

The Earn-Only Home Token Economy

An Executive Functioning Support Tool for Children with ADHD, Autism, and AuDHD

A Data.Driven.AdvocacySM Field Guide and Calibration Tool | ADHD Awareness Month, October 2026 | v0.42

Prepared by: Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, info@datadrivenadvocacy.com | Created: October 2026

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0). See Section 11 for how to cite and share this guide.

Accessible edition. This field guide is also rendered in EPUB for accessibility, so it can be read aloud with text-to-speech readers. Section 9 gives the link.

Executive Summary

This field guide presents a complete, calibrated design for a home token economy that families can build with inexpensive materials, together with a free token economy calibrator and a one-page daily routine. It is the Data.Driven.AdvocacySM contribution to ADHD Awareness Month.

- **What this guide offers.** A home token economy specified down to every component: what earns tokens, what tokens are worth, how rewards are valued in dollars and adult time, and how the system changes over time.
- **Why executive function.** Executive function (EF) is self-regulation: the actions a person directs at themselves to reach a future goal (1). EF differences appear in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and across autism, and they are not specific to any one diagnosis (2), (3). A token economy temporarily scaffolds EF and builds automaticity in one specific lagging skill, by placing a visible, immediate reward at the moment the behavior happens.
- **CPS-informed.** The design builds on Ross Greene's Collaborative & Proactive Solutions (CPS) model: kids do well if they can. Weak self-motivation is treated as a lagging skill the jar supports, and the target and the jar are chosen with the child through a Plan B conversation. Greene himself does not use reward systems, and this guide says so.
- **Shaping, not coercion.** Every token economy shapes behavior toward a goal. The operative question is whether it shapes or coerces. This design separates the two with four safeguards: an earn-only token rule in which nothing is ever lost, specific targets chosen for the child's well-being, a reward menu the child helps build, and no penalty for saying no.
- **Precision as the method.** A systematic review found that only 19% of 96 published token economy studies described all core components completely and replicably (4). This guide specifies every component.
- **Calibration.** Token values come from a private exchange rate: the weekly reward budget divided by the points the child saves in a week. About two-thirds of daily earnings are exchanged and one-third saved (5), targets rise in steps of no more than 20% (6), and special rewards stay within about two weeks of saving.
- **Built from multiple cases.** We developed the method in detail across twenty-five case studies in our practice over ten years, then generalized it. Section 5 shows the full calculation for a reading target, and Table 6 shows design decisions those cases refined. Each family then receives a short customization document that sets its own target, tokens, menu, and roles.
- **Data for advocacy.** A token log produces dated, specific behavior data. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), when a child's behavior impedes learning, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team must consider positive behavioral interventions and supports (7). Home data can inform that discussion.
- **Research depth.** Classroom studies have found token loss as effective as earning, and children often prefer it. This guide presents the earn-only rule as a deliberate design choice for home use and for behaviors to increase, and Section 8 explains why.
- **Boundaries.** This design supports clinical and educational care and does not replace it. Food-related targets must involve the child's health and psychiatric care team, and the method is not for children with feeding disorders without a clinician.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Executive Function Is the Common Thread.....	2
1.1. What Executive Function Is.....	2
1.2. Executive Function Across Neurodivergent Profiles.....	2
1.3. Externalized Regulation.....	3
2. Shaping, Not Coercion, Punishment, or Loss.....	3
2.1. Shaping Compared with Coercion.....	3
2.2. Shaping Is Not Punishment or Loss.....	3
2.3. A CPS-Informed Design.....	4
3. Design Principles.....	4
4. Calibration: What a Token Is Worth.....	5
4.1. Value Comes from Exchange.....	5
4.2. The Earning Side.....	5
4.3. The Exchange Side.....	5
4.4. Anchoring to Real Costs.....	6
4.5. Keeping Token Value Stable.....	6
4.6. Planning the Fade.....	6
5. Worked Example: Reading a Chapter Book.....	6
6. Measurement: Turning a Home System into Data.....	8
7. Extending to Other Targets.....	8
8. Boundaries and Limits.....	8
9. Tools.....	9
10. Glossary.....	9
11. How to Cite and Share This Guide.....	10
12. References.....	10
Appendix A. The Family Customization Document.....	12

1. Executive Function Is the Common Thread

1.1. What Executive Function Is

Barkley describes EF as self-regulation: directing one's attention, picturing the past, talking to oneself, managing emotional reactions in ways that support self-motivation, holding back strong urges, and mentally working with information to solve problems. Each aims to change one's own future (1). In his model of ADHD, behavioral inhibition is the base on which the other executive functions depend (8).

1.2. Executive Function Across Neurodivergent Profiles

EF differences are not limited to ADHD. A meta-analysis of autism studies found broad EF impairment compared with neurotypical peers (2), with considerable variation from one autistic person to the next (9). A later meta-analysis found reduced EF performance in autism and stressed that EF dysfunctions are not autism-specific (3).

Data.Driven.AdvocacySM's working model follows from this: EF challenges are downstream of several neurodivergent profiles, including ADHD, autism, co-occurring autism and ADHD (often called AuDHD), and others. A tool that supports EF at the point of performance can therefore serve children across these profiles, adjusted for each child.

1.3. Externalized Regulation

Barkley distinguishes between expanding EF and arranging the setting so it compensates for limited EF. A written note or a to-do list helps a person regulate themselves without expanding their working memory (1). He also argues that impairment is situation-specific: change the situation so the person is more effective, and the harm is reduced even when symptoms remain (1).

A token economy uses the same idea for motivation. Many children with ADHD find it hard to work now for a reward that comes later. For example, a child may know that reading for 15 minutes each night will get them to the end of a chapter book by Friday, but on Monday night, Friday feels too far away to matter. A token fixes the timing. The child reads for 15 minutes and gets a chip right away, and the chip goes into a clear jar. The jar shows the goal and the progress toward it, so the child does not have to hold the goal in mind alone.

A note on precision. A token economy temporarily scaffolds a child’s general EF capacity. It builds automaticity in one particular lagging skill, such as starting to read without a reminder. Each chip supplies the motivation the child cannot yet supply alone, so the behavior is repeated in the same setting day after day. With enough consistent repetition, a behavior becomes automatic: it starts on cue, with little deliberate effort. In a study of adults adopting a new daily behavior, automaticity built over a median of about 66 days, with a wide range from 18 to 254 days, and missing a single day did not derail the process (10). Once the target behavior runs on its own, it no longer depends on EF in the moment, and the jar can fade (Section 4.6). That study involved adults, not children with ADHD, so the timeline for any one child is tested with the log.

2. Shaping, Not Coercion, Punishment, or Loss

2.1. Shaping Compared with Coercion

Token economies are systems for shaping behavior toward a goal. Some critics, including voices in the autism community, argue that token systems have been used to train compliance. That critique deserves a direct answer.

The Data.Driven.AdvocacySM position is that shaping toward a goal is the purpose of a token economy. If a child’s skills were not lagging behind the expected level of maturity, no shaping would be needed. Compliance, in the narrow sense of following an expectation, is not harmful in itself; children follow many expectations that serve their own well-being. The operative question is whether a system shapes or coerces, and that difference can be specified.

Table 1: Shaping Compared with Coercion

Feature	Coercive System	Shaping System (This Design)
Who benefits from the target?	Mainly adult convenience	The child’s health, learning, or well-being
What happens after a refusal	Tokens or privileges are taken away	Nothing; the child does not earn at that moment
Who sets the rewards	Adults alone	The child helps build the menu
How targets are stated	Broad goals, such as "behave"	Specific, observable behaviors
How earned rewards are treated	Can be withheld for unrelated behavior	Always delivered
How the system ends	Abruptly, or never	A planned fade once the behavior is steady

A second, older critique is practical: gains made while tokens are in place do not automatically last after the tokens are withdrawn (11). The design in this field guide treats that as an engineering requirement and plans the fade from the start.

2.2. Shaping Is Not Punishment or Loss

ADHD-related dysregulation is not something to punish. Data.Driven.AdvocacySM therefore distinguishes behavioral shaping, which builds toward a goal, from punishment and loss, which subtract after a failure. Many behavioral parent-training programs include punishment components such as time-out and token removal, including the manual from which the Cincinnati handout is adapted (12). This design keeps the reinforcement and omits those components. Every element points forward: chips go in, the goal line holds still, and the child builds toward it at their own pace.

2.3. A CPS-Informed Design

Ross Greene's Collaborative & Proactive Solutions (CPS) model starts from a belief this design shares: kids do well if they can. If a child could do well, they would; when they do not, they are lacking skills, not will (13). CPS identifies lagging skills and unsolved problems, and it describes three ways adults respond to an unmet expectation: Plan A, in which adults solve the problem unilaterally; Plan B, in which adults and the child solve the problem together; and Plan C, in which an expectation is set aside for now (13).

Where this design meets and departs from Greene. Greene holds that rewards and punishments solve no problems and enhance no skills (13). In his model, Plan A means adults solve the problem unilaterally. This design's token system is not imposed unilaterally. The target and the token system come out of a Plan B conversation: the child's concern is heard first, the adult's concern is stated, and the jar is adopted only as a solution both agree to. In process, this is Greene's model. The difference lies in the solution itself. Greene's model looks for solutions that address each concern directly, while this design adds an external support for one lagging skill, self-motivation at the moment of action. The design is CPS-informed, not endorsed by Greene, and it states that difference openly.

Why the two are compatible. Barkley lists managing emotions in support of self-motivation among the executive functions (1). For a child with EF challenges, weak self-motivation at the moment of action is therefore itself a lagging skill: a "can't yet," not a "won't." Supporting a lagging skill from outside, while the child develops, is consistent with "kids do well if they can." The jar is part of what makes "can" possible. In this design, it is never the main way adults change behavior; it is one support, chosen together.

Table 2: How CPS Shapes This Token Economy

CPS Element	Role in This Design
Kids do well if they can	The starting belief; low performance signals a lagging skill, including lagging self-motivation
Unsolved problems	Each target begins as a specifically worded unsolved problem, for example "difficulty starting reading after dinner"
Plan B	Adults and the child choose the target and the solution together; the token jar is offered as one possible solution, not imposed
Plan C	Other expectations are set aside for now, so one target gets full attention
Plan A	Not used; there are no consequences, threats, or removal
Problems outside the jar	Other challenging behavior is handled through Plan B as separate unsolved problems, never through the jar

A Plan B conversation has three steps (13). For example, for a reading target:

- **Empathy.** "I've noticed it's hard to start reading after dinner. What's up?" The adult listens and gathers the child's concern.
- **Define adult concerns.** "My concern is that reading keeps getting pushed off, and you miss the end of the story you picked."
- **Invitation.** "I wonder if there's a way we can work on this together." The child's ideas come first; the token jar is one option the adult can offer. The solution must work for both.

3. Design Principles

The design adapts the Home Poker Chip program from the Cincinnati Children's Center for ADHD (5), itself modified from Barkley's parent training manual (12), with calibration rules from the University of Washington home token economy guide (6). Ten principles define it.

1. **Tokens are only earned.** Tokens never come out except when the child exchanges them. The Cincinnati handout warns that taking tokens away can quickly crash the system (5).
2. **Tokens are earned immediately.** A token follows the behavior right away, never a promise made in advance (5), (6).
3. **Tokens are tangible and carry numbers.** Physical chips in a clear jar make earnings visible. Chips with printed values let earnings count in tens, because larger numbers motivate children with ADHD more (5).
4. **Every target is specific.** A target names what the child does, when, and how an adult will see it. Open-ended goals, such as "behave better," are never targets, because no one can tell when a token has been earned.

5. **Adults control the supply.** Tokens must be something the child cannot obtain on their own (6).
6. **The language is earn and exchange.** The child earns tokens and exchanges them for rewards. The plan never speaks of paying, buying, or spending.
7. **The child helps choose the target and build the menu.** The target and the jar come out of a Plan B conversation, and the child helps generate the list of rewards (5), which keeps the system something done with the child rather than to the child.
8. **Food is never a reward, a penalty, or a weapon.** Food is never used to bribe, threaten, or punish, and it never appears on the reward menu. Using food as leverage turns eating into a contest and works against any target that involves food.
9. **Other behavior is handled outside the jar.** Handle other challenging behaviors through Plan B as separate, unsolved problems, so the jar stays a place where only good things happen.
10. **What the child already owns stays theirs.** A possession first given as a reward and later threatened turns the reward into a punishment. Menu rewards are new privileges available only through the jar.

The earn-only model. Data.Driven.AdvocacySM calls this design earn-only. Every opportunity ends one of two ways: the child earns now, or the child earns at the next opportunity. Nothing is lost, and the goal line never moves away. The child controls the pace, building toward the goal quickly or slowly. This positive framing is a deliberate design choice, and Section 8 places it against the research on token loss.



Figure 1: A 10-point chip: one chip per target behavior, and a second chip when the child starts it without a prompt

Two supporting practices complete the design. Each deposit is praised specifically, and each refusal is met calmly: "That is your choice," and the adult moves on without arguing (6).

4. Calibration: What a Token Is Worth

4.1. Value Comes from Exchange

A token has no value of its own. Like a currency, its value is set by what it can be exchanged for (6). Calibration therefore links two sides: how many points the child can earn in a day, and how many points each reward takes. The child never sees a dollar rate; the adults use a private one to keep the system calibrated within the family budget.

4.2. The Earning Side

- **Baseline first.** Log one week of the target behavior before tokens begin.
- **Target in steps.** Set the daily target no more than 20% above baseline (6). The target is for calibration; the child is not asked to hit it each day.
- **Regular earnings.** Compute regular daily earnings at the target. Leave bonus or double tokens out of this number, so they act as extra savings.
- **Chip denomination by age.** Use 10-point chips for children under 10 and 20-point chips for ages 10 to 17, so the denomination rises with the child. An optional scaling factor multiplies every value when larger numbers motivate more, as they often do for children with ADHD (5). The factor need not be a whole number. For example, a factor of 1.5 turns a 10-point chip into a 15-point chip, and a factor of 10 turns it into a 100-point chip, without changing what anything is worth.

4.3. The Exchange Side

- **Two-thirds rule.** Set exchange values for daily rewards so a typical day uses about two-thirds of regular earnings, leaving one-third to save (5). Daily rewards should cost the family no money.

- **Daily caps.** Cap screen time and similar privileges per day, as the Cincinnati handout does (5).
- **Floor test.** On a poor day, the child should still earn one or two small rewards. A system that offers no hope of success is one cause the handout lists when a child stops trying (5).

4.4. Anchoring to Real Costs

Every reward has two real costs: money and adult time. The private exchange rate converts both into points.

Table 3: Calibration Formulas

Quantity	Formula	Source
Daily target	Baseline $\times$ 1.2, rounded down	University of Washington (6)
Daily exchange budget	Regular earnings $\times$ 2/3, rounded down to a chip value	Cincinnati (5)
Weekly savings	(Regular earnings – daily budget) $\times$ 7	Derived
Private exchange rate	Weekly reward budget $\div$ weekly savings	Data.Driven.Advocacy SM design
Reward value in points	Money $\div$ rate + adult hours $\times$ time weight, rounded up to a chip value	Data.Driven.Advocacy SM design
Days of saving	Reward value $\div$ daily savings	Derived

Two design rules follow. Special rewards should take no more than about two weeks of saving, a horizon chosen for children under 10 with EF challenges; when an item costs more, choose a less expensive reward or have the family quietly cover part of the cost. And never price relationship time, such as regular time with grandparents. Rewards must be things the child cannot get otherwise (5), and making family time depend on behavior would tie relationships to performance. Earned extras, such as an outing a child plans with a grandparent, can sit on top of regular time with that adult's agreement.

Where the cash anchor came from. One of our earliest implementations, about ten years ago, ran alongside the Good Sport Bucks (GSB) system used at the UC Irvine Child Development School. Its calibration pegged every reward to one cash reference point: a movie outing, about \$10, equaled 22 tokens, and every other reward was valued in proportion. The rate was tied to a \$5 weekly allowance, so a movie was within reach about every two weeks. Twenty minutes of daily screen time stayed unconditional, and altruism, such as volunteering, earned more, with a donation to a charity available as a reward. The current design keeps the cash anchor and adds what later cases taught: adult time as a cost, a saving horizon, and a floor test.

4.5. Keeping Token Value Stable

- **No free tokens.** Tokens given without the behavior weaken every reward (6).
- **Raise targets in steps.** When the log shows the target met on at least five days in a week, raise it by no more than 20% and recalibrate.
- **Never devalue savings.** Changes to exchange values apply going forward only. Lowering the value of saved tokens would act the same as taking them away.

4.6. Planning the Fade

Once the behavior is steady, the guides recommend raising exchange values, lowering token value, or giving tokens less often (6), and moving to intermittent reinforcement (5). Change one thing at a time and tell the child in advance. This is how the design answers the generalization problem raised in Section 2 (11).

5. Worked Example: Reading a Chapter Book

We developed the method across twenty-five cases over ten years, then generalized it. This worked example uses a target that recurs across those cases: reading a chapter book for 15 minutes. The child's parent wanted reading to become a daily habit; the child enjoyed stories but rarely started reading without being asked multiple times. Reading had become a source of dysregulation.

- **What earns.** Each 15-minute reading session earns a 10-point chip. A session the child starts on their own, without a prompt, earns a second chip, for 20 points.

- **The visible goal.** A line on the jar, with a picture beside it, marks the special reward the child is saving for. There is no daily goal to track.

Table 4: Worked Example: Earning Side and Exchange Rate (Illustrative Numbers)

Step	Value
Baseline 15-minute reading sessions per day	3
Daily target: $3 \times 1.2 = 3.6$, rounded down	3 sessions
Regular daily earnings: 3×10	30 points
Daily exchange budget: $30 \times 2/3 = 20$	20 points
Saved per day and per week	10 and 70 points
Weekly reward budget (family decision)	\$20
Private exchange rate: $\$20 \div 70$	About \$0.286 per point
Adult time weight (family decision)	30 points per hour

With a small baseline, the 20% step rounds down to the baseline itself, so the first target is to hold the current level while the jar adds the motivation. Once the child meets 3 sessions on five days of a week, the target rises to 4.

Table 5: Worked Example: Exchange Menu Valued from Real Costs (Illustrative Numbers)

Reward	Money	Adult Time	Points	Days of Saving
10 minutes of game time (daily cap)	\$0	None	10	Daily
An extra story at bedtime	\$0	10 min	10	Daily
Having a friend over	\$5	2 hr	80	8.0
Outing planned with a grandparent	\$15	2 hr	120	12.0
A new game	\$30	None	110	11.0
New sports gear	\$40	None	140	14.0

For example, having a friend over takes $\$5 \div (\$20 \div 70) = 17.5$ points for money plus $2 \times 30 = 60$ points for time, a total of 77.5, rounded up to 80. A poor day of one reading session still earns 10 points, enough for one small daily reward. Because this child saves fewer points per week than in a high-frequency target, each point carries more dollar value, and the largest reward sits right at the two-week horizon.

Table 6: Design Decisions Refined Across Cases

Issue	Earlier Approach	Problem Found	Current Design
Reward values	Every reward pegged to one cash reference point, such as a movie outing	Did not count adult time or how long a child must save	Private exchange rate from the weekly budget, plus adult time and a saving horizon
Token type	Household items chosen for their symbolism, such as dried beans	A child can find more at home	Poker chips with printed values, supply kept by adults
Unit of earning	One token for any part of a broad activity	Rewarded what the child already did readily	Only the specific target earns
Doubling feature	The day's tokens matched when a daily goal was met	Required daily tracking and created a near miss one step short of the goal	Target behavior started without a prompt earns a second chip immediately
Consequences	An owned item threatened when the child did not follow through	The reward became a punishment	Owned items stay the child's; tokens are never removed

6. Measurement: Turning a Home System into Data

A one-minute daily voice memo is enough. It records points earned, target behaviors and their times, which ones the child started without a prompt, points exchanged, and any difficult moment with its time and context. One baseline week comes before tokens begin.

Table 7: Weekly Calibration Signals

Signal in the Log	Likely Meaning	Adjustment
Points pile up and are rarely exchanged	The menu is not appealing	Refresh the menu with the child
The jar never reaches the goal line	Exchange values or the target are too high	Lower special exchange values, or choose a nearer reward
The target is met every day with ease	The target is too low	Raise it by no more than 20%
Weekly reward spending runs over budget	The rate no longer matches saving	Rerun the token economy calibrator
Little is earned and the child begs for tokens	The target is too high, or tokens are given late	Lower the target; give tokens right after the behavior

The log also serves advocacy. When a child's behavior impedes learning, IDEA requires the IEP team to consider positive behavioral interventions and supports (7). Dated, specific home data can inform the team's understanding of present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAPF), and it gives parents a concrete record of which supports work.

7. Extending to Other Targets

The first application is only the beginning. The same jar, tokens, and menu can carry other targets later, added one at a time after the first is steady; the source handout works on a few at a time (5). Each new target starts as a specifically worded unsolved problem, is agreed through Plan B, and must pass a four-question test: what exactly the child does, when, who checks, and how many tokens it earns.

Table 8: Converting Open-Ended Goals into Specific Targets (Examples)

Open-Ended Goal	Specific Target	Who Checks and When
Behave better	Not usable as stated; choose one specific behavior first	Not applicable
Read more	Reads a chapter book for 15 minutes (the worked example in Section 5)	Parent at the agreed reading time
Less phone	Puts the phone on the kitchen charger at the agreed time	Parent at that time
Smoother mornings	Is dressed before coming to breakfast	Parent at breakfast
Kinder at home	Does one helpful act for a family member without being asked, and tells an adult	The adult told, the same day
Eat better	Eats a set number of bites of protein at dinner, with the number taken from the baseline week	The adult at dinner

Table 8 converts five common open-ended goals into specific targets. A food target, such as the last row, follows the food boundary in Section 8.

8. Boundaries and Limits

- **Support, not treatment.** This design complements medical, psychological, and educational care. Families working with a therapist or behavior analyst should coordinate the plan with that professional.
- **What the evidence shows.** Token economies have a long record across settings, and a review describes continued promise for children with autism or intellectual disability (14). Much of that evidence comes from clinical and classroom settings rather than homes, and gains do not automatically last after tokens are withdrawn (11). Whether the system works for a given child is tested with the baseline week and the log.

- **Earn-only is a Data.Driven.AdvocacySM design choice.** In a classroom study of 12 first graders, both earning and losing tokens reduced disruptive behavior; loss produced more consistent decreases for some children, and most children preferred the loss condition (15). A later classroom study found the two equally effective for on-task behavior, with preferences varying from child to child (16). This design still excludes token loss, for three reasons. Its targets are behaviors to increase, so a loss condition would penalize the absence of a behavior; for a target such as reading, that turns a missed session into the kind of conflict the plan exists to prevent. It is run by parents at home, where the source model warns that removing tokens can crash the system and defers any removal to a later, therapist-guided step (5); this design omits that step. And a refusal that costs nothing is one of the safeguards that separate shaping from coercion (Section 2). Families or professionals who choose a loss arrangement for a specific problem behavior will find support in this research; that is a different design.
- **Food and feeding.** Food targets must involve the child's health and psychiatric care team, and the method is not for children with feeding disorders without a clinician. In a randomized trial of 422 children ages 4 to 6, non-food rewards for tasting a disliked vegetable increased intake for three months without lowering liking, and praise alone was nearly as effective as stickers (17). The trial ran in schools with unfamiliar researchers and a moderately disliked vegetable, and its authors note that delivery by parents at home still needs testing, since parents may need support to persist for about ten exposures. It supports the approach without proving it for any one child.

9. Tools

This guide has two companions on the Data.Driven.AdvocacySM website: the token economy calibrator (18), and The Token Jar 1-2-3: Quick Start (19), a one-page daily routine. The guide itself is published in PDF and in an EPUB edition for text-to-speech readers (20).

- **Token economy calibrator.** The calibrator on the Data.Driven.AdvocacySM website updates its results as values are typed, or when Calculate is selected. It sets the chip denomination from the child's age, accepts a whole or decimal scaling factor, applies the calibration rules in Section 4, flags any special reward beyond the saving horizon, and follows the site's accessibility settings. Its example uses a reading target: 15 minutes of reading a chapter book.
- **The Token Jar 1-2-3: Quick Start.** A one-page daily routine: set up once, earn at every opportunity, exchange each evening, plus four things the family never does.
- **Family customization document.** A short, family-specific plan built on this guide (Appendix A).

10. Glossary

Table 9: Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
ADHD	Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder
AuDHD	An informal term for co-occurring autism and ADHD
Automaticity	A behavior that starts on cue, with little deliberate effort, after consistent repetition
Baseline week	One week of logging before tokens begin, used to set targets and compare results
Chip	The physical token used in this design: a poker chip printed with its point value, such as 10, given right after the target behavior and kept in the jar
CPS	Collaborative & Proactive Solutions, Ross Greene's model built on the belief that kids do well if they can
Earn-only	Data.Driven.Advocacy SM 's token rule: every opportunity ends in earning now or earning later; tokens are never removed, and the child sets the pace toward the goal
Executive function (EF)	Self-regulation directed at reaching a future goal, including attention, inhibition, working memory, and emotional regulation
Externalized regulation	Support placed in the environment, such as a visible token jar, that does part of the work of self-regulation
Goal line	A line on the jar, with a picture, marking the points needed for the reward the child is saving for

Term	Definition
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individualized Education Program
Lagging skill	In CPS, a skill a child has not yet developed that makes an expectation hard to meet; here, including self-motivation at the moment of action
PLAAFP	Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, the section of an IEP that describes the child's current performance
Plan A, Plan B, Plan C	In CPS: adults solve the problem unilaterally (A); adults and child solve the problem together (B); the expectation is set aside for now (C)
Private exchange rate	The dollar value of one point, used by adults to keep rewards within budget; never shown to the child
Response cost	Removing tokens or privileges after a problem behavior; excluded from this design
Token economy	A system in which a child earns tokens for target behaviors and exchanges them for chosen rewards
Unsolved problem	In CPS, a specific expectation a child is having difficulty meeting, worded without theories or adult solutions

11. How to Cite and Share This Guide

Citation (IEEE). Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, "The earn-only home token economy: An executive functioning support tool for children with ADHD, autism, and AuDHD," field guide and calibration tool, v0.42, Oct. 2026. (Online). Available: https://datadrivenadvocacy.com/assets/TokenEconomy/dda-Home_Token_Economy_Tool_v0.42.pdf

License. This field guide, the token economy calibrator, The Token Jar 1-2-3: Quick Start, and the chip illustrations are licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (21). Families, educators, clinicians, and advocates may copy, share, and adapt them for non-commercial purposes, provided they credit Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, link to the license, and indicate any changes. Commercial use requires written permission from Data.Driven.AdvocacySM.

Scope. This guide is educational information. It is not medical, psychological, or legal advice, and it does not replace care from the child's clinicians or educational team.

12. References

- (1) R. A. Barkley, "The importance of executive function in understanding and managing ADHD," Attention, pp. 28-35, Apr. 2011. (Online). Available: https://d393uh8gb46l22.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/ATTN_04_11_ImportanceExecutiveFunction.pdf
- (2) E. A. Demetriou, A. Lampit, D. S. Quintana, S. L. Naismith, Y. J. C. Song, J. E. Pye, I. Hickie, and A. J. Guastella, "Autism spectrum disorders: A meta-analysis of executive function," Mol. Psychiatry, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 1198-1204, 2018, doi: 10.1038/mp.2017.75. (Online). Available: <https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/server/api/core/bitstreams/9a9656b4-d19c-5cf5-83fb-20b878427c7b/content>
- (3) J. Hemmers, C. Baethge, K. Vogeley, and C. M. Falter-Wagner, "Are executive dysfunctions relevant for the autism-specific cognitive profile?" Front. Psychiatry, vol. 13, Art. no. 886588, 2022. (Online). Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsyf.2022.886588/pdf>
- (4) J. W. Ivy, J. N. Meindl, E. Overlay, and K. M. Robson, "Token economy: A systematic review of procedural descriptions," Behav. Modif., vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 708-737, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0145445517699559. (Online). Available: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0145445517699559>
- (5) R. E. A. Loren, "Contingency management systems for children with ADHD," Cincinnati Children's Center for ADHD, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH, USA, rev. Oct. 12, 2017. (Online). Available: <https://www.cincinnatichildrens.org/-/media/cincinnati%20childrens/home/patients/family-support-resources/behavioral-management/page-media/contingency%20management%20systems%20for%20children%20with%20adhd.pdf>
- (6) CBT+ Initiative, "CBT+ home token economy guide for therapists: Example session outline and handouts," University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA, 2017. (Online). Available: <https://uwhatc.uw.edu/PDF/TF-%20CBT/pages/combined/CBT+-Home-Token-Economy-Guide.pdf>

- (7) Center for Parent Information and Resources, "Special factors in IEP development," Parent Center Hub. (Online). Available: <https://www.parentcenterhub.org/?p=280>
- (8) R. A. Barkley, "Behavioral inhibition, sustained attention, and executive functions: Constructing a unifying theory of ADHD," Psychol. Bull., vol. 121, no. 1, pp. 65-94, 1997. (Online). Available: <https://sciences.ucf.edu/psychology/childrenslearningclinic/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2013/08/Barkley-1997-Psych-Bulletin.pdf>
- (9) E. A. Demetriou, M. M. DeMayo, and A. J. Guastella, "Executive function in autism spectrum disorder: History, theoretical models, empirical findings, and potential as an endophenotype," Front. Psychiatry, vol. 10, Art. no. 753, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2019.00753. (Online). Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00753/pdf>
- (10) P. Lally, C. H. M. van Jaarsveld, H. W. W. Potts, and J. Wardle, "How are habits formed: Modelling habit formation in the real world," Eur. J. Soc. Psychol., vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 998-1009, 2010, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.674.
- (11) A. E. Kazdin and R. R. Bootzin, "The token economy: An evaluative review," J. Appl. Behav. Anal., vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 343-372, 1972, doi: 10.1901/jaba.1972.5-343. (Online). Available: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1310772/>
- (12) R. A. Barkley, Defiant Children: A Clinician's Manual for Assessment and Parent Training, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Guilford Press, 1997.
- (13) R. W. Greene, "Moving from power and control to collaboration and problem solving," Lives in the Balance, 2021. (Presentation slides). (Online). Available: <https://livesinthebalance.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/2021-CMHC.pdf>
- (14) J. L. Matson and J. A. Boisjoli, "The token economy for children with intellectual disability and/or autism: A review," Res. Dev. Disabil., vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 240-248, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2008.04.001. (Online). Available: https://repository.lsu.edu/psychology_pubs/2191
- (15) J. M. Donaldson, I. G. DeLeon, A. B. Fisher, and S. Kahng, "Effects of and preference for conditions of token earn versus token loss," J. Appl. Behav. Anal., vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 537-548, 2014, doi: 10.1002/jaba.135. (Online). Available: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4487863/>
- (16) E. S. Jowett Hirst, C. L. Dozier, and S. W. Payne, "Efficacy of and preference for reinforcement and response cost in token economies," J. Appl. Behav. Anal., 2016, doi: 10.1002/jaba.294. (Online). Available: <https://metatoc.com/papers/52234-efficacy-of-and-preference-for-reinforcement-and-response-cost-in-token-economies>
- (17) L. J. Cooke, L. C. Chambers, E. V. Añez, H. A. Croker, D. Boniface, M. R. Yeomans, and J. Wardle, "Eating for pleasure or profit: The effect of incentives on children's enjoyment of vegetables," Psychol. Sci., vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 190-196, Feb. 2011, doi: 10.1177/0956797610394662. (Online). Available: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3272376/>
- (18) Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, "Token economy calibrator," web tool, Oct. 2026. (Online). Available: https://datadrivenadvocacy.com/dda-token_economy_calibrator.php
- (19) Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, "The Token Jar 1-2-3: Quick Start," one-page guide, v0.10, Oct. 2026. (Online). Available: https://datadrivenadvocacy.com/assets/TokenEconomy/dda-Token_Jar_1-2-3_Quick_Start_v0.10.pdf
- (20) Data.Driven.AdvocacySM, "The earn-only home token economy: An executive functioning support tool for children with ADHD, autism, and AuDHD," EPUB edition, v0.42, Oct. 2026. (Online). Available: https://datadrivenadvocacy.com/assets/TokenEconomy/dda-Home_Token_Economy_Tool_v0.42.epub
- (21) Creative Commons, "Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)." (Online). Available: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>



Appendix A. The Family Customization Document

Each family receives a short document built on this guide. It contains only what is specific to the child; every "why" refers back here. A typical document runs three to four pages plus the family's own one-page Token Jar 1-2-3.

Table 10: Contents of a Family Customization Document

Section	What It Contains
1. The target and why	The unsolved problem, the Plan B conversation that chose the target, the parent's hypothesis, and what the log will test
2. Tokens and jar	The chip set chosen with the child, the jar, and the goal line
3. What earns	The earning table, including any double-chip behavior
4. Exchange menu	Rewards chosen with the child, valued with the token economy calibrator
5. Roles	Who gives tokens, when, and where; agreements with extended family
6. Log and review	What the daily memo records and when the weekly review happens
7. The family's Token Jar 1-2-3	The one-page daily routine for the family

