent in the control group.

Furthermore, 97 percent of patients in the social learning program were effectively released to the community for at least 18 months, compared to 71% in the milieu condition and 45% in the control condition. The study's strengths include the collection of comprehensive and objective measurements, the completeness with which each of the treatments was defined and executed, and the study's duration, which allowed for follow-up beyond hospital release. The most recent controlled research of the token economy to emerge in the medical literature is from China, and it reflects a more current treatment program. Inpatients with schizophrenia and severe negative symptoms were randomly assigned to either a rehabilitation or a control group. Life skills training and positive reinforcement were part of the rehabilitation program, which was provided on a shoestring budget; the other activities and patient expectations were identical in both circumstances.

Patients in the experimental group exhibited substantially greater improvement in negative symptoms than those in the control group after three months. Significant scientific data supports the effectiveness of token economy social learning programs for people with schizophrenia. However, evaluating token economy schemes in the literature is hampered by the fact that the majority of research were conducted with long-stay inpatients more than 20 years ago. It's unclear how these individuals compare to those in modern inpatient or residential

treatment facilities. A prolonged disease course was usually needed for research participation in previous studies.

The fact that a patient was admitted to a long-term hospital unit or a minimum duration of stay in the hospital prior to the research was used to operationalize this inclusion criterion. For example, all individuals in the research had to have been hospitalized for at least two years, and the average length of prior hospitalization was 17 years. The overwhelming majority of inpatients in early token economy experiments are unlikely to be getting hospital-level treatment now. In light of current standards and therapies, it's also impossible to assess the clinical features of the patients who took part in several of the token economy research. Many of the research were conducted before the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders included more objective diagnostic criteria for schizophrenia.

Despite the fact that token economy programs in psychiatric settings were mainly designed for people with schizophrenia, few of the programs described in the literature were diagnostic-specific; the research by is an example. The majority of the token economy initiatives listed here have wide eligibility requirements. Participants in previous research were often all patients who were physically able to participate in a long-stay hospital ward where the token economy was used. In most cases, patients with mental retardation or organic illnesses were not excluded. In in order to identify the token's particular advantage.

In addition to using a cost-cutting strategy, it is critical that medicine be taken. Treatments are optimized and in accordance with the law. In regard to treatment criteria Because atypical antipsychotics (Atypical Antipsychotics) Medications may also help to alleviate unpleasant sensations. Social disengagement, as well as the relationship between the two. Atypical antipsychotics and the token economy approach. It is necessary to look into medicines. One a recent research looked at the combined efficacy. Clozapine, as well as a comprehensive social program although there is a learning program for schizophrenia, such an integrated approach is uncommon in the field.

3. CONCLUSION

Many prior token economy research need methodological upgrades. Masked evaluations of patient behavior and psychopathology, as well as explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria, should be utilized. In future research, random assignment of individuals to treatment conditions, which is present in fewer than half of the trials evaluated here, is desired. Furthermore, dependent metrics beyond those that assess adaptation to the hospital unit are required; these measures should assess patients' transfer to less restricted residential and community settings. The ultimate test of the token economy is if it saves money by reducing hospital or residential stays and reducing the demand for other high-cost services. The initial studies of the token economy were conducted in an age when the selection of reinforcers was governed by distinct ethical and legal norms. Studies conducted in modern settings with suitable reinforcers by today's standards might be beneficial in determining the most successful kinds of reinforcement systems. Materials for a standardized token economy would also be beneficial. The findings of research investigations may aid in demonstrating the advantages of the token economy in current psychiatric settings, allowing it to reclaim a larger position in schizophrenia treatment today.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Cooper, "Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM)," *Knowledge Organization*. 2017, doi: 10.5771/0943-7444-2017-8-668.

[2]   J. Davies, "How Voting and Consensus Created the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III)," *Anthropol. Med.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13648470.2016.1226684.

[3]   T. Bowles, "Book Review: Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition," *Ment. Heal. Clin.*, 2013, doi: 10.9740/mhc.n163617.

[4]   G. Parker *et al.*, "Revising Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, criteria for the bipolar disorders: Phase I of the AREDOC project," *Aust. N. Z. J. Psychiatry*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0004867418808382.

[5]   C. C. Bell, "DSM-IV: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders," *JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc.*, 1994, doi: 10.1001/jama.1994.03520100096046.

[6]   A. McGuire, "Diagnosing the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders," *Disabil. Soc.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09687599.2015.1062233.

[7]   T. A. Brown and D. H. Barlow, "Dimensional versus categorical classification of mental disorders in the fifth edition of the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders and beyond: Comment on the special section," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2005, doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.114.4.551.

[8]   E. M. Razzaghi, "A warm welcome to the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition?," *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*. 2014.

[9]   E. Shorter, "The history of nosology and the rise of the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders," *Dialogues Clin. Neurosci.*, 2015, doi: 10.31887/dcns.2015.17.1/eshorter.

[10]   &NA; &NA;, "Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition," *Alzheimer Dis. Assoc. Disord.*, 1996, doi: 10.1097/00002093-199601020-00009.